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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to find out from educators who held the requisite credentials to be a secondary principal, but were not serving in that position, why fewer licensed educators are choosing to apply for secondary principal positions. This investigation was initiated because a shortage of qualified secondary principals in the state of Iowa had been indicated.

Four research questions were utilized with a quantitative research approach. A survey instrument was mailed to a sample of Iowa educators holding the Iowa 7-12 principal license but not serving 7-12 principal positions. The final sample included 131 responses which represented a return rate of 67%. Descriptive statistics were used to report findings from the survey.

At the time of this study, 79% of the licensed population—most were teachers—were not seeking a 7-12 principal position. Most sought and obtained the 7-12 principal preparation and license to broaden their knowledge base, for an opportunity to use leadership skills, and for higher pay. Major barriers or dissatisfiers to their seeking or securing a 7-12 principal position were too much time spent on discipline and personnel issues, satisfaction with current job, and inability or undesirability to relocate. Individuals’ willingness to apply could be positively influenced by a decrease in the responsibilities and expectations associated with the position, the possibility of a job in the right location and by support from community, parents, and administration.

Although most of the respondents indicated they would not be seeking a 7-12 principalship in the near future, many of them (45.7%) had applied for a 7-12 principal
position but had not been offered or accepted one. This, and respondents’ comments regarding the large number of applicants for principal jobs for which they applied or of which they were aware, raise questions about a shortage in terms of actual numbers of applicants for 7-12 principal positions. Further research is warranted.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Background Information

Across our country lawmakers, educators, and parents remain concerned about quality schools. Although there are many different approaches to restructuring or reforming schools, all have one common element—the building principal. Central to the success of these efforts is effective leadership of the school principal (Robbins, 1995).

The job of a building principal is multifarious. Great expectations are placed on principals, and these expectations are imposed in the midst of a culture that is in rapid transition and an education system that is continually in the hot seat. Today’s principal is “a legal expert, health and social services coordinator, fundraiser, public relations consultant, parental involvement expert, and security officer, who is technologically savvy, diplomatic, with top-notch managerial skills, whose most important duty is the implementation of instructional programs, curricula, pedagogical practice, and assessment tools” (NASSP, 2001b, p. 2). The building level administrator is a key force in leading students to higher levels of educational attainment and staff members and parents into new conceptualizations of organization, staffing, program and instruction, technology, parent and community involvement, and accountability (Sybouts & Wendel, 1994).

Growing expectations and intensified demands are being placed on all educators in our schools today—teachers, principals, and superintendents (Deal & Peterson, 1999; Hargreaves, 1996). But what goes on in a building, where the recipients of change—the
children—are located, depends on the principal. Principals have the key role in creating an effective school ("Help Wanted," 1999; Olson, 2000a). Educational Research Service found good principals to be the "keystone" (p. 5) of good schools, determining that "without the principal's leadership, efforts to raise student achievement cannot succeed" (Ashford, 2000, p. 5). Chester Finn (1986) says of principals, "It comes as no surprise that every really good school turns outs to have a terrific leader at its helm. And it is no accident, I believe, that in a great many systems those terrific leaders are effective despite the constraints and limitations that surround their jobs" (p. 16).

So, after several years tuned to restructuring and reforming the system—benchmarks and standards and testing and other ways to hold students and schools accountable—the focus is now on the people charged with the execution. Much attention has been given to training, attracting, and keeping good teachers. "But nowhere is the focus on the human element in public education more prevalent than in the renewed recognition of the importance of strong and effective leadership" (Olson, 2000a, p. 1). School Administrators of Iowa (1997b) stresses, "Without strong leaders, we can't have strong schools. Iowa's schools have long enjoyed high ranking in the nation's education system. And it is Iowa's school leaders that maintain and develop the strong tradition of educational excellence" (p. 1).

The rationale for this research effort is built on the consensus that principals are critical to the success of school reform efforts and, in the long run, to the success of public education in this country and in our state. The importance of principals to effective schools has been documented, so much so that the concern of a school
leadership shortage has been noted at length in current school leadership journals, and has been cited in national school leadership organizations’ newsletters and in state reports, and has reached state legislators’ hearing rooms and the floors of Congress. Talking about the shortage, Susan Traiman, the director of education initiatives at the Washington-based Business Roundtable, said, “Virtually everyone I talk to is focused on leadership at the school level in terms of the principal. Some...groups feel that there’s a nationwide crisis” (as cited in Olson, 2000a, p.16). “The shortage of school administrators is real and is reaching crisis proportion” (Quinn, 2002). Talk of a leadership crisis is a result of an increasing number of administrators leaving their positions and a concern about who will replace them, especially in this time of intense focus on student achievement. This study was intended to contribute to the current dialogue on school leadership, particularly in terms of building level leadership at the secondary level.

Iowa Context

This study sought to shed light on this concern about school leadership as it impacts the State of Iowa, where on March 19, 1998, the Iowa State Board of Education issued a policy statement on the school administrator shortage: “Iowa has a long history of educational excellence and skilled administrators at all levels have been a major reason for that success. Now a shortage of qualified administrators is affecting Iowa—a shortage that could seriously hinder the state’s ability to build on its tradition of excellence and create schools to meet the needs of its citizens in the 21st century” (Iowa State Board of Education, 1998, p. 1). “The issue facing nearly every Iowa school board
is not whether the shortage in qualified school administrators will occur, but rather when it will affect them" (School Administrators of Iowa [SAI], Iowa Association of School Boards [IASB], & Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000, p. 1).

To maintain its strong tradition of educational excellence and to procure a new generation of educational leaders, Iowa is calling educators home. In its publication “Teach Iowa: Bring Your Knowledge Home...to Iowa!” the Iowa Department of Education (2000) names administration as a specific shortage area. The Iowa Department of Education determines shortage areas based on the number of conditional licenses issued, anecdotal evidence such as phone calls from districts stating that they can’t get applicants for a certain position, and from college and university preparation program projections of graduates in the various fields (S. Fischer, Lead Consultant, Iowa Department of Education, personal communication, January 6, 2003). The 2001-2002 Teacher Shortage Forgivable Loan Program list, based on the shortage areas determined by the Iowa Department of Education, included “K-12 principal” (Iowa College Student Aid Commission, 2001) as did the 2000-2001 list (Iowa College Student Aid Commission, 2000). The 2002-2003 Teacher Shortage Forgivable Loan Shortage Areas specifies “PK-6 and 7-12 Principal”(Iowa College Student Aid Commission, 2002). Iowa legislators also sought to pass alternative certification programs to license teachers and administrators to help reduce shortages in the 2000-2001 legislative session (Rehberg, 2001).

An amendment to Chapter 14 “Issuance of Practitioner’s Licenses and Endorsements,” Iowa Administrative Code, reduced the number of years of teaching
experience to become a principal from five years to three years. When asked if this was due to a shortage of principals, Anne Kruse, Executive Director of the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners said, “Yes” (personal communication, September 14, 2000).

Gaylord Tryon, former executive director of School Administrators of Iowa (SAI), predicted in 1997 that by the year 2000 the state would see a 60% turnover among Iowa’s school administrators (Villanueva, 1997). And he continued, “We don’t have the numbers in the pipeline for those who want to be certified in the future. We also have certified people who don’t want the job” (Villanueva, 1997, p. 1).

The Iowa State Board of Education, the Iowa Department of Education, and SAI’s concerns and actions were supported by a 1999 survey conducted by the Institute for Educational Leadership at the University of Northern Iowa. The Institute’s Principal Job Satisfaction and Shortage Survey projected that by 2004, Iowa would lose 32% of its principals to retirement. An Iowa Department of Education report in the same year, 1999, projected that among principals in Iowa eligible to retire by 2003, 93% plan to do so.

No updated research is available on the turnover rate in school administrative positions in Iowa, but Tryon’s 1997 prediction has not materialized. “While the turnover rate has not reached 60%, we know that there are about 2000 educators in Iowa who have administrative endorsements, but few indicate they are wanting to apply for principalships” (T. Fisher, SAI Executive Director, personal communication, November 23, 2002). Approximately 625 of the 2000 certified individuals not in administrative positions are licensed to serve as secondary principals (Iowa Department of Education,
2001a). These “qualified Iowa educators are choosing not to take administrative positions,” says the Iowa State Board of Education (1998, p. 1); they “have chosen not to seek employment as educational leaders” (SAI, 1997a, p. 1). “The bottom line,” says SAI (1997a), “is that we are facing a crisis in leadership in Iowa because of a shortage of school administrators. Unless we take some immediate and proactive steps to address this situation, Iowa will be shortchanging the future of the next several generations” (p. 1).

**Purpose/Importance of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to contribute to an understanding of the noted shortage of qualified secondary principals in the state of Iowa and to the growing building leadership crisis in American schools. Information from this study may assist in providing leadership for Iowa schools in the future.

Although there is a consensus that those who hold positions as building principals significantly impact the effectiveness of a school, a number of factors associated with the principalship currently influence educators’ perceptions of this critical position and in turn affect whether or not they serve in these roles. This study asked people who held the requisite credentials to be a secondary principal, but who were not serving in that position, why certified people are not applying for secondary principals’ jobs. Responses to the survey supplied by these educators provide additional insight for local school boards and central office administration, university faculty, and professional organizations regarding the factors impacting potential candidates for building level leadership positions.
Problem Statement

This study asked why some of those certified for secondary principal positions in Iowa are not in those positions. Specifically, it looked at why those qualified (holding the appropriate license from the State) are not in the leadership role of secondary principal in light of the noted shortage of K-12 administrators. This study investigated individuals holding a valid secondary (7–12) principal license in Iowa during the 2000-2001 school year, who were not currently serving as secondary principals in the state. The study sought to determine what these individuals perceived as motivators to or satisfiers of the principalship, whether any of these individuals had sought or were seeking positions as secondary principals, and if not, what barriers and/or dissatisfiers in the principalship they perceived and what would entice them to seek such a position.

Definition of Terms

7-12 principal, or secondary principal: Chief administrator of a middle school, junior high school, high school, or combination.

7-12 principal endorsement, or 7-12 principal license: State of Iowa authorization for holder to serve as a principal in grades 7 through 12.

Principalship: Position held by a principal.

Motivator: That which provides something (a need or desire) that causes a person to act (Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary, p. 751).
Satisfier: What attracts educators to become school administrators (Wendel, 1994, p. 9); Something that would attract a person to a position and once in that position, provide the person with intrinsic and/or extrinsic rewards (D. Else, Director of the Institute for Educational Leadership, personal communication, March 25, 2002).

Dissatisfier: Factors that inhibit satisfaction in being or becoming administrators (Wendel, 1994, p. 9); Something that is not attractive about a position to a person and that would not provide the person, in that position, intrinsic and/or extrinsic rewards (D. Else, Director of the Institute for Educational Leadership, personal communication, March 25, 2002).

Barriers: Obstructions, either intrinsic or external, which create real or perceived boundaries or limitations (Shakeshaft, 1987).

Note: Motivators and satisfiers are presented together in one research question and in the same section of the survey used in this research effort as are dissatisfers and barriers. While defined separately here, for some study participants some individual factors may be both a motivator and a satisfier or may be both a barrier and a dissatisfier. For example, “encouragement from a mentor” may be a motivator but is not a satisfier of the job of principal itself. However, “prestige and status” may be viewed as a motivator and a satisfier. Likewise for dissatisfiers and barriers. “Gender” is a barrier, but is not a dissatisfier of the job itself. “Inability or undesirability to relocate” may relate to a dissatisfying aspect associated with the position but may be seen as a barrier to securing a principal position as well.
Area Education Agency (AEA): One of 15 intermediate support units under the jurisdiction of the Iowa Department of Education that provide educational and fiscal services to local school districts in Iowa.

School Administrators of Iowa (SAI): A professional organization that serves superintendents and principals in the state of Iowa.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP): A professional organization that serves secondary principals and assistant principals across the United States and in other countries of the world.

National Association of Elementary Principals (NAESP): A professional organization that serves Pre K-8 principals and assistant principals across the United States and in other countries of the world.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. How many of those holding a 7-12 principal endorsement, but not currently serving as a 7-12 principal, are currently seeking a 7-12 principal position? How many have held a 7-12 principal position, but are not currently in that position?

2. When pursuing the 7-12 principal endorsement, for those holding a 7-12 principal endorsement, but not currently serving as a 7-12 principal, what were the motivators or perceived satisfiers of the 7-12 principalship to seek and obtain the endorsement?
3. What do those holding a 7-12 principal endorsement, but not currently serving as a 7-12 principal, see as significant dissatisfiers or barriers to seeking a 7-12 principalship?

4. What would entice those holding a 7-12 principal endorsement, but not currently serving as a 7-12 principal, to seek a 7-12 principal position?

**Organization of the Study**

This study of Iowa educators holding the 7-12 principal license but not using it despite an indicated shortage of secondary administrators consists of five chapters. In this, the first chapter, a rationale is offered as to the importance of this study. In addition, the framework of the study is described. The second chapter reviews the literature regarding the development of the position of principal, the shortage of secondary principal candidates, what is being done and what yet can be done to draw educators to the position of 7-12 principal. The third chapter presents details of the methodology used to conduct the research for this study. In the fourth chapter, the findings of the study are presented. The fifth chapter provides a summary discussion of the findings and conclusions drawn from an analysis of the data. The fifth chapter also includes reflections on the findings, recommendations for those involved in preparing, hiring and assisting principals, and recommendations for future research. Appendixes include copies of documents used in conducting this study.
Limitations

Limitations to this study are as follows:

1. The intent of this study was to understand the nature of the 7-12 principal shortage in the state of Iowa. The descriptive findings of the study cannot necessarily be generalized to other states. The findings discussed cannot be considered applicable to all persons holding 7-12 principal licenses.

2. This study used one-time data collection. Many different factors could have impacted the data. Participants were asked to respond to the survey questionnaire in late April and early May of the school year. The time of year may have impacted the results in at least two ways. First, May is considered by many educators to be a very busy time of year and completing the survey would have been an additional task in an already full schedule. Secondly, April and May are often job-seeking months for educators. Study participants may have addressed their job-seeking status and their views of the principalship differently at this time of year than at another time of the school year.

3. Why people seek or do not seek a particular position and their perceptions of that position may change over time and across people. Data for this study reflected the perceptions of a sample who held a 7-12 principal license during the 2000-2001 academic year. The findings reported here do not necessarily reflect how this population, the population they represent, or similar populations might respond at other times.

4. An additional limitation was that data collection was conducted by means of a self-reporting survey. The usefulness of this information depended upon the candor of the respondents as they reacted to survey questions.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature review for this study is divided into five parts. The first part gives a historical perspective of the secondary principalship. The second part focuses on the shortage of candidates for the principalship. The third part discusses what attracts educators to the pursuit of a principal license. Barriers and dissatisfiers of the principalship are explained in the fourth part. The fifth and final part addresses what is currently being done and what can be done to alleviate the shortage.

Historical Development of the Secondary Principalship

The local school principal was the first educational administrative position to evolve in the United States. A Massachusetts law in 1647 required that secondary schools be provided in towns of 100 families or more. "While these schools were not staffed with a person called 'principal,' they did provide a base for public recognition of the need for secondary education and its management" (Wood, Nicholson, & Findley, 1979, p. 1). In early colonial times the responsibility to provide supplies and employ teachers as well as see to other administrative duties rested with lay people. However, these administrative tasks were soon deemed by the lay boards of education to consume too much of their time. Thus, the position of head teacher was established. Gradually, head teachers—"principal" teachers—assumed more of the administrative duties of the local schools.

As towns grew larger, local school committees thought that one- and two-teacher schools were inefficient, so schools were combined. And as the schools became larger,
more and more administrative responsibility and authority was given to the head teachers. School committees or boards of these larger schools in the larger cities felt an even greater need for administrative personnel. The first superintendents of schools were appointed in 1837 in Buffalo, New York, and in Louisville, Kentucky. Superintendents soon realized that head teachers, whose main responsibility was to teach classes, were not able to provide the administrative assistance that was needed (Jacobson, Reavis, & Logsdon, 1954).

The school principal developed into an official staff position as the head teacher’s role changed into one of increasing responsibility for the administration of the local school. Head teachers’ teaching responsibilities were exchanged for local school administrative duties. In the latter half of the 19th century the word principal came into common use. “The term principal was derived from prince and means first in rank, degree, importance and authority” (Kimbrough & Burkett, 1990, p. 3). The principal then became the major authority in a school.

In the mid to late 1800s, the local school committees, or boards of education, relinquished their administrative responsibilities to administrators as it became quite clear that they needed more professional assistance in managing students and staff (Wood et al., 1979). This bureaucratic form of school organization was also designed to help eliminate graft and political patronage and to improve the management of rapidly growing schools (Seyfarth, 1999).

As schools grew larger and problems more complex, principal teachers acquired duties in addition to those of instructional leadership: hiring staff, maintaining the school
building, and handling finances. With the title of the position shortened to strictly “principal,” the position acquired a political dimension, “through which role occupants sought to sense and transform public expectations into formal decisions and authoritative actions” (Seyfarth, 1999, p. 7).

As schools emerged with the westward expansion across America in the late 1800s into the early 1900s, principals were not immediately found in every schoolhouse; most schools in the West were one-room institutions serving only a small number of rural students. Local school boards employed teachers and assumed the responsibility for supervising their employees and communicating their expectations. Growth in settlements was accompanied by a growth in school populations. Schools with sufficient rooms were built and staffed with teachers to accommodate this growth. Consequently, school board members responsible for governing larger schools felt, as did their counterparts in the East, the necessity of employing an administrator. Often the administrator taught part time, served as the building administrator, and was responsible to the board or the superintendent. Ultimately, as homes were constructed and communities increased in population, grade schools and high schools were built. With the increase of grade schools and high schools, a superintendent was employed by the board of education to oversee the district, and a principal was hired to manage each building. With the evolution of school districts in the early half to middle of the 1900s, building administrators were employed with the primary responsibility of supervising and managing a single attendance unit; these building administrators held the title of principal (Sybouts & Wendel, 1994).
There appears to be no single career path into school administration, but research indicates that the vast majority of secondary principals have spent part of their careers as secondary teachers (Lyons, 1984). Characteristically, teachers spend several years in the classroom and then enroll in a university’s administrator preparation program. They take the prescribed courses and fill out an application for licensure, and become certified (Wendel, 1994). A number of secondary principals, Lyons (1984) found, had spent some time in some combination of the following positions: department heads, guidance counselors, coaches, elementary principals, and assistant principals.

Shortage of Candidates

According to the Educational Research Service, “Good principals are the keystone of good schools. Without the principal’s leadership, efforts to raise student achievement cannot succeed” (Ashford, 2000, p. 5). But as Paul D. Houston, Executive Director of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), has noted “...the leadership is being abandoned” (2000, p. 1).

The belief in the existence of a widespread shortage of principals to provide that leadership has stirred a number of educational policy groups to action: the U.S. Department of Education, the Broad Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, state governors and education officials, and the leaders of national corporations (Olson, 2000a). The emphasis—and the millions of dollars in research grants and program funding that come with it—is on reshaping the training and preparation of principals. The 1998 re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) addressed in its second section, Title II, the professional
development component, the preparation, training, and recruiting of high quality teachers and principals ("What a Difference," 2002). A $10 million initiative to support principal recruitment, retention, and training was a component of the most recent ESEA reauthorization when Congress and the President approved the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, although cuts removed it from the federal fiscal year 2002 budget (Quinn, 2002).

A shortage of secondary principals is upon us (Armstrong, 1990; Barker, 1997; Bower, 1996; Brockett, 1999; Donaldson, 2001; Hardy, 1998; Houston, 2000; Iowa Department of Education, 2000; Iowa State Board of Education, 1998; Murphy, 2001; Nakamura & Samuels, 2000; Newsom, 2001; Olson, 2000a; Olson, 2000b; Quinn, 2002; SAI, 1997a; SAI, 1997b; Smith, 1999; Villanueva, 1997). Statistics suggest that 40% (Brockett, 1999; Ferrandino, 2001; Ferrandino & Tirozzi, 2000; Morford, 2002; "Principal Shortage," 2002) of the country’s 93,200 principals are nearing retirement age. It appears, Brockett (1999) argues, that fewer teachers want to move into these positions. The School Leadership for the 21st Century Initiative in its interim report, "Leadership for Student Learning: Reinventing the Principalship," addresses the shortage of candidates at a time when many principals are taking early retirement (Hurley, 2001). "We are on the verge of a serious shortage," (Brockett, 1999, p. 1) says James Doud, chair of the University of Florida’s Educational Leadership Department. "We clearly have a shortage of people interested in being secondary principals, especially high school principals," (Bower, 1996, p. 1) specifies Lavern Scott, director of the St. Louis Principals Academy, which trains administrators. Yerkes and Guaglianone (1998) agree that the shortage of applicants for principalships in high schools is especially acute. Olson (2000b) reported
that if you ask superintendents whether they are having trouble finding principals, the "frustration just comes pouring out" (p. 16).

The shortage of principals seems to be worst in inner city and rural schools (Hardy, 1998). New York City is evidence of this with 138 schools having started the 2000-2001 school year without a full-time principal ("Institute Trains Principals," 2001) and more recently with their struggle to replace 300 administrators in the 2001-2002 school year (Quinn, 2002). Rural districts—two-thirds of all school districts (Muse & Thomas, 1991a)—are going to have to deal with shortages of competent persons capable and willing to take on the responsibilities of the rural principalship. When more vacancies occur than there are competent people able to fill them, suburban districts with their generally higher salaries, better benefits, cultural and housing options, and greater opportunities for professional development may attract the better candidates, leaving rural districts understaffed (Muse & Thomas, 1991a).

Hurley (1994) says we must re-evaluate the rural principal role because it is difficult to recruit and retain quality leaders in rural school districts. An effort must be made to combat the "farm system" (Jacobson, as quoted in Hurley, 1994, p. 167). Jacobson compares rural school districts to baseball farm teams which prepare players for the major leagues: first-time administrators get administrative experience in smaller rural districts and then move into positions in larger suburban and urban districts. Capella University, a fully on-line university, touts the approval of their on-line degree in educational administration by the Arizona State Board for Private Post Secondary Education.
Education as a response to the growing difficulty of finding qualified principals and superintendents, particularly in rural locations (Capella University, 2001).

"The evidence of an administrator shortage is plentiful. The average number of applicants for a superintendent's position in Iowa has declined seriously and a similar decrease has occurred in the number of applicants for other administrative positions. While the number of applicants is declining, qualified Iowa educators are choosing not to take administrative positions" (Iowa State Board of Education, 1998, p. 1). Two of the nine highlights of the Educator Supply and Demand in the United States: 2000 Executive Summary addressed the administrative shortage: "There are significant shortages in the supply of K-12 teachers and administrators" (p. 5) and "Administrative fields, including superintendent and principal positions at all levels, are identified as being shortages across the country" (American Association for Employment in Education, 2001a, p. 5). For their publications on educator supply and demand in the United States, the American Association for Employment in Education surveys every teacher education college in the United States, asking the career service office and/or education dean to respond to market questions about each education field and factor impacting supply and demand for educators. They then work with the Research and Data Analysis Consultation Service at Ohio State University in tabulating the results. The 2000 Summary suggested that while there was a shortage of principals at all levels, the shortage at the secondary level was greater. Of the 11 U.S. regions researched, Region 4—Great Plains/Midwest—had the fourth most severe shortage of high school principals in 2000. It was also noted in the 2000 Summary that "the shortage can be anticipated to
increase” (p. 7). Data from the 2001 study indicated that Region 4 had moved to the
ranking of third in terms of severity of high school principal shortages, sharing that
position with two other regions (Mid-Atlantic and Hawaii) behind the Northeast and the
Northwest (American Association for Employment in Education, 2001b). Data from the
2002 study revealed that Region 4 had moved to second in terms of severity of high
school principal shortages, behind only the Northeast.

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) surveyed
superintendents in 1998, asking them if they thought there was a surplus, shortage, or the
right number of qualified candidates for the principal positions they needed to fill. Eight
percent said there was a surplus, 42% said there was the right number, but half of all
those surveyed said there was a shortage (Ashford, 2000). Public Agenda, a nonprofit
research and polling organization, released the results of its survey in November 2001. It
revealed that 40% of superintendents said their school districts had “somewhat serious”
or “severe” shortages of principals (Stricherz, 2001b). The Department of Labor reports
that 40% of our country’s 93,200 principals will soon be retiring, and in a survey of
school districts, 42% responded that they already had a shortage of candidates for
principal positions (Chmelynski, 2001). In a survey of 400 school superintendents
conducted by the Task Force on Administrator Shortage of the Association of California
School Administrators in 2001, 90% of the responding superintendents reported a
shortage in the number of applicants for their last advertised high school principal
opening, and 84% of the superintendents reported a shortage of applicants for their last
advertised middle school principal position (Quinn, 2002).
“Shortages occur in a market economy when the demand for workers for a particular occupation is greater than the supply of workers who are qualified, available, and willing to do that job” (Veneri, 1999, p. 15). Supply and demand, however, are nebulous concepts. Veneri (1999) verifies that the term labor shortage has no clear-cut definition and is often used to describe a number of situations. Employers may claim a shortage if the pool of candidates to which they are accustomed shrinks, or if the caliber of candidates in the pool of applicants is not that to which they are accustomed. Some school situations fit under Blank and Stigler's social-demand model (as described in Veneri, 1999, p. 16). This model assumes a shortage if the number of workers is less than that established by some social criterion: in the case of secondary principals, the ratio of principal to staff or the ratio of principal to students. A shortage may also be described as occurring “when the number of workers available (the supply) increases less rapidly than the number demanded at the salaries paid in the recent past” (Blank & Stigler as quoted in Veneri, 1999, p. 16). For school districts, funding and compensation guidelines often limit their ability to provide more attractive pay incentives. Carole Kennedy, 2000 principal in residence at the United Stated Department of Education, notes that “While there is no hard data documenting a shortage of principals, there is plenty of anecdotal evidence that fewer people are interested in becoming principals” (as quoted in Ashford, 2000, p. 4).

Contributing Factors

A 1999 report from the National Association of State Boards of Education offers explanations for the shortage of building level administrators:
The principal’s job has become more complex and demanding; growing student populations, retirements, and decreasing numbers of applicants are creating significant shortages in some districts and regions; principal training, support, and professional development are largely inadequate and not up to the task of producing the capable principals we need; and states lack a coherent vision and system for developing and retaining high-quality principals. (Tirozzi, 2001, p. 437)

In *A Crisis in the Making*, School Administrators of Iowa (1997a) presented 15 factors contributing to the administrator shortage in Iowa:

- The increased expectations, complexities and responsibilities of the school administrator’s role
- The increased responsibilities for building principals because of decentralization and site-based decision making
- More meetings because of Phase III responsibilities (teachers receive extra compensation to attend, school administrators do not)
- The stressful conditions of being a school administrator (challenges balancing work and home)
- Lack of needed resources and support
- Insufficient salaries and fringe benefits (especially the difference between the salaries of classroom teachers and beginning administrators)
- Longer work days and extended school years
- Required attendance at night and weekend activities
- Lack of information available about the positive aspects of school administration
- Failure of administrators to identify and recruit quality people into the profession
- A state retirement system with disincentive for going into higher paid positions
- The “glass ceiling” that exists for women and minorities to get hired as school administrators
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• The possibility that certification and preparation programs do not keep present-day demands

• A lack of awareness about the administrator shortage that exists in Iowa

• An emphasis on the negative aspects of school administration (especially by school administrators themselves). (pp. 1-2)

When a shortage is perceived, we look to increase the supply. Teachers are, for the most part, the group from whom principal candidates come. What attracts them and possibly others in education to the principalship? What is keeping them from the principalship in this time of shortage? How can recruitment of these individuals be enhanced?

Satisfiers and Motivators of the 7-12 Principalship

What do teachers and other educators who seek a secondary principal license perceive to be the satisfiers of this position? Wendel (1994) found the satisfiers to be the variety of tasks and functions that administrators perform, their intrinsic commitment to their jobs, the responsibility they are given, professional freedom and opportunity to make a difference, personal aspirations, desire for a leadership position, encouragement from others, and interpersonal relationships with their fellow educators. (p. 9)

The stimulus for a teacher or for any other potential candidate to pursue a principal endorsement may come from a variety of situations or for any number of reasons. Some educators obviously see satisfiers in the principalship that they do not experience in their roles as teachers. Witmer (1995) gives four examples why teachers eye the principalship: (a) tired of the same routine day after day, year in and year out; (b) tired of being “just a teacher” (Witmer clarifies that she is “not questioning the honorableness of the profession” but is “repeating the attitudinal comments made in that certain tone of voice
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that we all recognize as being condescending,” (p. 1); (c) angry that one has little say in what goes on in one’s own school and; (d) aggravated that what you’ve done and what you continue to do goes unappreciated and unrecognized. Mary, an Iowa high school English teacher who is considering earning a 7-12 principal endorsement emphatically stated this point: “I’m tired of not being recognized for what I do. I want to be paid what I’m worth” (personal communication, July 21, 2001).

The ability to effect change is seen as a major satisfier of the principalship. Jeff, an Iowa high school teacher and coach enrolled in a university principal preparation program, supports this, giving as his number one reason for pursuing a 7-12 principal endorsement, “I see things in high school that I don’t agree with and want to change” (personal communication, April 11, 2001). Tanya, a teacher of six years enrolled in the same principal preparation program as Jeff, also believes she can improve the status quo: “I think I can do some things better” (personal communication, April 11, 2001).

Many individuals are happy with their chosen field of education but aspire to do something else within that field. “Always seeking a better opportunity,” says Audrey, and “Looking for a change and a challenge,” says Steve, School Governance and Law classmates of Jeff and Tanya’s (personal communication, April 11, 2001). Karen Beckers, a Wisconsin teacher, wanted a new challenge and had “an itch for change” (Berntsein, 1999, p. 33) when she moved into an administrative role. “A nagging urge to do something else,” Witmer (1995, p. 3) explains. Witmer says, though, that she considered obtaining principal certification “perhaps most of all, to prove that I could succeed in another capacity” (p. 3).
People choose administration for more money (Black & English, 1986; Wilmore, 1995; Witmer, 1995), more autonomy (Black & English, 1986; Witmer, 1995), more status (Witmer, 1995), more power (Black & English, 1986) and "a desire for personal growth, expression of creativity, and a broader range of influence (empowering others)" (Witmer, 1995, p. 7). Money as a reason for pursuing an administrative endorsement was given by four of the eighteen students in the aforementioned School Governance and Law course. A northeast Iowa secondary principal explains, "Money is why I became a principal. I make almost twice as much as I would as a teacher. I miss the teacher-student relationship with the kids, but we wanted my wife to be able to stay home to raise our children and we couldn't do that if I taught" (Joe, personal communication, April 25, 2001). Six of the 18 School Governance and Law students specifically mentioned broadening their base of influence as a reason for choosing administration (personal communication, April 11, 2001).

Encouragement from a mentor is often an additional external impetus to seek and obtain a principal license. In a 1989 study of rural principals in seven western states, 49% of the principals said they were encouraged to seek administrative licensure by a district level administrator, a principal, or a school board member (Muse & Thomas, 1991b). Such encouragement was also noted by members of the Nebraska Council of School Administrators in Wendel's (1994) study of the supply and demand of school administrators in Nebraska: they ranked it 3rd out of 12 variables in importance to their deciding to become administrators. Ten of the 18 School Governance and Law students gave as a reason for seeking the principal license the encouragement from a mentor or
mentors (personal communication, April 11, 2001). Who were their mentors? For all 10, the principal or principals with whom they worked. Mentors are “teachers or coaches whose functions are primarily to make introductions or to train a young person to move effectively through the system” (Kanter, 1977, p. 181). Mentors “advise, support, and promote an aspiring administrative candidate” (Robinson, 1996, p. 54).

Licensed, But Not Seeking 7-12 Principal Position

Jordan, McCauley, and Comeaux (1994) feel that most of the explanations given for the shortage of administrators fall under two categories: administrators leaving their positions or the unwillingness of qualified individuals to pursue administrative positions. Studies suggest that many people hold certification for leadership positions in school and are not using the certification (Borja, 2000; Haley & McDonald, 1988; Henry, 2000; Houston, 2000). Donaldson (2001) says that “most states have vastly more educators holding administrative certificates than they have serving in or applying for administrator positions” (p. 45). Barker (1997) notes that the administratively certified teachers and counselors who sought the principalship in the past are not stepping forward now. Gerald N. Tirozzi, Executive Director of the National Association for Secondary School Principals (NASSP), says, “About 50 percent to 60 percent of them never intend to become principals” (Borja, 2001, p. 1). In Jordan et al.’s (1994) study of public school employees certified in the area of educational administration but not serving in administrative positions in a five parish area of Louisiana, 74 of the 127 respondents checked “no” to the question “Are you interested in an administrative position?” (p. 6). In Hurley’s (1994) five-county-wide study of teachers identified as having the most
"principal potential" (p. 166) by their peers, of the 25 so labeled only 5 said they were interested in becoming principals. Seven said that they may be interested in becoming principals and 13 said they definitely were not interested. Hurley points out that those that said they may be interested also said that the principalship would have to change considerably for them to become seriously interested. One Minnesota study found that only one in four licensed administrators is practicing (Henry, 2000). In Iowa alone 625 individuals held 7-12 principal certification and were working in education but were not serving as 7-12 principals in the 2000-2001 school year (Iowa Department of Education, 2001a).

It may be that many of the 7-12 principal certified Iowa educators do not intend to seek one of the 312 high school principal positions that exist in Iowa (Iowa Department of Education, 2002). Many who are in an administrative degree program, say Jordan et al. (1994), do not plan to seek a principal position upon completing their degree. Barker (1997) found that some enter administrator preparation programs because they are interested in exercising leadership in their schools, but not as principals. They satisfy their need to do something more by taking on higher levels of team and department responsibilities, working with site-based councils, and engaging in other leadership roles as schools restructure (Barker, 1997). One north central Iowa school teacher explains that having the degree or endorsement gives you a level of status among your peers; the other teachers tend to listen to what you say (Vicki, personal communication, January 31, 2001).
Restine found that most of the women in her graduate educational administration classes had “little or no desire to become an administrator” (as quoted in Witmer, 1995, p. 4). Witmer found the same to be true of women in introductory educational administration classes that she taught. At a 1999 meeting of individuals in an administrative training program in Maryland the question was asked, “How many of you want to be a principal?” (Nakamura & Samuels, 2000, p. 2). Of the approximately 90 people in attendance only about a dozen raised their hands. “The others,” Marcus Newsome, a former Prince George County, Maryland, principal and now a regional director overseeing several schools, says, “wanted to be administrators but not principals” (Nakamura & Samuels, 2000, p. 2).

Dissatisfiers and Barriers of the 7-12 Principalship

The pool of educators who sought the preparation and earned the license for the 7-12 principalship in Iowa provides more than enough candidates, in actual numbers, to alleviate the shortage of secondary principals. Factors that may have been viewed as satisfying or motivating in the seeking of the license may have given way to a view of the 7-12 principalship filled with barriers and/or dissatisfiers.

A number of reasons are given for the reluctance of certified individuals to apply for principal positions. The certified teachers who in the past would have sought the principalship are observing school administrators closely (Barker, 1997). A number of dissatisfiers and barriers are perceived.

The responsibilities and the pressures on the person in the principal position have increased. Their lives as teachers are complex and demanding enough these days; what
they see in the principalship are "new and more complex demands and higher expectations from more diverse constituencies" (Barker, 1997, p. 86). Wendel (1994) reported on the Nebraska Council of School Administrators' investigation of the supply and demand of school administrators in Nebraska and their levels of satisfaction. Practicing members of the Nebraska Council of School Administrators and teacher members of the Nebraska State Education Association were both asked to complete a questionnaire on their perceptions toward being a school administrator. They were asked to rate on a five-point scale 12 selected factors related to becoming an administrator. The teachers gave "job responsibilities of administrators" (Wendel, 1994, p. 78) as a reason for not wanting to be an administrator a high 4.08. Forty-seven percent of the respondents in the study by Jordan et al. (1994) checked "increased complexity and responsibility of role" (p. 7) as a factor in not pursuing an administrative position, and for good reason. "Today's principal must be a legal expert, health and social services coordinator, fundraiser, public relations consultant, parental involvement expert, and security officer, who is technologically savvy, diplomatic, with top-notch managerial skills, whose most important duty is the implementation of instructional programs, curricula, pedagogical practice, and assessment tools" (NASSP, 2001b, p. 2). The principal is "the school's community relations director, disciplinarian, business manager, marketer, safety officer, facilities supervisor, fund raiser, labor relations officer, medical supervisor, social service agent, facilitator, and enforcer of the laws, policies, and regulations from various levels of government" (Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001, p. 73). As Chmelyniski (2001) says, "Today's schools demand that a principal be nearly as accomplished as a university
president, while he or she must still tend to such issues as backed up plumbing” (p. 5). Ashford (2000) adds that the principal “is in charge of everything from setting the bus schedule to evaluating teachers, from overseeing the custodians to raising test scores” (p. 1). High school principals have to “figure out how to help students with special needs and students with behavioral problems...They get cornered at athletic events, parent-teacher organization sessions, and school board meetings” (Bower, 1996, p. 1).

One hundred eighty-nine master’s students enrolled in a midwestern university’s educational leadership program completed Cooley and Shen’s (1999) survey identifying factors that they would consider in deciding whether they would apply for an administrative position. Nearly 62% of the students surveyed gave the nature of the job—discipline of students, relationships with parents, answering to external stakeholders, teacher-administrator conflict, etc.—as a major consideration in not seeking a principal position. Iowa’s Adel-DeSoto-Minburn Superintendent Tim Hoffman concurs: “It’s more difficult to find time to deal with educational issues because so much of their [principals’] time is spent dealing with conflict. We’re seeing more bizarre behavior from students than ever before, and we’re also seeing a lack of support from parents” (as cited in Villanueva, 1997, p. 1).

In Public Agenda’s 2001 survey of superintendents and principals for their report “Trying to Stay Ahead of the Game: Superintendents and Principals Talk About School Leadership,” 83% of principals said there are too many mandates and 47% said that bureaucratic red tape and politics of the position have caused colleagues to leave the profession (Stricherz, 2001b). Expectations from external groups, in addition to pressure
from internal groups, increases the stress on principals as they try to balance the need to be visible and accountable (Foster, 2002). As Michael Fullan (1998) puts it, "Out there is now 'in here' as government policy, parent and community demands, corporate interests, and ubiquitous technology have all stormed the walls of the school" (p. 6).

In a 1998 survey by the NASSP, NAESP and the Educational Research Service (ERS), one of every 10 principals responding had been named in a civil law suit because of some job-related activity (Ferrandino, 2001). Although no judgment has been brought against a principal in such cases, the stress of such possible litigation certainly exists for those in the position, and those looking at the position see the possibility.

Near the end of his doctoral program one student announced to his surprised audience that he had no intention of going into administration. He explained that "people become angry with school administrators and that he could not stand the emotional strain of having people angry at him" (Kimbrough & Burkett, 1990, p. 10). A Fellow at the Long Island Leadership Academy said that he knows fellow teachers who are certified to be administrators and, when asked why they didn’t “step up to the plate,” (p. 37) they replied, “It’s not worth it. The standards, the testing, the public criticism of administrators and education is too much to handle” (Aronstein, 2001, p. 37). “I’m working so hard to balance my career, my family, and my course work,” said another Fellow at the Long Island academy. “I guess I will be one of those capable teachers who will assert leadership from the security of my classroom” (Aronstein, 2001, p. 37).

Cooley and Shen (1999) found that teachers certainly recognize stress as part and parcel of the principalship.
SAI's (1997a) list of factors contributing to the shortage of administrators in Iowa included the following relating to principal responsibilities and stress: “the increased expectations, complexities and responsibilities of the school administrator's role, the increased responsibilities for building principals because of decentralization and site-based decision-making, more meetings because of Phase III responsibilities, and the stressful conditions of being a school administrator” (pp. 1-2). Results of Hurley’s (1994) interviews with rural teachers indicate they perceive the principal position as being “too distant from the instructional core, having too little direct contact with students, and having too many non-instructional duties” (p. 170). With so many other responsibilities, what should be the principal’s primary responsibility, instructional leadership, often takes a back seat (Ashford, 2000; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Richard, 2000). Hurley (2001) points out that when teachers, the largest pool of aspiring principal candidates, attend educational administration classes at night, they compare what they are taught about leading to what they see during the day—their principal engaged mostly in managing.

Fewer teachers are interested in the principalship, says Carole Kennedy, 2000 principal in residence at the U.S. Department of Education, “because they see it as a stressful job full of irate parents, irate students, increasing accountability, and limitations on what they can do to change the schedule or instructional program” (as quoted in Ashford, 2000, p. 5). “It used to be that you could get by being a good manager,” Kennedy says. “Now principals must do everything from ensuring immigrant students..."
learn English to bringing all kids up to high standards, and so much more” (as quoted in Ashford, 2000, p. 1).

Management tasks alone would be enough to fully occupy the principal’s day, but the job now requires much more. As Donaldson (2001) mentions in his commentary “The Lose-Lose Leadership Hunt: Scores of Potential Principals Right under Our Noses—But They May not Want the Job,” principals are asked to take on the accountability and standards issues, besides everything else, with, in Maine, an average of 35 faculty members and a support staff of seven, a supervisory load about three times that of middle managers in the business sector. In Ohio, Ed Davis, a school board member who is in manufacturing, says that he could not work with education’s staffing ratios. In his company, the ratio is one supervisor for every six employees (Marlowe, 2000). Using U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the ERS found that in 1999, the average number of people employed per executive, administrator, or manager in the manufacturing sector was 5.8 and in the communications sector, 3.6. In schools, the number was 12.8 (Marlowe, 2000).

The pressure of accountability, the pressure to have students achieve on external measures, can be particularly overwhelming (Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Nakamura & Samuels, 2000; Richard, 2000). “Standardized test scores, which were originally intended to assist educators in diagnosing student strengths and weaknesses, are now the basis for judging principals’ abilities” (Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001, p. 73). Districts are linking principals’ contracts to these tests scores (Donaldson, 2001). One school system bases 65% of a principal’s evaluation on test scores alone (Evaluating...
the Principalship, 2000). Reports of principals’ efforts to help their students cheat on standardized tests (Kleiner, 2000; Labi, 1999) speak to the pressure felt by individuals whose jobs are at stake.

Houston (2000) explains the accountability – limitations conundrum mentioned by Kennedy (as cited in Ashford, 2000), the 2000 principal in residence at the U.S. Department of Education:

In education, responsibility is centralized, but authority dispersed. When something goes wrong or answers are needed, the questions are aimed at the school leader. Yet there are many players in education with a slice of the power pie. Teacher unions dictate many rules and working conditions. School boards set policy. Increasingly, governors and legislators create mandates and lay down expectations. Judges limit latitude. And for good measure the community, parents and the students feel they have a legitimate right to spell out expectations while they set limits to collaboration (p. 2).

“School leaders often find themselves at the brunt of unfair criticism that is played out in highly public arenas. They are held responsible when things go wrong and they are being asked to lead at a time when a lack of consensus prevails over where people want to go” (Houston, 2000, p. 1).

A principal’s work often leaves little time for a personal life. It is a year-round job. A principal’s school day often begins at 7:00 or earlier and often lasts into the night. Weekends are catch up time for paperwork. “Sixty hour or more work weeks were standard,” acknowledges John, a recently retired Iowa high school principal (personal communication, September 5, 2001). Many principals report that they work from 56 to 70 hours per week (Ashford, 2001; Cooley & Shen, 1999; Ferrandino, 2001; NASSP, 2001b; Rodda, 1999) but still feel that they are not on top of things (Rodda, 1999). “Especially at the high school level,” (Borja, 2001, p. 1) says Dr. Gerald Tirozzi,
Executive Director of the NASSP, “principals have to go to evening events, weekend athletic events, monitor exit testing” (p. 1). The time demands often discourage teachers from seeking administrative positions (Borja, 2001; Cooley & Shen, 1999; Henry, 2000; Libit, 1999; Nakamura & Samuels, 2000; SAI, 1997a).

Twenty-six percent of the teachers in Jordan et al.’s (1994) study and 72% of the teachers in Cooley and Shen’s (1999) study noted the impact taking an administrative position would have on their home and family life. “It seems clear that the position and its perceived impact on the family constitute a significant barrier to teachers entering administration,” say Cooley and Shen (1999, p. 77).

Jim, a high school principal, in advocating for a support system for principals, says, “Sometimes you have to come in, close the door, and blow off steam. You can’t always take things home. I have a concern on how this job affects home life. There are many times when I go home frustrated and it carries over to the family” (Whitaker, 1996, p. 64). “The principal’s job is all-consuming, one of the most stressful jobs you can have,” said Gary Mazzola, an interim principal in a St. Louis, Missouri, school and the father of two school-age children, on his decision to not take the principalship the following year. “I wanted to be a very good principal. I also wanted to be a great dad” (Bower, 1996, p. 2). Mary Tallerico (2000), associate professor at Syracuse University, says the high school principal’s schedule leaves little time for a life away from the job: “It’s not an appealing job to women—or men, for that matter—who want to spend time with their families” (p. 57). “I look at the time involved, and I don’t think it’s right for me,” said Paul Muller, chair of Maryland’s Overlea High School’s guidance department.
"With young children, I'm not willing to make that commitment right now" (Libit, 1999, p. 3).

Another factor impacting family life is location of the district (Cooley & Shen, 1999). Teacher respondents in Wendel's (1994) investigation of the supply and demand of school administrators in Nebraska, when asked to rate selected factors related to becoming an administrator, gave as their number one factor for not choosing to go into administration "personal obligations in my life" (p. 78) and gave as their number three factor "the location of administrative positions" (p. 78). Often people choose to live in a particular geographic area and base their employment possibilities on that choice (New England School Development Council, 1988), and economic factors often limit professional mobility (Jordan et al., 1994; New England School Development Council, 1988). Bernstein (1999) points out that if you feel inclined to move into administration, you must be prepared to move geographically as well.

Although given by some as a reason to seek a principal position, pay is also one of the most frequently noted dissatisfiers of the principalship: in relation to the responsibilities, the pay is inadequate (Ashford; 2000; Borja, 2001; Cooley & Shen, 1999; Ferrandino, 2001; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Grace, 2001; Henry, 2000; Houston, 2000; Jordan et al., 1994; Libit, 1999; Mandel, 2000; Murphy, 2001; Nakamura & Samuels, 2000; New England School Development Council, 1988; Newsom, 2001; Olson, 2001; Richard, 2000; SAI, 1997a; Tallerico, 2000; Tirozzi, 2001; Wendel, 1994). In NAESP's 1998 study, inadequate pay for heavy responsibilities was the single biggest reason given for educators not wanting to go into the principalship (Newsom, 2001). "A
top-paid teacher makes $70,000 and works 10 months a year. An assistant principal makes $75,000, works 12 months a year and six to 10 nights every month,” compares Thomas G. Kerr, assistant executive director of the Delaware County, Pennsylvania, Intermediate Unit, a regional service agency. “A typical teacher works between 180 to 190 days, but a principal works 220 days to earn the same retirement credit” (as cited in Chmelynski, 2001, p. 5). “The difference between a teacher’s salary and a principal’s salary is not large enough for most teachers to warrant the longer hours, added accountability pressures, parents’ complaints and general bashing by the media that comes with an administrative post” (Murphy 2001, p. 30).

“Insufficient salaries and fringe benefits (especially the difference between the salaries of classroom teachers and beginning administrators)” (p. 2) appears on the SAI list of factors contributing to the administrator shortage in Iowa (1997a, p. 2). In many cases teachers are making only $10,000 to $15,000 less than principals (Borja, 2001). Libit (1999) figured that although the average salary of a high school principal is $20,000 to $30,000 more than the average teacher salary, sometimes it’s only a few thousand dollars more than what a teacher with 20 to 30 years of experience—the type of teacher schools often want to hire for administrative positions—is making. An Iowa teacher with a master’s degree and 10 or more years of experience working in one of the larger schools of the state makes an average $51,461 per year. Often times a beginning principalship is in a small rural school where the average pay is $55,404 per year (Iowa Department of Education, 2002). Per diem pay of an administrator may, in fact, be equal to or less than that of teachers who are at the top of the salary scale (Archer, 2002;
Cooley & Shen, 1999). Educational Research Service (ERS) matched up the average daily pay of novice principals (whose salaries were in the 25th percentile nationally) with that of veteran teachers (whose salaries were at the 50th percentile nationally) in their 2001-2002 annual report on salaries and wages of public school positions. The daily rate for teachers was $225.89 and for high school assistant principals it was $255.13 (Archer, 2002). "We have such a need for people to become administrators," says Maryland's state school Superintendent Nancy S. Grasmick, "but we find that you cannot pay people enough to be a principal, especially in secondary schools" (Libit, 1999, p. 1).

Job security is sometimes a barrier to those thinking about making the leap to administration from the classroom (Bowles, as cited in Jordan et al., 1994; Cooley & Shen, 1999; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Libit, 1999; SAI, 1997b; Tirozzi, 2001; Wendel, 1994; Witmer, 1995). In most states few due process protections are provided to principals who are in danger of losing their jobs as compared to teachers' due process protections (Davis, 1997). Principals' jobs are usually not protected by tenure; teachers' jobs are.

One's gender may be seen as a barrier by some considering the principalship, particularly the high school principalship. Women have throughout much of our history held the majority of teaching positions, yet have not climbed the career ladder into administration in public schools as rapidly as men (Witmer, 1995; Vail, 2001). Bowles and Johnson (as cited in Jordan et al., 1994) found that women were not moving into school leadership positions even though they made up half of those in school administration preparation programs. Mary Faber, head of the National Education
Association's Human and Civil Rights Committee, explains the difference in how men and women become principals: "With men it's cut and dried. They go right from teacher to principal. Women are required to prove themselves, and [in addition] they’re expected to put family obligations first while men aren’t" (as quoted in Witmer, 1995, p. 13). The "data on equality of opportunity in education reveals that sex—more than age, experience, background, or competence—determines the role an individual will hold in education" (Whitaker & Lane, 1990, p. 12). Eight of the 25 study participants in Hurley’s (1994) study of rural teachers with “principal potential” (p. 166) said that females still face barriers to positions in administration.

Women are more likely to be elementary principals or curriculum coordinators than high school principals (Vail, 2001). According to NASSP’s “Priorities and Barriers in High School Leadership: A Survey of Principals,” (2001b) high school principals are still typically male. They head schools of fewer than 750 students and have been in their positions for more than 15 years. However, more women are entering the secondary principalship: in 2000, one in five American secondary principals was a woman (NASSP, 2001a). In the 2001-2002 school year, Iowa had 273 male public high school principals and 39 female high school public school principals (Iowa Department of Education, 2002). The ratio of males to females in Iowa principalships (87.5% to 12.5%) is in sharp contrast to the overall ratio of male to female teachers in Iowa (51.4% to 48.6%). The 12.5% proportion of women in Iowa secondary principal positions remains behind the nation's 20% share.
Much like women, those belonging to ethnic minority groups “have not been used as a pool of potential school leaders” (Jordan et al., 1994, p. 2). Among the school districts responding to the ERS (1998) survey contracted by the NAESP and the NASSP, 64% said no qualified minority candidates applied for positions. Only 2.6% (seven males and one female) of Iowa’s high school principals are minority status. This percentage is, however, greater than the 1.4% minority status in the high school teaching ranks (Iowa Department of Education, 2002).

“Probably nowhere in America is there a larger bloc that gives more credence to the phrase, ‘good, old boys’ club’ than public school administrators” (Muse & Thomas, 1991a, p. 10). “They are disproportionately men, white and older than their counterparts in other occupations” (Schuster & Foote as quoted in Wendel, 1994, p. 25).

“Lack of needed resources and support” (p. 2) appears on the SAI (1997a) listing of reasons for a principal shortage. This is echoed elsewhere in the literature (Ashford, 2000; Cooley & Shen, 1999; Henry, 2000; Hurley, 2001; Jordan et al., 1994; Nakamura & Samuels, 2000; New England School Development Council, 1988). In Wendel’s (1994) Nebraska study “lack of recognition for work” (p. 9) was a dissatisfier for those who were administrators and for those who were licensed as administrators but not in administrative positions. Those who might consider the principalship look for support in terms of resources and in terms of relationships from both the community, and administration and board and teachers. Potential principals look at school funding, community politics, and parental involvement (Cooley & Shen, 1999). They also look for solid working relationships among the board, the administrators, and the teachers.
(Cooley & Shen, 1999). Of Cooley and Shen's (1999) "Top Ten Factors Teachers Consider in Applying for Administrative Positions," "Community support" ranked number three and "Relationship among the board, administration, and teachers" (p. 79) ranked number one.

**What Could Be Done to Entice Educators to the Principalship**

"As we face a shortage of people willing to become principals and see school leaders retiring early or going to other professions, we've come to general consensus that the principalship must be redefined, reinvented, and rethought" (Tirozzi & Ferrandino, 2001, p. 2). In addition, attention must be given to preparation and recruitment of 7-12 principal candidates.

In redefining, reinventing, and rethinking the principalship, the role should first be restructured. Workloads, expectations, and work conditions must be looked at, and if necessary, the principal's role must be modified (Ashford, 2000; Cooley & Shen, 1999; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Houston, 2000; Hurley, 2001; SAI, IASB, & Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000; Nakamura & Samuels, 2000; Olson, 2001; SAI, 1997a). Stephen DeWitt of the NASSP and Donald Barron, a Maryland middle school principal and president of the Maryland state principal's organization, describe this modification: "Something needs to be done to lighten the load on principals" (Libit, 1999, p. 4).

Hurley (2001), writing about the reports, the School Leadership for the 21st Century Initiative's Leadership for Student Learning: Reinventing the Principalship and the National Staff Development Council's "Learning to Lead, Leading to Learn,"
admonishes, "Evidently, we have embarked on another round of exhorting principals to do more, be more, and expect to be held accountable for more. But to the extent that these reports call for principals to become instructional leaders without also making recommendations that narrow the post's job description, they are a disservice to principals and to the prospects of better school leadership. It's time we stopped insisting that principals be both superleaders and supermanagers" (p. 37). "Why," Hurley (2001) asks, "are policymakers continuing to define the principal's role in such a way that few people want the job, and even fewer can be effective in it?" (p. 37). The local school district communities which have become accustomed to having administrators available any time of the day and seeing them at every school event, too, need to be re-socialized that the principal's role needs to be redesigned "as a set of functions that can and should be achieved in manageable and humane ways" (Barker, 1997, p. 89). A working conference with representatives from SAI, IASB, and the Institute for Educational Leadership (2000) called for a redesign of school administration, establishing ten goals and providing strategies to move toward attainment of those goals. Emphasized throughout the strategies is ongoing communication with the community about the revised expectations for their administrators.

A task force in Maryland that studied the principal shortage recommended in June, 2000, that administrators be given more help from assistants on administrative tasks (Nakamura & Samuels, 2000). Cafeteria, busing, and building maintenance could be handled by someone other than a principal suggests Carole Kennedy, the 2000 Principal in Residence at the U. S. Education Department (Ashford, 2000). Business managers
may be the answer in Houston, Texas, schools, to give principals the ability to concentrate on instructional leadership (Ashford, 2000). Other Texas schools are reassigning duties among teachers and others (Richard, 2000). An October 2000, report by the National Institute for Educational Leadership, *Reinventing the Principalship*, gives a number of examples of how other leadership roles may assist the principal. “A lead teacher might coordinate curriculum development. A chief academic officer might guide instruction. An assessment specialist might supervise school-wide testing and routine classroom evaluation. A community services coordinator from a community-based organization might organize supports and opportunities for students and families. An outside contractor might oversee management or services, such as food, transportation, or maintenance” (Ashford, 2000, p. 3). Teachers can take over responsibility for what are traditionally thought of as principal tasks, such as attending athletic events and giving feedback to staff members (Boris-Schacter & Langer, 2002). In the NAESP’s recently published *Leading Learning Communities: Standards for What Principals Should Know and Be Able to Do*, instructional leadership is emphasized (Stricherz, 2001a). At a press conference, NAESP officials acknowledged that principals must indeed be managers too, but that some managerial tasks could be assigned to others (Stricherz, 2001a). SAI, IASB, and the Institute for Educational Leadership (2000) point out that communities must realize that for administrators to truly be educational leaders whose focus is to improve student learning, some non-leadership tasks normally done by administrators need to be assigned to others or eliminated. Tirozzi and Ferrandino (2001) concur: “Just because it’s always been the principal’s job, doesn’t mean it must not change” (p. 3).
Boris-Schacter and Langer (2002) share restructuring options suggested by current principals:

1. **A co-principalship** in which either all tasks are evenly divided, or there is a principal for instruction and a principal for management. Each principal can be on site every day, or the week can be divided.

2. **A rotating principalship** in which a classroom teacher takes on (and tries on) the principalship for a specified amount of time, while the principal returns to the classroom, teaches in higher education, or conducts educational research.

3. **Distributed leadership**, a scenario in which some administrative tasks are divided among many members of a leadership team or across the teaching staff in general.

4. **Professional-development opportunities** for the principal that are built into the work week. These include school visitations, meetings with community-based groups, and attendance at principal-support groups. Principals from other schools and communities may “swap” schools for a period of time. (p. 37)

Lightening the load of principals may help individuals in that role to carve out more time for a personal life and for family. In terms of the importance of personal balance, “creating a job that is realistic and focuses on children should be much more attractive to those waiting in the wings” (Houston, 2000, p. 3).

Since pay is seen as a significant barrier to seeking the principalship, making the salary commensurate with the responsibilities of the position must be a priority (Barker, 1997; Borja, 2001; Cooley & Shen, 1999; Cunningham & Sperry, 2001; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; SAI, IASB, and Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000; New England School Development Council, 1988; SAI, 1997b; Tallerico, 2000; Tirozzi & Ferrandino, 2001; Whitaker, 1993).

Improved contract and tenure arrangements would add appeal to a job for which individuals leave a secure teaching post. Multiyear contracts would allow principals time...
to develop a leadership style without the possibility of dismissal hanging over their heads (Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001). SAI (1997b), in its resolve to address the shortage of school administrators in Iowa, included job security issues as an area to be addressed.

Efforts need to be made to recruit women into administrative positions (Iowa State Board of Education, 1998; Jordan et al., 1994; McCormick, 1987; Olson, 2001; SAI, 1997b; Witmer, 1995). These efforts must be executed in conjunction with the redefining of the role. Although the glass ceiling still exists in some school districts, many women won’t—or can’t—consider a job that leaves so little personal and family time: the “balance-of-life question looms very large” for them (Houston, 2000, p. 3).

Efforts need to be made to recruit minorities as well (Iowa State Board of Education, 1998; Jordan et al., 1994; McCormick, 1987; Olson, 2001; SAI, 1997b; Tirozzi, 2001). “As the nation’s minority population grows, it will be imperative to have more minority role models in the principalship” (Tirozzi, 2001, p. 437). Women and minorities in leadership positions traditionally held by white males “are under extraordinary pressure and scrutiny” and “are given less leeway when they make mistakes,” holds Tallerico (2000, p. 57). SAI (1997a) specifically stated that, working with the IASB, search consultants and area education agencies, they would look at “removing the glass ceiling that exists for women and minority applicants” (p. 2).

Potential principals need to know that they will have the resources, the support and the authority to do the job. Everyday resources to do the job—clerical, support staff, technological and professional resources—must be available to principals (Morford, 2002; SAI, IASB, & Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000). Support from the
community (Cooley & Shen, 1999) and support and authority from the board and other administrators (Ashford, 2000; Cooley & Shen, 1999; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Nakamura & Samuels, 2000; Olson, 2001; Whitaker, 1993) are crucial if we hold principals accountable for what goes on in their schools. “Give principals the autonomy to hire (and fire) their staffs and control their budgets. Also give them the ability to significantly reward their staff for strong performance” (Tirozzi & Ferrandino, 2001, p. 2). “Show support for your administrators by encouraging them, respecting them, and recognizing their accomplishments” (Tallerico, 2000, p. 57). “Recognize administrative accomplishments which contribute to the climate of continual school improvement” (SAI, IASB, & Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000). Whitaker (1996), when studying principal burnout, found that principals have a need for more recognition, particularly from the central office. “Find ways to honor and nurture them” (Donaldson, 2001, p. 45). As teachers become newly hired principals, they will need their school boards and superintendents to “understand that they must be both administrators and instructional leaders, that they must answer both to their faculties and to the central office, and that their truest allegiance must be to the children in their immediate care” (Donaldson, 2001, p. 45).

SAI, in conjunction with IASB, the Iowa State Education Association, local teacher associations, local boards of education, search consultants, and area education agencies are reviewing resources and support for school administrators, especially to new hires (SAI, 1997a). First-year principals in Elsberry’s 1993 study identified induction practices that were most helpful in assisting them to be successful (Elsberry & Bishop,
The practices that they identified, however, were not those most widely used in their southeastern states. At the top of their list, in order of effectiveness, were a summer induction conference which allows them to learn specifics of the new job without the pressures of daily school demands, mentoring by a veteran principal in the district to help the novice learn and understand the district's "unwritten rules, procedures, and expectations" (p. 33) and providing a discussion and problem solving partner. If a veteran principal in the district is not available to mentor, schools should look to a formal mentoring program through regional education service centers or a local university (Morford, 2002). "Be aggressive about mentoring 3 to 4-year veteran teachers for administration by their seventh year, not their tenth," "provide more mentoring throughout the system in both formal and informal ways," and "provide stronger coaching in the initial years of administration" are samplings of the activities identified by a Washington State conference group that focused on advocating for principals as "human beings with human needs" (Barker, 1997, p. 90).

**What Is Being Done to Entice Educators to the Principalship**

Support for those who are potential candidates for the principalship must exist in recruitment and in training, and must continue once they have taken principal positions. Research suggests that any type of assistance and support that can be provided is "desperately needed and would be highly welcomed by new principals" (Lyons, 1992, p. 3).
Grow-Your-Own Programs

Murphy’s (2001) “Growing Leaders” describes an increasing number of districts’ and a few states’ response to the shortage. Programs termed grow-your-own (Chmelynski, 2001; Donaldson, 2001; Henry, 2000; Newsom, 2001) are searching out, encouraging and nurturing individuals in their own backyards for work in their own backyards. John Glore, Executive Director of the Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals, says that schools need to recruit potential leaders within their own schools (Bower, 1996). Mary Jacque Marchione, director of staff development for the Baltimore County, Maryland, schools explains, “We hope if we give good teachers training in leadership and prepare them for school administration, we’ll create a pool for the superintendent to find assistant principals and principals” (Libit, 1999, p. 3). Paul Hersey, former Director of Professional Assistance at NASSP, notes, “You can’t wait until the year you need them to identify such candidates” (McCormick, 1987, p. 21). And because of the realities of two-career families and the costs of moving, it is important “to identify talent inside your schools, rather than look outside” (McCormick, 1987, p. 21). Identifying talent inside rather than outside makes particularly good sense for rural districts. Attempts to recruit non-rural principals may not seem plausible if one considers a finding in a study of rural schools: nearly 70% of the current rural principals in a seven state area had rural backgrounds (Muse & Thomas, 1991b). Rural school districts, therefore, look for their principals among their effective teacher leaders who are already committed to living in a rural community (Hurley, 1994).
Even though only a fourth of the districts surveyed in 1998 by the ERS had programs to recruit and prepare aspiring principals (Tirozzi, 2001), in Rochester and New York City, New York, in St. Paul, Minnesota, in Jefferson County, Kentucky, in Highland, Michigan, in Norfolk, Virginia, in Chicago, Illinois, in Kirkwood, Missouri, and in the states of Ohio and North Carolina, leadership programs had been instituted in school systems to encourage their top-notch educators to aspire to the principalship and then to train them to function in the position (Chmelynski, 2001; Henry, 2000; Murphy, 2001; Newsom, 2001). The Principals’ Center (2001) at Harvard Graduate School looked at what school districts were doing to deal with their principal shortages. At the top of the list? “Nothing.” But, while 30% said they had no strategies in place, 20% had put into place mentoring programs for aspiring principals, 20% had implemented leadership academies, and 10% were collaborating with their local university principal preparation programs.

SAI, IASB, and the Institute for Educational Leadership (2000) provided the following grow-your-own strategies to districts to identify, recruit, and develop aspiring administrators:

- Develop a plan for encouraging, identifying, recruiting and promoting potential leaders.

- Establish policies to support internships, mentoring programs, orientation processes, job shadowing, and other ongoing professional development for aspiring administrators.

- Encourage and reward current school administrators for identifying, recruiting and developing potential educational leaders.
• Organize time in all schools to ensure ongoing, research-based professional development of all staff members which allows people to see themselves as educational leaders.

• Provide a deliberate, developmental career planning process for each individual interested in moving into administration including professional development time and monetary incentives.

• Develop leadership assessment tools and surveys to identify individual potential.

(p. 6)

This list of strategies could provide a framework for recruitment programs.

An important caveat for many grow-your-own programs is that not just anyone interested in becoming a principal may apply. Teacher-leaders are nominated by an administrator or are screened. The NASSP has developed a listing of administrator skills that are aligned with the Interstate Leaders Licensure Consortium standards. These skills serve as the foundation for several screening assessments and development programs offered by the Association and other agencies (Quinn, 2002). One, “Selecting and Developing the 21st-Century Principal,” is an assessment program that can measure “leadership potential” (Tirozzi, 2001, p. 439) by identifying strengths and needs of aspiring principals. Screening methods include performance assessment measures, behavioral interviews, personality inventories and cognitive tests (Quinn, 2002). Such screening assessments, internships, simulations, competency-based requirements, and having practicing principals as visiting professors as means to restructure the principalship “may well be a harbinger of the future” (Jenkins & Bebar, 1994, p. 345).

Another term for grow-your-own programs is “succession planning” (Quinn, 2002, p. 2). Quinn outlines the advantages of succession planning:
• Provides a coordinated strategy for the identification and development of the school district’s key pool of candidates—the teachers

• Retains the services of upwardly mobile teachers within the district

• Makes the district more attractive to prospective employees who want opportunities to grow professionally

• Ensures a readily available and inexpensive source of in-house replacements for leadership positions in the district

• Promotes challenging and rewarding career possibilities through professional development

• Reduces lost productivity while a replacement from the outside needs time to acclimate

• Helps to commit to diversity goals in hiring

• Enhances the work culture through continuous support for employees. (pp. 2-3)

Grow-your-own efforts appear to be working. Such programs report that more than 90% of their graduates are employed as school administrators (Newsom, 2001).

University Preparation

Most of the grow-your-own training programs and leadership academies, are organized around the increasing demands on principals. They include real-life case studies, issue-based learning, or problem-based learning, and internships in the field that pair their aspiring candidates with a mentor, a practicing administrator (Newsom, 2001). Gilman and Lanman-Givens (2001) say that universities, too, “must develop meaningful training programs and focus on relevant professional issues rather than offer the traditional collection of classes” (p. 73). University preparation must be “focused around the real work of principals” (Williamson, as quoted in National Staff Development...
ERS, in its 1998 study, found that those who aspire to the principalship prefer visiting model programs and taking courses in technology, diversity, personnel management, and community relations instead of the theory-based courses found in many university educational leadership programs. And increasing numbers of school leaders are requesting for those that they would hire as principals more hands-on learning dealing with the day-to-day real-life issues principals contend with, or "job-embedded learning," (National Staff Development Council, 2000, p. 4). For educational administration students at Western Carolina University, that learning includes how to prepare budgets, schedule buses, keep the school building clean and neat, and avoid negative press in the local newspaper (Hurley, 2001). An example of characteristics of such programs is summarized by Tanner, Keedy, and Galis (1995): what administrators in training are to learn is centered around real-life problems, the administrators in training assume the major responsibility for their own learning, and the format for learning is small group work rather than lecture.

The University of Northern Iowa's and Iowa State University's response to the Iowa State Board of Educational Examiners' March 1998 declaration of an administrator shortage was to make the university preparation programs more easily accessible to potential students. The goal was to increase enrollment in their educational administration programs by offering their programs off campus at sites around the state. As a result, enrollment in principal preparation programs at both universities has grown...
substantially over the last four years (D. Hackmann, Coordinator, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Iowa State University, personal communication, November 4, 2002; M. Waggoner, Chair, Educational Leadership, Counseling and Post-secondary Education, University of Northern Iowa, personal communication, November 22, 2002).

**Internships/Mentorships**

Participants in many principal preparation programs say the most valuable part of their training is the internship (Newsom, 2001). Teresa Gray (2001) who spent a year in a successful principal internship, says the “greatest injustice that we do to aspiring leaders” (p. 665) is to not require hands-on learning in the form of internships. The NASSP, in fact, called for a year-long internship requirement after certification and before assuming responsibility for a school as a principal back in 1988 (Thomson, 1988). Mentored internships aligned with practical applicable-to-real-life activities in classes are advocated (Aronstein, 2001; Clark, 2001; Donaldson, 2001; Murphy, 2001). Gerald Tirozzi, Executive Director of the NASSP, echoes the views of Aronstein, Clark, Donaldson, Gray, and Murphy on the importance of the internship, saying that we need to give those in principal preparation programs “viable intensive internships in schools so they can learn to become leaders. We just turn people loose and expect them to be instant successes” (Boija, 2001, p. 2). “In schools across America we are throwing our beginning administrators into school leadership positions with the assumption that they know what they need to know and virtually telling them, ‘Sink or swim’” (Clark, 2001, p. 4). “There are,” says Mack Bullard, a principal in Clayton County, Georgia, “a lot of
principals out there floundering trying to learn all things by themselves” (National Staff Development Council, 2000, p. 4).

Aronstein (2001) advocates a mentorship that would last throughout prospective principals’ course work, internships, and the first year or two of their administrative careers. Deb Ayres, Assistant superintendent for Human Resources and Administration in the Kirkwood, Missouri, School District, which has a grow-your-own program, says that “a critical key to the program’s success is that every participant is assigned an administrative mentor based on his or her aspirations” (Chmelynski, 2001, p. 5). A mentoring relationship provides many benefits to these individuals: “safe sounding board, establishing connections, insights into the history of the organization, broader views, balance and feedback, safety net, and increased self-confidence” (Hill & Ragland, 1995, p. 75). Providing teachers opportunities to increase their administrative skills and experience success in leadership positions often stimulates their initial interest in administration (Tallerico, 2000). Daresh and Playko (as cited in Smith, 1993) make the point, however, that these opportunities such as internships or other leadership experiences in the field, are “virtually meaningless” (p. 48) without a suitable mentor and time to engage with that mentor in professional reflection.

On-the-Job Support

The need to recruit, train, and support those individuals who will provide the leadership in our schools has been recognized at the national level as well as at the district and state level. The National Staff Development Council (2000) recommended that the federal government, as well as states and local districts, adopt policies for
professional development to improve school leadership. On June 6, 2001, Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton of New York proposed to the Senate an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that would help recruit and retain principals in high-need areas. She emphasized, “By attracting good candidates and providing them with the mentorship and professional development they need to succeed, we’ll be making a wise investment in our children’s future” (NASSP, 2001a, p. 1). Senator John Kerry and Senator Gordon Smith on June 13, 2001, in their proposal to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, included leadership training for principals and called for schools to set objectives for retaining teachers and principals in their first three years (NASSP, 2001a). The emphasis on recruiting and retaining the leaders in our schools (Section 2101, Section 2102, and Section 2103) was evident in the Senate and the House of Representatives as the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act, No Child Left Behind, was being forged, but as previously noted, federal funding for this component of the law was not provided for fiscal year 2002.

Less than half of the districts in the 1998 Educational Research Service survey had formal initiation or mentoring programs for their new principals (Tirozzi, 2001). Thirty percent of the respondents in Harvard’s Principals’ Center study had no program in place to recruit and retain those aspiring to the principalship (Quinn, 2002). “More and better efforts need to be made by SAI, local school districts, and others to do everything possible to support these people in their first years of school administration” (SAI, 1997b, p. 3) was the consensus of Iowa’s Committee to Review and Rethink the Position of School Administrator. The support “should make mentoring available to all first-year
administrators, work with local school districts and new hires to ensure current job
descriptions exist, assist local school districts to have good performance review processes
in place, provide networking opportunities—especially with more experienced
administrators, provide on-going workshops for new hires” (SAI, 1997b, p. 3). New
principals need mentors and should have access to hands-on, ongoing, professional
development (Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Tirozzi & Ferrandino, 2001). Tirozzi
and Ferrandino (2001) add that principals should have regular opportunities to meet and
exchange ideas and discuss their work. *Requisites of a Leader: The Essential Capacities
of School Leadership for Breakthrough Results* (2000), a professional development
program for present and future school leaders, recognizes the importance of on-going
support and “provides opportunities for networking, collaboration, reflective processing,
benchmarking, on-site coaching and feedback, advanced learning, opportunities for
leading and teaching others, action research, developing and examining case studies,
facilitated problem solving, and other job-embedded learning opportunities” (p. 3). The
isolated nature of the principal position, however, limits principals’ development
(Fitzgerald, 2000). Principals in rural districts in particular work in isolation; often there
are few or no peers with whom they can network (Hill, 1993). Networking technology
and distance learning such as found in the *Requisites* program may help to decrease this
isolation. South Carolina’s state-mandated Principal Induction Program (PIP) for all
first-year principals has many components desired by those new to the principalship: a
one-week summer institute and three or more one-day follow-up sessions that provide
training in individual, team and organizational development; leadership styles; and the
use of data in effecting school improvement. PIP participants are also assigned experienced principals as mentors throughout their first year ("South Carolina, Texas, Make School Leadership," 2002).

The ERS publication "Professional Development for School Principals," a component of their 1999 Informed Educators Series, insists that quality staff development for principals be long-term, planned, and job-embedded; center on student achievement; assist reflective practice; and provide opportunities to discuss, and problem solve with peers (National Staff Development Council, 2000). Engaging principals in continuous development should send the message to teachers in a building that improving one's abilities and knowledge base is so important that the principal is willing to spend the time and effort to enhance his/her own (National Staff Development Council, 2000). And as Richard (2001) notes, authorities in the field of educational leadership emphasize that two needs must be attended to, the needs of the promising candidate who is just beginning and the needs of the seasoned principal, if schools are to meet high expectations.

Summary

Effective school research has determined that the principal is pivotal to a school's success. These findings turned the focus on improving school leadership. The focus has intensified with the knowledge that school districts face a large number of retirements in the principal ranks. If the principal is a key to school effectiveness and if many principals are retiring soon, it is important to have qualified individuals ready to step into the position.
The place to find future building principals is among the current teaching ranks. Many teachers hold the credentials to be a principal but are not using them. Those who hold positions as building principals impact the effectiveness of a school. However, various elements influence teachers’ perceptions of this critical position and in turn affect whether or not they serve in the role. The satisfiers of the position of building administrator, and the dissatisfiers of the position pervading the literature, come largely from those in or connected to the principalship. Recognizing the dissatisfiers of the position, government officials, professional organizations, university preparation programs, state departments of education and school districts themselves are considering ways to make the position of principal more attractive. The views of educators licensed but not serving as principals on the principalship are not known because of the relative silence of the literature in this regard. Because of their potential applicant status, the need to address their views is apparent.
CHAPTER 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

A study determining what would make the Iowa superintendency more attractive to those Iowa educators holding the superintendent endorsement but not seeking a superintendent position was conducted by Smith (1999) at Drake University. Smith was interested in why, in spite of a national school leadership crisis and the influence of the superintendent position, “there was a growing trend toward a lack of interest for doing this job” (p. 5). The primary data-gathering instrument used in the Smith study was a survey. Conclusions included in the study were based on information provided by the superintendents who responded at a rate of 70.4%.

Addressing the need for further study, Smith (1999) noted that “fewer people are currently attracted to taking on the responsibilities of a school principal and a similar study of people endorsed for Pre K-6 as well as 7-12 school principalships in Iowa could contribute to the dialogue and interest regarding the leadership crisis in the state” (p. 118). Therefore, the research conducted here was an adaptation of the Smith study, determining what would make the principalship more attractive to those Iowa educators holding the 7-12 principal endorsement but not occupying 7-12 principal positions.

Methodology

A non-experimental quantitative research methodology was employed. A descriptive survey, which measures characteristics of a sample at one point in time (Leedy, 1997), took the form of a mail questionnaire. Adapting Smith’s (1999) research...
design, the survey was mailed to a sampling of individuals holding the 7-12 principal endorsement, but not holding principal positions.

**The Population Studied**

A list of individuals with Iowa endorsement 170, 7-12 principal, employed in Iowa public or private schools or Area Education Agencies (AEAs) but not in the capacity of superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal or assistant principal, was obtained from the Iowa Department of Education. This sampling frame was drawn from the staff file of the Basic Educational Data Survey (BEDS), 2000-2001 school year. Six hundred twenty-five individuals made up this group. Because of the large size of the population, a sample of the population was studied. Krejcie and Morgan (as cited in Leedy, 1997) developed a chart of statistically determined sample sizes required to adequately represent various population sizes. Using Krejcie and Morgan’s guidelines, a representative sample for this study was 238.

“From a population whose texture is either homogeneous or homogeneous conglomerate, the sample is derived by means of a simple randomization process” (Leedy, 1997, p. 213). “Homogeneous conglomerate” would describe the 625 individuals in the sampling frame: all held the Iowa 7-12 principal endorsement, all were employed in Iowa public or accredited non-public schools, all were employed in capacities other than superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal, or assistant principal. “Simple random sampling requires that each unit of the population have an equal chance of being selected. A more precise definition is that all possible samples of a given size have an equal opportunity of being selected” (Krathwohl, 1993, p. 127).
Randomization was accomplished by numbering the names on the BERS document from one to 625 and submitting them to computer randomization using the Excel program to get 238 samples.

**Survey Instrument**

The principal data source for this study was a survey. The survey was developed through three drafts. The first draft was formed on the basis of Smith's (1999) survey questionnaire used to investigate what Iowa individuals holding Iowa Pre K-12 superintendent endorsements but not in positions as superintendents, considered attractive or not attractive about serving as a Pre K-12 school superintendent.

The second draft incorporated additional ideas taken from a review of surveys used in educational research projects looking at what educators found satisfying or dissatisfying about the position of principal. Because questionnaires should be pretested on a small population to check for clarity of each item (Leedy, 1993), a pilot study was conducted. Thirty-three students in a university educational leadership course "Change and Transformation" were asked to report difficulty in understanding any item or whether any item may not ask exactly what the researcher intended. Nineteen students in the pilot study were teachers, two were guidance counselors, two were athletic directors, one was a guidance counselor/teacher, one was an athletic director/teacher, one was a curriculum director, five were in a supportive administrative role, two were 7-12 principals, and seven were also coaches. Thirteen had applied for a 7-12 principalship but had not been offered or had not accepted one and 11 had never applied for a 7-12 principalship. Two had been 7-12 principals but were not serving in that role at the time of this pilot study,
one had just accepted a 7-12 principalship, two were serving as 7-12 principals, and four
did not give their application status at the time of the pilot study. Feedback from the pilot
study group indicated that the survey items were clear, that the format was easy to follow,
and that the questions were relevant and timely.

According to Krathwohl (1993), "Returns are highest on mail questionnaires that
are short and easy to respond to" (p. 384). The three-page questionnaire was a quick
checklist, short-answer format, utilizing three types of questions: forced choice, check all
that apply, and open-ended. Printed front and back, the survey contained 33 items.

**Method of Gathering Data**

"Motivating the respondent is central to getting a reply with good data" (Krathwohl, 1993, p. 384). In accordance with Leedy (1997) and Krathwohl (1993) who
discuss the "foot in the door" (Krathwohl, p. 387) technique of contacting potential
respondents before sending a survey, a short advance notice was mailed to each potential
respondent.

To retain anonymity, each questionnaire was mailed along with a tracking card.
A log was kept of the individuals to whom the questionnaires were mailed and the
individuals’ addresses and dates of mailing. Returned, completed questionnaires were
logged via the use of the tracking cards. Three weeks after the mailing of the
questionnaires, a follow-up letter and questionnaire was sent to each potential respondent
from whom a reply was not received. The follow-up letter garnered 20 additional
responses. A consideration is the fact that the questionnaire arrived in the hands of
respondents in May, the last full month of the school year and one of the busiest times of the year for educators.

Data Collection/Analysis

Upon collection of data from among the individuals endorsed as 7-12 principals but not holding secondary principal positions, data analysis was conducted in descriptive statistics that are typically used in this type of survey research: counts (numbers or frequencies); proportions (percentages); measure of central tendency (mean), and measure of variation (range; Fink & Kosecoff, 1998). The first five items (three unnumbered and A and B) of the survey, included to establish job status and job-seeking status of the respondents, were tabulated for frequency and percentage of responses. Other Items (2, 3, 4, 5, and 6) dealing with demographic data were also tabulated for frequency and percentage.

Forced-choice Items 8 through 27, perceived dissatisfiers or barriers to a 7-12 principal position, were tabulated by value (1 [low] – 5 [high]), frequency, and percentage of responses and then rank ordered by mean score. Items (1, 7, 28, and 31) designating the respondent’s current position(s) and assessing the respondent’s personal beliefs, reasons, and experiences were check-all-that-apply items; these items were tabulated by count and percentage of responses. Written responses to three Items (30, 32, and 33) asking the respondent to record his/her suggestions or beliefs about the principalship were transcribed in the respondent’s exact words. Gender was cross-tabulated with perceived barriers and dissatisfiers to the 7-12 principalship. Having held
the position of 7-12 principal but not in that position at the time of the study was also cross-tabulated with barriers and dissatisfiers.

Summary

A survey questionnaire was used to gather the necessary data to determine what motivated individuals to obtain the 7-12 principal endorsement and what they saw as barriers or dissatisfiers to obtaining a 7-12 principal position, as well as what would entice them to seek a 7-12 principal position. Data analysis was conducted using descriptive statistics.
CHAPTER 4
REPORTING THE DATA

The intent of this study was to report what was found in the authoritative literature regarding principal shortages in the United States and the possible causes of these shortages. Because of these expressed shortages, it was further intended to engage in a survey so that data collected would contribute to an understanding of why educators licensed for 7-12 principal positions are not in those positions in the state of Iowa. To achieve this purpose, a survey was mailed to 238 individuals in late April 2002.

Consistent with the descriptive statistical analyses discussed in Chapter 3, treatment of the data was undertaken using SPSS Base 9.0 software. The analyses provide information about the respondents' demographics, administrative job seeking status, and perceptions of the 7-12 principalship.

The Population Surveyed

The population surveyed in this study was composed of individuals in the field of education working in schools or AEA's who held Iowa endorsement 170, 7-12 principal, in the 2000-2001 school year but were not in positions of superintendent, associate superintendent, high school principal, middle school principal, junior high principal, elementary principal, assistant high school principal, assistant middle school principal, assistant junior high principal, or assistant elementary principal. Asked to provide names and addresses of those who fit the description above, the Iowa Department of Education, which routinely collects demographic information on licensed educators in the state, provided data from its Basic Educational Data Survey (BEDS) documents for the 2000-
2001 school year. Six hundred twenty-five individuals were identified. A sample of 238 from the total population of 625 was randomly selected according to sample size guidelines of Krejcie and Morgan (as cited in Leedy, 1997). Some of the BEDS information was incorrect: in preparing mailing addresses it was realized that some of the individuals in the sample were administrators who had been in administrative positions for some time. All individuals’ names in the sample, therefore, were checked against those in the Iowa Educational Directory, 2001-2002 School Year (Iowa Department of Education, 2001b) that lists principals and superintendents in all Iowa schools. Any names in the sample that appeared in the directory were pulled and additional names were culled from the random sample listing. One hundred seventy-three individuals of the 238 in the sample responded for a 72.7% return rate.

Although efforts were made to eliminate individuals in the sample frame that did not fit the population description, some surveys were returned by individuals in school administrative positions. Of the 173 who returned surveys, 22 completing the survey were currently in positions of superintendent, associate superintendent, high school principal, middle school principal, junior high principal, elementary principal, assistant high school principal, assistant middle school principal, assistant junior high principal, or assistant elementary principal. Seventeen were currently in these positions and let the researcher know and did not complete the survey. One person was no longer in education and one had left the school to which the survey had been sent and the person’s successor did not know where the individual had gone. One unopened survey was returned marked “No longer at this address.” These responses were deleted from the study. The resulting
effective sample for this study was 196. The final sample included 131 responses that represented a return rate of 67%.

Not all of the 131 respondents addressed every item on the survey. For clarity, the number responding to an item is included with the displayed data.

The current position(s) of each of the respondents was (were) sought and are represented in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Positions of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number that responded (130 out of 131).
Sixty-five percent of the respondents were teachers, 15.4% were coaches, 11.5% worked at the AEA’s, 9.2% were athletic directors, 5.4% were guidance counselors, 5.4% were curriculum directors, and 1.9% were media specialists. Thirteen percent gave a position under “Other”: band director, tag coordinator (2), special projects facilitator, consultant, administrator’s assistant (2), at-risk coordinator (2), special needs coordinator, activities director (2), department chair (2), night school director, team leader, and fine arts department leader. One respondent checked “Other” but gave no specific position.

Thirty-four respondents (26%) gave more than one current position. For all but one of these respondents, teaching was one of their current positions with a teacher-coach combination predominant among those with more than one current position. Females made up 46% of the responding population and males 54% (2 respondents did not respond to this item), as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Gender of respondents.
To further define the respondent group, survey items requested additional demographic information. Respondent age, race/ethnic classification, years that 7-12 principal endorsement has been held, and years to retirement are represented in Figures 2 through 5. The largest percentage of respondents fell in the 51-55 age range, followed by those in the 46-50 age range. As is the case with the majority of those who hold the position of 7-12 principal in Iowa, those who hold the license but are not in the position are overwhelmingly Caucasian (98%).

Figure 2. Ages of respondents.

Many of the respondents (37.9%) have held their 7-12 principal endorsement for more than 10 years. A quarter of the respondents have held their licenses for four to six years and a quarter have held theirs for three or fewer years. Just over 12% have held
theirs for seven to nine years. Based on the number of years respondents gave until they planned to retire, those holding the license do represent a viable candidate pool for the job of principal: 35.5% do not plan to retire for 10 years or more and 18.2% have no current plans to retire.

Figure 3. Respondents’ race/ethnic classification.

Findings

Research Question 1

How many of those holding a 7-12 principal endorsement, but not currently serving as a 7-12 principal, are currently seeking a 7-12 principal position? How many have held a 7-12 principal position, but are not currently in that position?

The first five items on the survey ask the respondents to report their status as a candidate for a 7-12 principal’s position. Forty-seven point seven percent, 58 respondents, had applied for a 7-12 principalship but had not been offered one or did not accept one, while 42.5% had never applied for the position. About 12% had previously
**Figure 4.** Years 7-12 principal license has been held by respondents.
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**Figure 5.** Respondents’ years to planned retirement.

![Pie chart showing years to planned retirement.]
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held 7-12 principal positions. Responses to survey items asking about their plans to seek employment as a 7-12 principal clearly suggested that most of the respondents were not seeking a 7-12 principalship, nor would they be in the next five years. See Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2

Application Status of Respondents Concerning the 7-12 Principalship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number of Responses*</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have applied for a 7-12 principal position but have never been offered or accepted one.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never applied for a 7-12 principal’s position.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been a 7-12 principal, but I am currently in another position.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Number that responded (127 out of 131 – 2 did not check any items, 2 checked both the first and second items and, therefore, were not included in the count for either item).

Ninety-four out of 131 responded to question A, “Are you currently seeking a 7-12 principal’s position?” and 121 out of 131 responded to the second question (B) regarding their job-seeking status, “Will you be seeking a 7-12 principal’s position in the near future (within 5 years)?”

A closer look at the career plans of the 58 individuals who had applied for a 7-12 principal position but had never been offered or accepted one suggests that most of them are not currently seeking a position but that a greater number may seek a position in the
future. About 64% of this group (37 respondents) who had applied for a 7-12 principal position prior to the study said they are not currently seeking such a position. Thirty-one percent (18 respondents) said they are currently seeking a position as a 7-12 principal and 5% (3 respondents) did not respond to this question. However, when asked if they would be seeking a 7-12 principal position within the next five years, just over 46% (27 respondents) said that they would. About 40% (23 respondents) said that they did not plan to seek a 7-12 principalship within the next five years, and about 14% (8 respondents) did not respond to this question.

Table 3

Job-Seeking Status of the Respondents Concerning the 7-12 Principalship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number of Responses*</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Are you currently seeking a 7-12 principal's position?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Will you be seeking a 7-12 principal's position in the near future (within 5 years)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Number that responded (A.-94 out of 131, B.-121 out of 131).
Research Question 2

When pursuing the 7-12 principal endorsement, for those holding a 7-12 principal endorsement, but not currently serving as a 7-12 principal, what were the motivators or perceived satisfiers of the 7-12 principalship to seek and obtain the endorsement?

In order to try and determine why people would spend the time and money to secure a license that they may never use, survey Item 7 was created. It asked respondents what motivated them to secure the 7-12 principal license. Of the 130 responding to this section, all but five had multiple reasons for pursuing the licensure. The largest percentage (67.7%) responded they had pursued the principal endorsement to “Broaden [their] knowledge base.” For the respondents a commendable motive, but not a strong indication they would seek a principalship. “Opportunity to use leadership skills” (64.6%), “Higher pay” (58.5%), and “Effect change on a greater scale” (50.0%), seem to evince an interest in the principalship. “Encouragement from a mentor” (42.3%), the fifth most prominent motivator for seeking licensure, support the importance of mentors as emphasized in the authoritative literature.

However, the reasons above viewed with the eighth most noted reason for seeking a 7-12 principal license, “Desire to head a school” (36.2%), the picture for possible applicants for secondary principal positions does not improve. Table 4 displays the percentage of respondents selecting each factor.
Table 4

Motivators for the Respondents to Secure the 7-12 Principal License

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Responses*</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Broaden knowledge base</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Opportunity to use leadership skills</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Higher pay</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Effect change on a greater scale</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Encouragement from a mentor</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Broaden range of influence</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Enhance job opportunities, but not serve as principal</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Desire to head a school</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Greater professional freedom</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Increased responsibility</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Variety in tasks and functions of principal</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Prestige and status</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Required for building or district level position, other than 7-12 principal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Number that responded (130 out of 131).
Written responses to the choice of “Other” which did not fit into any of the presented categories were the following:

We need more females in leadership positions throughout society.

Students

I was going to college until my GI Bill exhausted and that happened with a specialist in administration.

I was very happy teaching, but economic fluctuations such as the farm crisis of the 80s meant that I faced “Reduction in Force” too many times. I was riffed 3 times and recalled, but that life was just too scary, because a teacher’s years of experience are not always carried over to a new school. I then moved into a position of assistant principal/activities director, and I am a full time Activities Director.

I had no kids at the time so it was a great time to obtain the degree.

To make a difference in students’ and staff/support people’s and parents’ lives.

Research Question 3

What do those holding a 7-12 principal endorsement, but not currently serving as a 7-12 principal, see as significant dissatisfiers or barriers to seeking the 7-12 principalship?

In order to understand why respondents were not seeking positions as 7-12 principals, they were asked to rate, according to significance, 19 dissatisfiers and barriers that information from current research literature suggested may be reasons why people are not seeking the job of secondary principal. For many of the study participants, the satisfaction they felt in their present job was cause enough not to seek a principalship. Looking at the principal’s job itself, respondents chose as the five most prominent dissatisfiers or barriers to their seeking the 7-12 principalship: “too much time spent on
student discipline and personnel issues," "inability or undesirability to relocate," "the isolated nature of the position," "the stress level of the job," and "lack of financial or human resources to do the job." Table 5 lists the 19 barriers/dissatisfiers in order of significance from highest to lowest, 3.96-1.45, mean score on a 5-point scale.

A far greater number of secondary principals in Iowa and across our nation are male than are female. Because attention has been given to the disproportionately small number of women in leadership positions in a field dominated by women, dissatisfiers or barriers ranked by women were compared with those of the entire group of respondents. Fifty-nine of the respondents were women while 70 were men; two did not give their gender. In the overall ranking of dissatisfiers and barriers, gender ranked next to the bottom; gender did not appear to be of significance. When the 19 dissatisfiers and barriers were cross-tabulated by gender, female respondents moved gender up only one place in the rankings.

Views of the negative aspects of the 7-12 principalship are, for the most part, not gender-specific. The top three dissatisfiers or barriers were the same for both females and males: (a) "too much time spent on student discipline and personnel issues" (females-4.37, males-3.60), (b) "satisfaction with current job" (females-3.27, males-3.30), and (c) "inability or undesirability to relocate" (females-3.05, males-2.97). In fact, when comparing the rankings of females, males, and the total respondent group, no ranking differed by more than three positions except for one: "Testing/accountability pressures" was ranked thirteenth overall, 14th by females, and 9th by males.
Table 5

*Dissatisfiers and Barriers as Ranked by All Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable – item number and label</th>
<th>Number of Responses*</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Too much time spent on student discipline and personnel issues</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Satisfaction with current job</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Inability or undesirability to relocate</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Isolated nature of position</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Stress level of the job</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lack of financial or human resources to do the job</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Impact on family</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Year-round assignment</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of information on jobs</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Insufficient salary</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Lack of time to put balance in life</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Too far removed from students and instruction</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Testing/accountability pressures</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Too political</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lack of job security</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Lack of community support</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Absence of principal experience</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gender</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ethnic classification</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Number that responded (130-131 out of 131).
A blank line (Item 27) allowed respondents to give additional dissatisfiers or barriers to their securing a position as a 7-12 principal. Many of the 23 written responses here were reiterations, emphases, or detailed explanations of barriers or dissatisfiers given. Eight responses (all rated as above average or major in significance except for "age" which had no rating marked) were unique, and they are given here as written by the respondents:

Cannot coach,

I love to coach

"Good ol’ Boy" system prevents many qualified from serving

Personal problems

Age

9-12 sports

The majority of my experience is in special education, including my current position as Director of Special Education for an A.E.A. When I was interested in applying for principalships, I felt my background was sometimes viewed as inadequate, since I hadn’t experienced ‘real education.’

Not as good of benefits as other companies (could get a year round job with big company if I wanted that for more pay and better benefits).

Fifteen of the 131 respondents in this study stated that they had been a 7-12 principal but were currently in another position. Ten of the 15 were teachers, two held positions with AEA’s, one was an athletic director, and two did not provide information as to the positions they held at the time of the survey. Were the responses to this survey of those who had been 7-12 principals different from the 131-member group as a whole?
How the barriers and dissatisfiers of the 7-12 principalship ranked according to this group can be viewed in Table 6. For both the entire respondent group and those who had held a 7-12 principal position the top five barriers or dissatisfiers were the same.

"Too much time spent on student discipline and personnel issues" is the most prominent dissatisfier or barrier followed by "satisfaction with current position," "inability or undesirability to relocate," "the isolated nature of the position," and "the stress associated with the job." A comparison of the rankings of those who had held a 7-12 principal position and the total respondent group has three items differing in rank by more than three positions. Perhaps experience played a part in the responses of those who were 7-12 principals. Those who had been 7-12 principals gave more significance to "lack of time to put balance in their lives" (four positions), less significance to insufficient salary" (five positions), and less significance to "lack of information on jobs" (five positions) than did the respondent group as a whole.

Research Question 4

What would entice those holding a 7-12 principal endorsement, but not currently serving as a 7-12 principal, to seek a 7-12 principal position?

Item 33, the final item on the survey, addressed the respondents' personal views on applying for a principal position. One hundred one of the 131 respondents (77%) gave a variety of answers; 30 respondents (23%) chose not to reply to this open-ended question. Many of the answers reflected topics already recorded from the data. However, all responses were sorted by the relatedness of their content, and the number of responses and select written comments are given here.
Table 6

Dissatisfiers and Barriers as Ranked by Respondents Who Had Held a 7-12 Principalship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable - item number and label</th>
<th>Number of Responses*</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Too much time spent on student discipline and personnel issues</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Satisfaction with current job</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Isolated nature of the position</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Stress level of the job</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Inability or undesirability to relocate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lack of financial or human resources to do the job</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Lack of time to put balance in life</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Year-round assignment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Impact on family</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Too far removed from students and instruction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Testing/accountability pressures</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Too political</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lack of job security</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of information on jobs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Insufficient salary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Lack of community support</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Absence of principal experience</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gender</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ethnic classification</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Number that responded (15 out of 15).
**Location.** Consistent with findings in terms of barriers or dissatisfiers, 15 responded that the location of the position would impact their decision to seek a principal position. Some just said “Location.” Others said that a job in their geographic area so they wouldn’t have to move would be attractive while those that would move were specific about the location, “Middle school openings in southwest Iowa” and “southern Iowa near family.”

**Support.** Support (respect and positiveness)—from community, parents, and superintendent—was mentioned at the same rate as location: “I would like to work in a situation where the community works with the administration,” “Parents becoming more supportive of education and teachers (i.e., less lawsuit oriented; less threatening toward educators and administrators),” and “Superintendent knowledgeable and desirous of really impacting student achievement.”

**No enticement.** Twelve said there was “very little” or “nothing” that would entice them to seek a principal position. Two said they would consider the superintendency but not the principalship. Two wanted assistant principal positions. Eleven wouldn’t consider the position of principal because they are happy doing what they do. One said “My role as a team leader has the benefits of administration and few of the encumbrances of administration.” Another pointed out the teacher-principal salary differential that is a consideration: “I have a wonderful teaching position with a salary comparable to what a principal in a smaller district would earn.”

**Increase in salary.** Ten, however, said salary—higher pay—would be an enticement.
Nature of the job. Ten responded with comments such as “less responsibility,” “take away the discipline and long hours!,” “A position where you don’t put in 100 hr./week!,” and “work load spread out.” Three asked for “a division of administrative labor” and/or a “competent associate principal.” Four respondents also said they would seek elementary or middle school positions but not those that involved the upper four grades. Because of the time commitment and other demands of the job, and the inferable impact on family life, four respondents said maybe they would seek a principalship when their own children are all graduated from high school.

Gender. Three females expressed their frustration:

I have pretty much given up on being an administrator. In numerous interviews I have heard comments like ‘you look very young,’ and ‘you aren’t very big are you.’ I have been asked questions like, ‘How will you handle a big, tough football player since you aren’t as strong as a male?’ and ‘Are you married?’ Administrators from schools where I was interviewing have called my supervisors and tried to wheedle information such as am I married, how old am I, would I be having any children, etc. How can a younger female fight a system in which the leaders don’t care as much about student achievement and school return as they do about whether a female can handle being a high school principal?

I have not been interested in becoming a principal—my enticement would be in curricular openings but if I did, I would seek a position in Texas where the percentage of female administrators at the secondary level is much higher than the 3% in Iowa!

An offer! (in the Des Moines area). I have found that (in Iowa) it is still very male dominated—I am originally from Texas where women have been able to obtain positions in all areas from elementary to superintendent! I interviewed for two associate principal positions—in each situation, the position was given to a male.

Right type of school. “Total freedom” would be an enticement, one said. Another wanted “A progressive school with strong leadership and staff development in place.”
Two wanted specific types of schools: “A charter school position where the leader has more control of the variables in managing/leading a school free of district and state regulations and law” and “Fine arts magnet school, year-round educational philosophy.” Another said, “A ‘fit’ between my vision and the district’s vision of educational leadership!”

Opportunity. Comments by some respondents cast doubt on the existence of a shortage of secondary principals. Their thoughts centered on being given an opportunity or being recognized for a position. Two felt that sometimes real opportunities didn’t exist: “Most of the local jobs are already decided before they are advertised” and “Many times the schools already have a candidate in house and it ends up being a waste of time and money sending all the information the districts request.” “An opportunity,” one respondent said. Others responded in a similar vein: “Recognition by current administrators;” “I am actively seeking a position with excellent credentials but have been passed over;” “I have been seeking positions but they all keep saying ‘need experience’;” “I would love to be one. We are contemplating moving to another state—that is going to find me more opportunities;” “The knowledge that someone would want my expertise and years of service;” “A school district that needs my talents;” “A job offer for a dedicated professional;” and “I would love to have a principal position. Make me an offer!”
**Additional Findings**

Respondents were also asked the sources of perceptions of the principalship, their views of their principal preparation experiences, and their suggestions to alleviate a shortage of principal candidates.

**Sources of Perceptions of the Principalship**

Where do respondents turn when they want to know the specifics of the job of principal? Most of the respondents turned to current principals (95.4%) or to colleagues (73.8%) to learn about the principalship. Responses to the question “From which of the following have you gathered your perceptions of the 7-12 principalship?” are displayed in Table 7. These responses established that principals and others in the educational community, far more than other sources, are the means by which the image of the principalship emerges for those holding but not using the principal license. Perceptions gathered from sources other than those provided and given in the “Other” category, suggest personal experience in administration in some form—internships and working in the position of principal—carry much weight in forming a picture of the principalship.

**Views of Principal Preparation Programs**

Survey Items 29 and 30 were directed to respondents’ views of their principal preparation. Respondents were asked to describe how well they were prepared in their formal education program. The responses are detailed in Table 8.

All but one of the respondents rated high (very well and moderately well) their principal preparation programs. Because the content of preparation programs is raised as a concern in the literature (ERS, 1998; Fitzgerald, 2000; Gilman & Lanman-Givens,
2001; National Staff Development Council, 2000; Richard, 2001), the respondents were asked in Item 30 to write one positive change they would make to their preparation program. Even though they gave high marks to their university preparatory education, the respondents had numerous suggestions (80) for their preparation programs. Eighty-nine wrote responses, but nine used the space provided to reiterate their approval of the programs they completed. Here, in narrative form, are the changes proposed by the 80 respondents. Just over 46% (37) recommended 23 topics or courses they believed would have benefited them as prospective principals. Budget and finances were mentioned most (14.5%), followed by scheduling, supervision and evaluation, and real life situations and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Responses*</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current principals</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional publications</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/press</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional organizations</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This item reflects check-all-that-apply type responses. (130 out of 131 responded to this item).
Table 8

*To What Extent Did Your University Program Prepare You to Be a 7-12 Principal?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Responses*</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Well</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poorly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* * Number who responded (129 out of 131).

applications—sometimes punctuated with a request for professors who know what really goes on in schools today or “less theory,” and inclusion of the negative aspects of the job (all at 9.0%). Other recommendations included discipline (7.3%); educational law, including special education law (5.5%); school improvement (5.5%); decision making/problem solving (5.5%); student and teacher issues (3.6%); increasing student achievement (3.6%); school improvement (3.6%); leadership, including curriculum leadership (3.6%); special education (3.6%); and dealing with parents (3.6%). Additional topics or courses were each given once (1.8%): systems thinking training, conflict resolution training, mediation, counseling techniques, ethics and ethical behavior of principals, use of secretarial staff, dealing with the press, grant writing, how demands of the profession impact family life, and an athletic information class.
One-third of the suggested changes focused on the provision of mentorships, internships, or practicums for prospective principals. Although expressed in a variety of ways, the emphasis was on real-life experiences in a school: more time in the field to 1) get experience hiring people, doing schedules, figuring budgets and 2) to make connections with principals who are already practicing; more on-the-job training; more in-school experience; more practical experience—more time with a working principal; more internship hours; more experiences in the field; more field training; more-in school administrative practicums, observations; making the school district give time off with pay to do a real practicum; more time spent with people active in the field; more time with a current principal and a showing of duties; an actual internship in which I would be able to gain experience; a real practicum where you actually work with a principal as a student administrator; being a 'student' principal; I would have liked to have had a mentor during my preparation and also during at least the first year on the job; some kind of internship program where you are still preparing for the job and actually doing an administrative job, to get experience—more than a practicum involves; and shadowing more principals to identify different leadership and management styles and strategies for effectiveness.

A couple of respondents had wishes in terms of the scheduling of the preparation courses themselves, advocating for weekend classes, more ICN classes during the school year and summers off. One asked that courses with "busy work" be eliminated, another said that every person should be required to complete the same requirements—that there be "no glass ceiling to conquer for females," and one felt programs should "weed out those who glaringly will not be effective principals."
Four respondents (5%) wanted more help in preparing for and getting a job. Assistance in writing resumes, mock interviews, and development of "a network for support for current and future administrators to assist them in locating jobs and developing professionally" were suggested.

Suggestions to Alleviate Shortage of Principal Candidates

To contribute to thoughts on the principal shortage, Item 31 listed several options that could be checked by the respondents as having the greatest impact on alleviating the principal shortage. Responses are outlined in Table 9.

Table 9

Perceived Changes that Will Make the Greatest Impact on Alleviating our Current Shortage of Principal Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number*</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes in administrator certification</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in administrator preparation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase salary and benefits</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations efforts</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in expectations and responsibilities of the principal</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification and recruitment of candidates</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *This item reflects check-all-that-apply type responses (125 out of 131 responded).
Changing the expectations and the responsibilities to help alleviate the shortage of principal candidates was by far the preference of the respondents (68.0%). More than half of the respondents (52.8%) felt compensation in the form of salary and benefits needed to be addressed. Over 40% also said to look at identification and recruitment in terms of alleviating the shortage. Item 32 provided for comments or suggestions respondents might add to those listed in Item 31: fifty-eight responses were presented. Many comments or suggestions had a similar message and most addressed areas already discussed in the data presented thus far. Seven respondents commented that they did not believe a shortage existed. To give voice to their personal perspectives, the 58 respondents’ replies to this item are included here, and as much as possible, grouped by the relatedness of their messages:

Respect and support.

Respect from school boards and communities for administrators in general. Let’s include the legislature as well.

More respect for school administrators and educators by the public.

Community support and staff support for “managers” and administrators.

Good support.

Lack of community and school board support drive quality candidates away.

Some districts are very political.

The greatest roadblock in my community is an association with the teacher union. Our previous administrator saw this as a threat.

Expectations and compensation.

The job is around the clock almost and very stressful for the pay. In smaller districts, the principal does it all—including more and more
responsibilities with special education. Family life is affected by all the late hours.

I would not make any more money but would have an 11-month contract.

The job description for administrators in small communities is too great. It is unrealistic to expect a principal to be both a leader and a manager in a small school. They actually are only managers because they wear so many hats. Burnout is a problem because of that. They need more assistants.

Principals can't be expected to attend every ball game and event.

Expectations/responsibilities can be overwhelming for a principal of a small district.

Time...biggest complaint of principals is that they aren't at events...I can't take that type of job unless I know I will be there.

H.S. principals are expected to be at all/most functions. The legal issues associated with running a high school are intimidating.

The stress is ridiculous. Discipline, parents, etc. leave little time for actual leadership.

Not everybody is suited to working 14-16 hour days—six days a week, whether it's an activities director or principal.

At least a half time or more principal is needed in most buildings just to handle discipline.

You can't change expectations or responsibilities of principals but it is difficult to find someone who wants to deal with discipline most of the day.

Find a way to spend time with family.

The community expectations for a building principal are overwhelming for a principal of a small school district.

The present role of many school administrators is not to guide and enhance educational opportunities for students, but to ward off lawsuits and deal with hostile parents and/or students.
In general—it’s not a ‘great job’ for a mom—especially since I’m 7-12; notice many female administrators are single or divorced and have grown children—that speaks volumes.

Responsibilities are expected—people’s expectations are often too unreasonable for humans.

Clarity on incentives—if not salary, benefits, etc.

Principals need to have some security in their jobs.

Salary and benefits—need to keep in line with increases in salaries of superintendents. I believe that principal/admin must have more time to be involved with leading teaching, instruction and have more support/options available for those other duties—lunch supervision, after-school supervision, sports supervision, etc.

Middle management is very challenging at the current time...

I do not want to terminate teachers and programs due to lack of funding.

In private business in our area span of control is approx. 1-15. As an administrator at school my span of control was approx. 1-105.

Have some type of consistency from small districts to large districts.

In a large high school this job is 24/7 one and the pay is not commensurate with the time or the responsibilities, however, love of kids and passion for education will get you through!

Candidates must understand that their job is to improve teaching and learning—not coaching and politics first.

Expected to do things that aren’t educationally sound—pressure from superintendents and those above.

Public blames administrators for their lack of parent skills.

I believe the evaluator issue (10 days are needed) will be a problem for us to continue to remain certified. [Ten days are required for the training. At present, these 10 days of training occur during the school year.]

Change rule from 88 to 85. [The “Rule of 88” allows individuals 55 and older whose retirement benefits are with the Iowa Public Employees’ Retirement
System to take early retirement with full retirement benefits if their years of service added to their age equal 88.]

**Recruitment and hiring process.**

Identification and recruitment may alleviate some of the politics involved.

It is really hard to get your foot in the door.

The hiring process needs to be covered in class, resume work, interviewing strategies. Networking is everything! It is all in who you know. If you don’t belong to the social clubs and golf, it is difficult to get a good position.

Promote from within without so much of an old boy/girl network. Develop our best teachers to be administrators, not your weakest.

In my building there are three of us certified to be administrators. None of us are encouraged, however, we have all done administrative duties for the principal. When I asked, I was told I had to prove myself, then they would recognize me. I’m still waiting and doing many projects.

**Hiring people without experience**

Most of the administrators I have worked with are male, former, coaches, and part of a very close knit group of administrators. If you are different from them, they are not very accepting.

There are still too few female 7-12 administrators. If hired, it's usually as an assistant.

Most of my administrators have been coaches—as a non-coaching female, I feel I could handle situations with equal control—the “good old boys club” is really trite.

There needs to be a change in the perceptions of women in administrative positions.

Different perspective—age is OK for men but not women; women can discipline.

Not everyone can make a good principal—that is why we have poor schools.
**Supported experiences.**

More practicum activities under fire

Changes in preparation might help get over the “lack of experience” hurdle. Maybe with a different kind of preparation, schools will be willing to try a first time administrator.

Mentor program

Need to improve mentoring programs in districts

**No shortage.**

I’m not sure there is a real shortage—several positions in which I applied had 50-70 candidates—that is no shortage!

I don’t think there is a shortage, at least not any more than a teacher shortage. Why would anyone go into education when the money is not good and more and more litigation takes place making the job not very appealing?

I don’t think there is that great a principal shortage—teacher salaries have improved so some don’t feel the pressure to make the change.

I don’t believe there is a shortage when I see schools receiving 25-40 applications for elementary and secondary principalships. The shortage may well be from the standpoint of candidates being steeped in school improvement processes; operation from a research base and data-driven decision making; having knowledge of and ability to be educational leaders.

I just finished #2 for a middle school position out of 80 applicants. What shortage?

There has been no shortage of candidates for any of the positions I have applied for.

In eastern Iowa there seems to be an abundance of candidates for administrative positions.

**Summary**

The data analysis in this study centered on: (a) the demographic characteristics of the respondents, (b) the motivators and satisfiers behind obtaining a 7-12 principal
license, (c) the barriers and dissatisfiers to seeking a 7-12 principal position, (d) the means by which perceptions of the 7-12 principalship were formed, (e) suggested changes to principal preparation programs, (f) suggestions to alleviate the shortage of principal candidates, and (g) what specifically would entice respondents to seek a 7-12 principal position.

Most respondents were teachers. Most sought and obtained the 7-12 principal license to broaden their knowledge base, for an opportunity to use leadership skills, and for higher pay. The top three barriers or dissatisfiers to seeking or securing a 7-12 principal position were too much time spent on student discipline and personnel issues, satisfaction with current job, and inability or undesirability to relocate. Respondents were generous in their written responses to questions about their sources of information about the principalship, their principal preparation programs, and their own interest in seeking a 7-12 principalship.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, REFLECTIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter consists of six parts: Summary of the Study, Conclusions of the Study, Reflections on the Study, Comparative Analysis of the Superintendent License and Principal License Studies, Recommendations, and Suggestions for Further Research. The study’s methodology and purpose are discussed in the Summary. Observations made from the analysis of the data are found in the Conclusions. Similarities and differences in the findings of the study of individuals holding the superintendent license but not in superintendent positions and this study are found in the Comparative Analysis. Suggestions for state level policy makers, local school boards and central office personnel, university principal preparation program faculty, and professional organizations are included in the Recommendations section. The Reflections section includes elements of the literature review and specific related research findings. Implications address topics for future research.

Summary of the Study

A descriptive study was conducted to find what was satisfying and dissatisfying about the principalship and what steps might be taken to make the principalship more satisfying to those Iowa educators who hold the 7-12 principal endorsement but are not in 7-12 principal positions. The purpose of this study was to contribute to an understanding of the shortage of qualified secondary principal candidates in the state of Iowa. The data used to examine the satisfiers and dissatisfiers were compiled from the responses to a self-reporting survey of 131 individuals in the field of education working in schools or
AEA's who hold the 7-12 principal endorsement but are not in the position of 7-12 principal.

Included in the survey were questions addressing what motivated the respondents to secure the 7-12 principal license, what they perceived as barriers or dissatisfiers to their seeking or securing a position as 7-12 principal, and what would entice them to seek a secondary principal position. Similar questions were asked of individuals holding the Iowa superintendent license but not serving in that capacity by Smith (1999). The decision to survey those that are licensed to hold building level administrative positions was prompted by the policy statement issued by the Iowa State Board of Education in 1998 that addressed the shortage of qualified administrators and its effect on Iowa and Smith’s (1999) recommendation that studying those licensed for the principalship as she did those holding the superintendent’s license would contribute to the dialogue on the “leadership crisis in the state” (p. 118).

Conclusions of the Study

Summations of the pertinent findings resulting from this study are provided here. The demographic characteristics of the 131 respondents who participated in this study are summarized. Conclusions centered around a review of the four research questions are related to the information discussed in the authoritative literature review of Chapter 2.

Demographic Characteristics

Viewed demographically, the pool of possible candidates for 7-12 principal positions are largely middle-aged (41-55 years of age) Caucasians whose primary job responsibility at the time of this study was that of teacher. Most do not plan to retire soon.
Forty-five point seven percent of the members of this pool had applied for at least one 7-12 principal position—about 27% of the men and just over 18% of the women in the overall respondent group. Most were in the 41-55 age range. Just over 42% had never applied; 20% of the men had never applied and 21% of the women had never applied for a 7-12 principal position. Most were in the 41-60 age range. Fifteen percent had served as 7-12 principals but were currently in other positions which, for most of them, were teaching positions. In terms of age, those who had been 7-12 principals were more evenly spread across the age groups than the other two groups, but were somewhat concentrated in the 36-55 age range.

For two groups, those that had applied for a 7-12 principalship but had not been offered or had not accepted one and those that had never applied for a 7-12 principalship, even when sorted by gender the years that respondents had held the 7-12 principal license were across all age groups. The years that the 7-12 principal license had been held were also across all age groups for the females who had served as 7-12 principals but were not doing so at the time of this study. Most of the males who had at one time been 7-12 principals had held their licenses for more than 10 years with a remaining small percentage having held theirs for three years or fewer.

Findings

Findings from this study relate to important conclusions reviewed in the literature in Chapter 2. These findings are organized around the research questions.

Research Question 1. How many of those holding a 7-12 principal endorsement, but not currently serving as a 7-12 principal, are currently seeking a 7-12 principal
position? How many have held a 7-12 principal position, but are not currently in that position?

Prior to this study, 45.7% had applied for a 7-12 principalship but had not been offered one or did not accept one. Of the 94 who responded to the question, “Are you currently seeking a 7-12 principal’s position?” 20 respondents, or 21.3%, said that they were seeking a position; 74, or 78.7%, were not seeking a position. Of the 121 who responded to the question, “Will you be seeking a 7-12 principal’s position in the near future (within 5 years)?” 38 respondents (31.4%) said that they would be seeking a position in the near future; 83 (68.6%) would not be seeking a position in the next five years. None of the 15 individuals (about 12%) who had held a 7-12 principal position at one time were seeking another principal position at the time of this study. Three (only a fifth of the fifteen), however, may seek a 7-12 principal position in the next five years.

For those who may apply for a position, the not-now-but-maybe-in-the-future status may be due to personal circumstances or may be due to a hope that the nature of the principalship will change.

Although current and impending shortages of principals—secondary principals in particular—are widely discussed in the literature, and much of that discussion centers around licensed individuals not seeking principal positions, over 45% of the respondents in this study had applied for a 7-12 position but had never been offered or accepted one. Shortages have been reported by the ERS (1998), the NASSP (2001a), and the American Association for Employment in Education (2002), as well as numerous other organizations. In Iowa, the Iowa Department of Education (1999), the State Board of
of Education (1998) and SAI, IASB and the Institute for Educational Leadership (2000) have identified a shortage of candidates for principal positions.

Perhaps in her explanation of labor shortages Veneri (1999) has offered some understanding: "...the term 'labor shortage' is often used to describe a variety of situations, some of which are not generally considered by economists to be actual shortages" (p. 2). Employers become accustomed to hiring a certain quality of candidates. When the labor market tightens, the applicant pool shrinks. Employers may have difficulty finding candidates of the quality to which they have become accustomed. Employers may be able to fill positions by offering higher pay, or they may need to make do with candidates who do not match the quality to which they have become accustomed. Thus, Veneri (1999) says, "...the issue becomes one of the quality of job candidates, not necessarily quantity of people willing and able to do that job" (p. 2).

**Research Question 2.** When pursuing the 7-12 principal endorsement, for those holding a 7-12 principal endorsement, but not currently serving as a 7-12 principal, what were the motivators or perceived satisfiers of the 7-12 principalship to seek and obtain the endorsement?

Witmer (1995) suggested that the impetus for people to pursue the professional education and license for principal comes from a variety of situations or for any number of reasons. This is true for the Iowa educators who participated in this study: 125 of the 131 respondents had multiple reasons for securing the 7-12 principal license. Above all, most engaged in the pursuit of the education for the 7-12 principal license to broaden their knowledge base. They wanted higher pay, but they also wanted an
opportunity to use leadership skills, to broaden their range of influence and to effect change on a greater scale. A mentor, most likely a principal, probably encouraged them.

Concurring with the literature that proposes that more than half of the people who pursue the license don’t intend to use it (Borja, 2001; Jordan et al., 1994), “Desire to head a school” fell into the bottom half of the motivators or satisfiers when ranked, with only 36.2% of the respondents giving that as a reason for obtaining the principal license. Just over 45.5% of the respondents had applied for a 7-12 principal position at some point in their professional lives (but had not been offered or accepted one), 78.7% said they were not currently seeking a 7-12 principal position at the time of this study and 68.6% said they would not be seeking one within the next five years.

However, three motivators/satisfiers included in the top six of the 13 motivators/satisfiers—“opportunity to use leadership skills,” “to broaden their range of influence,” and “to effect change on a greater scale”—suggested individuals pursuing the education and the license did intend to use it for leadership purposes in whatever position they were in or in one that did not necessarily require the principal license. “Required for building or district level position other than 7-12 principal” was the least noted motivator or satisfier. One could conclude that people may pursue the education and obtain the license for reasons that have nothing to do with what they perceive to be satisfiers of the 7-12 principalship.

Research Question 3. What do those holding a 7-12 principal endorsement, but not currently serving as a 7-12 principal, see as significant dissatisfiers or barriers to seeking the 7-12 principalship?
“Only if I started disliking teaching” was the reason one respondent gave for possibly considering the principalship. “Happy where I am,” others said. Many who hold the 7-12 principal license enjoy what they do—for most of them, teach—and do not wish to leave a position from which they derive satisfaction to take one in which they may not. These thoughts are much like those of participants in Hurley’s (1994) study of teachers with principal potential who felt the principalship would take them too far away instruction and engage them in too many non-instructional duties and too much paperwork.

Cooley and Shen (1997), Gilman and Lanman-Givens (2001), NASSP (2001b), and Villanueva (1997) as well as others who discussed the stress level of secondary principals, spoke to the increase in time and energy given by principals to discipline and related issues. The great amount of time spent on student discipline and personnel issues was the only dissatisfier/barrier to seeking or securing a 7-12 principalship that ranked higher in significance than current job satisfaction in this study. This dissatisfier was joined by four others that ranked in the top six as significant as dissatisfiers or barriers to seeking or securing the principalship that reflect directly on the nature of the job itself and are supported by previous studies: relocation (Bernstein, 1999; Jordan et al., 1994; New England School Development Council, 1988; Wendel, 1994), isolated nature of the position (Fitzgerald, 2000; Hill, 1993; SAI, 1997a; Tirozzi & Ferrandino, 2001), stress level of the job (Aronstein, 2001; Ashford, 2000; Bower, 1996; Cooley & Shen, 1999; Ferrandino, 2001; Foster, 2002; SAI, 1997a), and lack of financial or human resources to do the job (Ashford, 2000; Cooley & Shen, 1999; Henry, 2000; Hurley, 2001; Jordan et

Both those in the positions and those who observe the 7-12 principalship from the outside agree that the nature of the job must change to make it more attractive, and, some say, doable. In 1994, the Nebraska Council of School Administrators studied the supply and demand of school administrators in their state. Teacher members of the Nebraska State Education Association viewed the "responsibilities of administrators" (p. 78) as the second greatest dissatisfier, preceded by time for "personal obligations in my life" (Wendel, 1994, p. 78). The Iowa teachers and other educators who participated in this study echoed the sentiments of their Nebraska colleagues and others (Ashford, 2000; Cooley & Shen, 1999; Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Houston, 2000; Hurley, 2001; IASB, SAI, & Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000; Nakamura & Samuels, 2000; Olson, 2001; SAI, 1997a). Sixty-eight percent of the respondents said changes in the expectations and responsibilities of the secondary principal must change to make the job more attractive to potential candidates.

Although the ratio of male secondary public school principals to female secondary public school principals in Iowa was 7 to 1 in 2001 (Iowa Department of Education, 2001a), gender was not seen as an issue by the respondents in this study. Even when responses were sorted by gender, the females overall did not find their gender a barrier to seeking or securing a principalship. "In general—it's not a great job for a mom" said one female respondent. Interestingly enough, male respondents as a group saw the
impact on family as a more significant dissatisfier than did the female respondents as a
group. Five females did believe a change in the perception of women as secondary
administrators would advance more candidates. And while one female requested that the
glass ceiling for women be removed in preparation programs, another asked that
individuals be promoted from within without so much of an old boy/girl network,
including girl in what has always previously been singularly referred to as the “good old
boys’ club.” The implication was that women were part of the network; it wasn’t
exclusively for male benefit.

People choose administration for more money (Black & English, 1986; Wilmore,
1995; Witmer, 1995). The respondents in this study ranked “higher pay” their third
highest satisfier or motivator to secure the 7-12 principal license and “insufficient salary”
tenth out of 19 dissatisfiers or barriers. Yet, when asked the less personal, more general
question “Which of these suggestions do you feel will make the greatest impact on
alleviating our current shortage of principal candidates?” more than 50% said increase
salary and benefits.

Numerous studies have addressed how the pressure of increased accountability
directly impacts a principal (Gilman & Lanman-Givens, 2001; Nakamura & Samuels,
2000; Richard, 2000; Donaldson, 2001; Evaluating the Principalship, 2000; Kleiner,
2000; Labi, 1999). The pressure of testing and accountability was ranked eleventh out of
nineteen as a dissatisfier for the entire group of participants in this study. The men saw it
as far more of a dissatisfier than women, ranking it ninth to the females’ fourteenth.
Testing and accountability were never written about in open-ended response items. With
the passage of the No Child Left Behind legislation in 2001 and its heavy emphasis on testing and accountability and accompanying sanctions for schools who fail to make the required annual yearly progress, views of this type of pressure as a dis satisfier of the principalship may change dramatically. Likewise, the advent of Iowa's new teacher evaluation system presents increased accountability pressures and time commitment for principals. One secondary principal who had taken part in the new evaluator training told a colleague who had not begun the training about the accountability associated with the new evaluation system, "You won't want to be a principal anymore" (John Johnson, personal communication, September 25, 2002).

_Research Question 4._ What would entice those holding a 7-12 principal endorsement, but not currently serving as a 7-12 principal, to seek a 7-12 principal position?

Hurley's (1994) study of teachers with "principal potential" (p. 166) points out that those potentially interested in the principalship said that the position would have to change considerably for them to be seriously interested. Iowa educators with 7-12 principal licenses but not in 7-12 principal positions feel the same way. A reinvented principalship in their eyes would have far fewer commitments especially in terms of hours on the job and a supportive administration and community that recognized and respected the principal. If the principalship itself did not change, the pay would have to increase considerably. A respondent sums it up: "Lots and lots of dollars!!!! I have seen this job destroy the lives and health of two people I personally have worked with."
In addition, the principalship they would consider has to be in the “right” geographic location, which means either one in their area or one in a part of the state that holds appeal for them.

Mentoring is now to be provided by Iowa schools for their new teachers. Mentoring would also benefit potential and new principals. Encouragement from a mentor was often a catalyst for individuals in this study to pursue the license for 7-12 principal. A third of the study participants also desired mentorships or internships—or a greater time spent in such relationships if they were already part of the participants’ preparation programs—as part of their professional education for the license, and some specifically requested a mentor for the first year in a principal position. This fits with the grow-your-own plans of some districts in this country (Chmelynski, 2001; Donaldson, 2001; Henry, 2000; Newsom, 2001), and with SAI’s (1997a) plans to work with the Iowa State Education Association to “identify and recruit classroom teachers into school administration” (p. 3) and, within this effort, “make mentoring available to all first-year administrators”(p. 3).

The list of enticements was great, but for some, no inducement would suffice: “I would not touch his [principal of his school] job or any principal job with a ten-foot pole.” For others, no enticement is necessary: “Make me an offer!”

Reflections on the Study

Highlights of the study are addressed here. Expectations of those in the secondary principal position and the significance of the gender issue are discussed. What “shortage” may really mean in terms of the 7-12 principalship and how this study
compared to a similar study of those licensed for but not serving in the capacity of school superintendent are also evaluated.

**Expectations**

Findings in this survey strongly support the literature that calls for rethinking, or reinventing, the principalship. For those considering a 7-12 principalship, dealing with student discipline issues, isolation, the lack of financial and human resources to do the job, and the overall stress related to the demands and responsibilities of the position may not be worth it. For the fifteen respondents in this study who had been 7-12 principals, the above factors were also the primary reasons for none of them seeking another principalship at the time of this study. Work expectations for the person in the position of 7-12 principal must be modified. “Work load spread out” is how one respondent phrased it. In other words, realign the principal’s duties and responsibilities. Indeed, superintendents, school boards and the community would need to work diligently to redefine their expectations.

**Gender**

An unexpected finding in this study was that gender in the secondary principalship may have ceased to be an issue. More has been written about females in the superintendency and the glass ceiling they encounter, but abundant literature on the glare the glass ceiling casts on females aspiring to the secondary principalship can also be found. Some female participants in the study alluded to the glass ceiling. However, survey data indicates that being female is not considered a significant barrier to the secondary principalship by males or females. In addition, the top reasons for not seeking
a 7-12 principal position were the same for both females and males: “too much time spent on student discipline and personnel issues,” “satisfaction with current position,” and “inability or undesirability to relocate.”

Many would agree with Farber who explained in Witmer (1995) the difference in how men and women become principals: “…they’re expected to put family obligations first while men aren’t” (p. 13). This long-held expectation regarding women is also refuted by the findings in this study. “Impact on family” was rated as a more significant dissatisfier or barrier by the male respondents in this study than by the female respondents. The gender equity may have arrived, in the minds of individual educators, if not in schools.

Shortage of Candidates

A variety of adjectives precede the term “shortage” in the authoritative literature: impending, widespread, looming, serious, acute, significant, severe. Yet some respondents in this study didn’t feel there was a shortage based on the number of applicants to jobs for which they had applied or with which they were familiar. No single measure of occupational labor shortages exists (Veneri, 1999). The term “labor shortage” (p. 15) is used to describe many situations, some of which are not considered by economists to be true shortages (Veneri, 1999). Sometimes the term is used when the number of applicants falls somewhat short of the historical “norm”, but a shortage may also be perceived because the quality of candidates falls beneath the standard to which an employer has become accustomed. “Under these labor market conditions,” Veneri (1999) explains, “the issue becomes one of the quality of job candidates, not necessarily quantity
of people willing and able to do that job” (p. 15). One respondent thinks this is the case with the 7-12 principal shortage:

I don't believe there is a shortage when I see schools receiving 25-40 applications for elementary and secondary principals. The shortage may well be from the standpoint of candidates being steeped in school improvement processes; operating according to research-based and data-driven decision making; and having knowledge of and ability to be educational leaders.

Cooley and Shen, (1999), Houston, (2000), and McCormick, (1987) express similar skepticism in writing about the number of principals retiring and the declining number of teachers seeking administrative certification and administrative positions. They seem to argue that we aren’t experiencing a shortage of certified candidates, but we may have a shortage of leaders who can address the complex issues and demands found in today's schools. Perhaps a search of the Department of Education and school administrator organizations' anecdotal records, which are used as measures of shortages in the absence of definitive data sources, (Veneri, 1999), would support or reject the hypothesis that the shortage of 7-12 principals is a problem of quality, rather than quantity.

Comparative Analysis of the Superintendent License and Principal License Studies

Much of the preparation for superintendents and principals is similar and satisfactory performance in another administrative position within a school district is one of the three general requirements for someone to hold the superintendency (Konnert & Augenstein, 1995). That administrative position within a district, when not a previous superintendency, is most often the secondary principalship (IASB, personal communication, 2002). Therefore a comparative analysis of Smith’s 1999 study of individuals who held the superintendent’s license but were not in superintendent
positions and this study of individuals who held the 7-12 principal’s license but were not in 7-12 principal positions was done to identify useful similarities or distinctions.

This study and Smith’s (1999) both asked about the likelihood that the respondents would seek 7-12 principal positions and superintendent positions, respectively. In both cases the answer was that it was not likely that they would be seeking positions now or in the near future. In fact, the percentages were amazingly similar. When asked in this study if they were currently seeking a 7-12 principalship, 78.7% said they were not. When Smith (1999) asked a similar question about the superintendency, 78.3% of her study participants said they were not currently seeking such a position. Remarkably, 68.6% of the respondents in both studies answered “no” when asked whether they would be seeking, in the next five years, a 7-12 principal position (this study) or a superintendency (Smith’s study).

There were similarities in the responses of the participants in the two studies regarding why they spent the time and money on the educational requirements for the license that they may never use. The survey for this study provided fourteen variables and the survey addressing those holding Iowa superintendent licenses but not in superintendent positions provided six variables in addressing what motivated individuals to seek the respective licenses. The greatest motivator for the respondents in each study was to broaden their knowledge base. The other two variables that rounded out the top half in the study of those with superintendent licenses but not in superintendent positions were “to enhance job opportunities [but not serve as superintendent]” and “desire to lead” (Smith, 1999, p. 69). Similarly, in this study, “enhance job opportunities, but not serve as
principal” and “opportunity to use leadership skills” were in the top half of the variables given as motivators or satisfiers for seeking the 7-12 principal license.

Similarities decreased somewhat, however, when respondents in each study were asked what considerations were keeping them from seeking and/or obtaining a 7-12 principalship or superintendency. Twenty-two survey items were presented for significance ranking to those with superintendent licenses and nineteen items plus an “other” category were presented for significance ranking to those with 7-12 principal licenses. The top five significant barriers to seeking or securing a superintendent position were, in rank order, “satisfaction with current job,” “impact on family,” “too political,” “stress level of job,” and “absence of superintendent experience” (Smith, 1999, p. 57). The top five rankings of the respondents with 7-12 principal licenses were “too much time spent on student discipline and personnel issues,” “satisfaction with current job,” “inability orUndesirability to relocate,” “isolated nature of the position,” and “stress level of the job.” The differences in rankings of dissatisfiers and barriers between the two respondent groups may be due to differences in the jobs of 7-12 principals and superintendents.

Additionally, impact on family and the political nature of the position were addressed on both surveys. While the impact of the superintendency on one’s family was ranked as number two in significance, it was seventh for those with 7-12 principal licenses. The politics of the superintendency (ranked third) was viewed as far more dissatisfying than the politics of the secondary principalship (ranked 14th). Absence of experience in the position was viewed as a bigger barrier by those with superintendent
licenses who placed it in the top five of 22 barriers, than those with 7-12 principal licenses who ranked it 17th out of 19 given dissatisfiers or barriers. The relocation issue was a major consideration for those with principal licenses (ranked fifth in significance), but was also a consideration for those with superintendent licenses (ranked seventh in significance). Those with superintendent licenses saw less significance in the isolated nature of the position, ranking it eleventh, than did those with principal licenses, who ranked it fourth. Perhaps one gets used to the isolation associated with a position as one moves up the rungs of a career ladder and fewer and fewer individuals hold the same or equivalent position (63.7% of the respondents in Smith’s 1999 survey were in assistant principal, principal, or assistant superintendent positions).

Also notable is the fact that when their responses were separated from the total group, female respondents with the superintendent license moved “gender” as a barrier from second from the bottom to second from the top in significance (Smith, 1999, p. 58). Responses of the participants in the principal license study when sorted by gender, however, revealed that female respondents moved the significance of gender up only one place, from second from the bottom to third from the bottom.

Respondents in both studies had similar items on their wish lists of changes to their preparation programs: more on budgets and finances and more in terms of mentorships or internships. Although wish lists in both studies were long and often punctuated with very specific changes or requests, the two items above were emphasized.

When asked what would alleviate a shortage of candidates for the superintendency and the secondary principalship, both respondent groups said that first
we must look at the position itself: review it and rethink it in terms of expectations, responsibilities and compensation. Secondly, we must put real effort into identification and recruitment of candidates.

And finally, what would it take to get these superintendent-licensed and principal-licensed individuals to become candidates for the jobs? The written responses by participants on both surveys reflect a wide range of sentiments: “Location,” “Support,” “Nothing would entice me,” “When my kids are graduated from high school,” and “Recruit me.”

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, a number of issues should be addressed with action. Suggestions for local school boards and district administrators, university principal preparation program faculty, and professional organizations are provided in this section. Many individuals involved with the principalship have already offered recommendations; these are included, as appropriate.

Suggestions for Local School Boards and Central Office Personnel

If the principal is a key to school effectiveness, and if many principals will be retiring soon, it is important to attract highly qualified individuals into the principalship. To effectively recruit teacher-leaders into the principalship, the role must be made more attractive.

We should begin by reducing the traditional management burdens placed on principals. As Hurley (1994) suggested, we should focus the principal’s role on the school’s central purposes and the activities that directly affect students’ lives and their
learning. Recall that many respondents in this study found their current teaching jobs attractive; they enjoy their involvement in instruction and student learning. While managerial functions are important, principals are less effective as educational leaders if more time/energy is devoted to non-instructional-leadership tasks than to instructional tasks (SAI, IASB, & Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000).

Educators and community members must reach consensus on the differences between educational leadership and management responsibilities for principals in their district (SAI, IASB, & Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000). The board and superintendent then must outline roles and expectations of the 7-12 principal(s)—this may mean that some non-leadership tasks, usually done by principals, will be reassigned to others. And, most importantly, the board and superintendent must engage in continual communications with the public to foster support of the roles and responsibilities of its secondary principals, so the traditional way is no longer expected. This can be done through meetings with community groups to assure thorough understanding, through publications of the school district and through other media avenues, and by encouraging and supporting principals when they act according to the newly defined roles and expectations. This communication is crucial if the public is to accept administrators as educational leaders and not as managers.

School districts and communities must make sure principals have the resources to fulfill job responsibilities: support and administrative staff, technological and professional resources, etc. A district culture should be established that allows principals
to balance personal life needs and district needs (SAI, IASB, & Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000).

Raising the salaries for school administrators will make the principalship more attractive to potential principals. In theory, a labor shortage, if it exists, should cease when pay is increased (Veneri, 1999).

Suggestions for Local School Boards and District Administrators in Conjunction with University Principal Preparation Programs

School districts with grow-your-own administrator programs have termed them successful. The school should collaborate with universities to recruit and prepare principals within one’s own district. With assistance from the university, the school should develop a plan for encouraging, identifying and recruiting potential leaders. Also with assistance from the university, after screening for potential and interest, the school should provide a deliberate, developmental career planning process for each educator to move into administration. The school, working with the university, should include in-house internships, mentoring programs, orientation processes, job shadowing, and other ongoing professional development for the aspiring administrators. In addition, the school should provide release time for attendance at local, state, and national conferences. Houston (2000) puts it concisely, “We have to move from depending on the ‘wannabe’ leaders to creating a generation of ‘ought-to-be’ leaders” (p. 3).

School administrators and board members must allow teachers to see themselves as educational leaders. “Because the supply of school administrators rests upon the ranks of teachers, school administrators can increase the interest of teachers in becoming
administrators by whetting their teachers' appetites for administrative roles and responsibilities" (Wendel, 1994, p. 31). Together with the university principal preparation program, the school should rethink the all-important internship or practicum component. Often in principal internship situations, duties that are assigned to interns are duties that supervising administrators are happy to give to someone else: duties such as supervision of the loading and unloading of buses; monitoring the halls; dealing with students' tardiness and absence; overseeing playgrounds, yards, and grounds; ordering textbooks; scheduling and monitoring tests, and seeing that district, state, and federal reports are completed.

The most important duties of administrators are the supervision of instruction and the supervision, motivation, and evaluation of staff (Wendel, 1994). These duties likely include some of the most satisfying aspects of the job. Working together with the university, districts could facilitate an internship or practicum that provides a more well-rounded experience that includes elements of the more challenging and satisfying principals' duties. Wendel (1994) included the following recommendations for such a practicum or internship. Interns should be given some responsibilities for supervision, and should have some responsibility for managing a specific project or event that contains a degree of complexity in planning, creativity, and supervision, such as getting a new reading program off the ground. They should have opportunities to observe and analyze how administrators use and analyze information to solve problems ranging from managing daily routines to responding to crisis situations. They should have some personal experience in moving a group to a decision in solving problems, or in generating
and implementing some change or improvement in curriculum or in day-to-day operations. Interns should have experience in making a public presentation to the faculty, a parent group, community organization, or the school board.

Schools must provide mentoring for aspiring and new principals. Mentoring offers a collegial relationship in which mentors share the insights of their experiences with those they mentor. Sharing reduces the isolation of the position and provides an avenue for questions to be answered and for direct guidance to be provided.

Suggestions for Professional Organizations

Often school districts rely on professional organizations to assist them in drafting policies. Organizations should craft policies that assist districts in recruiting and supporting those with principal potential within their own districts. Furthermore, organizations should provide districts with ideas to communicate these policies effectively to their communities.

Professional organizations should make statements on the record supporting the redefined role of the secondary principal. Moreover, organizations should encourage and celebrate boards, central office personnel, university preparation program faculty, and principals who show evidence of this redefinition in their actions.

Implications for Future Research

1. Individuals or groups quoted in the literature reviewed for this study expressed concern of a shortage of school principal candidates. This study focused on the indicated secondary principal shortage in Iowa; similar studies in other states could contribute additional information and insights.
2. The literature suggests that shortages exist in all ranks of school administration. The shortage of superintendent candidates for positions in Iowa schools has been studied. An investigation into the perceived dissatisfiers or barriers of the K-6 principal position by those holding K-6 principal licenses in Iowa schools could contribute to the dialogue about the leadership crisis in the state.

3. "Higher pay," ranked third as a motivator to secure the 7-12 principal license. This may mean an increase in pay for an advanced degree—a move up the teacher salary schedule—and not a move into a principal position. An investigation to discover why individuals chose an advanced degree in educational administration instead of in a subject specialty area or curriculum and instruction.

4. Over 45% of the respondents in this study had applied for a 7-12 principal position but did not get an offer or did not accept an offer. An investigation of principal candidates who did not receive job offers might clarify the quality issue: Is the problem a shortage of principal-certified candidates or of principal-certified candidates who possess desired leadership qualities?
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APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND LETTER OF INTRODUCTION
FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE DECISION NOT TO BECOME 7-12 PRINCIPALS BY THOSE HOLDING THE LICENSE

Dear Colleague:

The state of Iowa, like many states in our nation, is facing a shortage of candidates for school administrator positions. At a time when the expectations of and the demands on schools are greater than ever, fewer educators are choosing to go into school administration.

I am a doctoral student in educational leadership at the University of Northern Iowa in Cedar Falls. Most of the information on perceptions of the principalship is from those in the position of principal. In light of the shortage, I think it is important to know the perceptions of those who are qualified but not in the position.

You have been identified by the Iowa Department of Education as being certified to hold a 7-12 principal position but not currently serving in this capacity. Your response to this survey is valuable to determine the reasons why individuals have invested the time and money to become certified as a 7-12 (a middle school, junior high, high school, or combination) principal but then have chosen not to become or continue as a principal.

PLEASE HELP BY COMPLETING AND RETURNING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BY MAY 17, 2002. For your convenience I have enclosed a self-addressed, stamped reply envelope.

While I will be composing a summary of all responses, your individual response will be kept confidential and anonymous. As an enclosure with this letter, you will find a return postcard. To retain your anonymity but allow me to know to whom I should send a follow-up request, please mail the postcard separately when you mail the completed questionnaire in the reply envelope. I know that the end of the school year is a very busy time for you; thank you so much for the courtesy of your assistance.

Very sincerely yours,

Gail Moorman Behrens

If you do not use the enclosed envelope, please return the questionnaire to:
Gail Moorman Behrens
4127 50th Street
Arlington, IA 50606
**DEMOGRAPHICS**

Please put a √ in the blank to the left of the choice that best describes you.

---

___ I have applied for a 7-12 principal position but have never been offered or accepted one. (Complete items A, B and 1-33.)

___ I have never applied for a 7-12 principal’s position. (Complete items B and 1-33.)

___ I have been a 7-12 principal, but I am currently in another position. (Complete items A, B and 1-33.)

A. Are you currently seeking a 7-12 principal’s position?
   ___ A. Yes  ___ B. No

B. Will you be seeking a 7-12 principal position in the near future (within 5 years)?
   ___ A. Yes  ___ B. No

1. Your Current Position (Please check all that apply.)
   ___ A. Teacher  ___ D. Media Specialist  ___ G. AEA position
   ___ B. Athletic Director  ___ E. Guidance Counselor  ___ H. Other _________
   ___ C. Curriculum Director  ___ F. Coach

2. Your Gender (Check one.)
   ___ A. Female  ___ B. Male

3. Your Age (Check one.)
   ___ A. 35 or under  ___ E. 51-55
   ___ B. 36-40  ___ F. 56-60
   ___ C. 41-45  ___ G. 61 or Above
   ___ D. 46-50

4. Race/Ethnic Classification (Check one.)
   ___ A. African American  ___ D. Hispanic
   ___ B. Asian  ___ E. Native American
   ___ C. Caucasian  ___ F. Other _________

5. I Have Held a 7-12 Principal License for:
   ___ A. 3 or fewer years  ___ D. 10 or more years
   ___ B. 4-6 years  ___ E. No current plans
   ___ C. 7-9 years

6. I Plan to Retire in:
   ___ A. 1-3 years  ___ D. 10 or more years
   ___ B. 4-6 years  ___ E. No current plans
   ___ C. 7-9 years

---

**WHAT MOTIVATED YOU TO SECURE THE 7-12 PRINCIPAL LICENSE?**

Check all that apply.

7. ___ A. Encouragement from a mentor  ___ H. Prestige and status
   ___ B. Enhance job opportunities, but not serve as principal  ___ I. Higher pay
   ___ C. Required for building or district level position, other than 7-12 principal  ___ J. Greater professional freedom
   ___ D. Broaden knowledge base  ___ K. Variety in tasks and functions of principal
   ___ E. Broaden range of influence  ___ L. Increased responsibility
   ___ F. Opportunity to use leadership skills  ___ M. Effect change on a greater scale
   ___ G. Desire to head a school  ___ N. Other ___________________
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Inability or undesirability to relocate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of information on jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ethnic classification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Absence of principal experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Insufficient salary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lack of job security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Lack of time to put balance in life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Isolated nature of position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Impact on family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lack of financial or human resources to do the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Lack of community support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Too political</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Year-round assignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Testing/accountability pressures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Too far removed from students and instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Stress level of the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Satisfaction with current job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Too much time spent on student discipline and personnel issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FROM WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING HAVE YOU GATHERED YOUR PERCEPTIONS OF THE 7-12 PRINCIPALSHIP?  
Check all that apply.

28.  ___A. Current principals  ___D. Professional organizations
     ___B. Colleagues  ___E. Public/press
     ___C. Professional publications  ___F. Other ___________________

YOUR PRINCIPAL PREPARATION PROGRAM

To what extent did your university program prepare you to be a 7-12 principal? (Check one.)
29.  ___A. Very well  ___B. Moderately well  ___C. Poorly  ___D. Very poorly

30. If you could have made one positive change to your university preparation program for principals, what would that have been?

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS

31. Which of these suggestions do you feel will make the greatest impact on alleviating our current shortage of principal candidates? (Check all that apply.)
   ___A. Changes in administrator certification  ___E. Changes in expectations and responsibilities of the principal
   ___B. Changes in administrator preparation  ___F. Identification and recruitment of candidates
   ___C. Increase salary and benefits  ___D. Public relations efforts

32. Comments or suggestions you might add to question #31.

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________

33. What specifically would entice you to seek a principal position?

   ________________________________________________________________

   ________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

ADVANCE-NOTICE LETTER
April 26, 2002

Dear Colleague:

Within the next few days, you will receive a request to complete a brief survey. A doctoral student in Educational Leadership, I am mailing this survey to you to better understand what people find attractive and unattractive about the 7-12 principalship. I know that the end of the school year is a busy time, but I hope that you will take the few minutes necessary to complete and return the survey.

Thank you in advance for your assistance with this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Gail Moorman Behrens
APPENDIX C

REMINDER LETTER
May 20, 2002

Dear Colleague:

A couple of weeks ago I sent you a questionnaire pertaining to the perceptions of individuals holding the 7-12 principal endorsement but not serving in a secondary principal position. If you have already completed and returned it, please accept my sincere thanks. I know that May is an extremely busy time in schools, but if you have not completed and returned your survey, please do so today. I am especially grateful because I believe that your response will impact the position of secondary principal.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed. I would be happy to answer any questions you have about the study; you may contact me at 563-425-5211 or at behrensg@uiu.edu.

Sincerely,

Gail Moorman Behrens