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ABSTRACT

While No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top inaugurated new movements in education, it has been reported that school districts are finding it increasingly difficult to recruit qualified new principals. Reports indicate there is an abundance of certified individuals able to assume this position. However, the principalship has evolved into a position that is associated with additional responsibilities and new accountability mandates.

The purpose of this study is to explore the reasons why teachers who hold administrative certifications are not pursuing the principalship. During this new era of educational accountability, it is important to understand why teachers pursued their administrative certifications, but chose not to pursue a career as principal. In today’s educational climate and current changes in our country’s educational system, it is imperative to understand why these groups of teachers are not pursuing administrative positions as there is an impending shortage of principals.

The research design utilized in this study was a qualitative multiple case study. Essential, descriptive data was gathered through the interview process from secondary teachers with administrative certification in grades 7-12. This study investigated key variables of how insufficient compensation, increased time demands, and new pressures associated with an increase in principal accountability have impacted teachers’ perceptions of the principalship. This study is beneficial to all levels of leadership to
better understand how to assist in the recruitment, training, and retention of qualified leaders into administrative positions, such as the principal.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

*No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) was developed to promote educational excellence by increasing accountability and holding schools more responsible for student achievement (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). More recently, President Obama’s *Race to the Top* (RTTT) initiative has further reformed education by implementing a system that measures teacher and principal effectiveness through new performance measures (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Research over many years has established that principals’ successful leadership positively affects school outcomes including student achievement (Brewer, 1993; Edmonds, 1979; Jacob & Lefgren, 2005; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). According to Hallinger (2005), a principal supports instructional leadership by sustaining a school vision, sharing leadership opportunities with teachers, and supporting quality curriculum and instruction. Effective principals also influence school climate by involving all stakeholders and building and sustaining trust (Kythereotis, Pashiardis & Kyriakides, 2010).

While *No Child Left Behind* and *Race to the Top* inaugurated a new movement in education, researchers (Carnine, Denny, Hewitt & Pijanowski, 2008; Guterman, 2007; Howley, Andrianaiivo & Perry, 2005;) reported that school districts were finding it increasingly difficult to recruit qualified new principals. A report by the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (as cited in Shelton, 2012) asserted that more than half of the nation’s teachers and principals were baby boomers, and over the next several years the educational system could lose a third of these educators and leaders to retirement. Similarly, Winter, Rinchart, Keedy, and Bjork (2004) reported that the shortage of administrative candidates included the retirement
of baby boomer principals. Furthermore, research by the universities of Minnesota and Toronto showed that principal turnover averages every 3 or 4 years produce a negative impact on student achievement (Shelton, 2012). Nearly 60% of a school’s influence on student achievement is attributable to teacher and principal effectiveness, and principals alone account for as much as 25% (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

In a study conducted by the National Association of Elementary School Principals reported by Guterman (2007), nearly half of the school districts reported a shortage of applicants applying for a principalship. A survey conducted by Carnine, Denny, Hewitt, and Pijanowski (2008) revealed that 197 school districts across all grade levels and locations in Arkansas experienced a decrease in the number of qualified candidates for a principalship for the past 10 years: Superintendents of these districts also reported that less than half of those who applied for the job met the required criteria.

It is important to differentiate that there is not a shortage of individuals with administrative certification, rather there is evidence that reveals a shortage of teachers wanting to become principals (Grubb & Flessa, 2006). If individuals, particularly those in leadership positions, are to live up to the demands of NCLB and improve the quality of education, then it is imperative to recruit and retain highly-qualified principals. Improving school leadership ranks high on the list of priorities for school reform. In a 2010 Wallace Foundation survey from the Academy of Educational Development, school and district administrators, policymakers, and others declared principal leadership as among the most important issues on the list in public education. Teacher quality was first, but principal leadership came next, surpassing subjects including dropout rates, STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) education, student testing, and preparation for college and careers (The Wallace Foundation, 2012). In today’s
climate of heightened expectations and the need to increase student achievement and teacher performance, principals are being held more accountable in their roles to improve teaching and learning. This expectation is becoming more challenging.

The primary role of the principal is to serve as an instructional leader and to manage the overall operations of a school. During the latter part of the twentieth century, specifically during the 1980s, schools started to become more accountable for the performance of their students on national and state assessments, and the duties and responsibilities of the principal changed to conform with these altered expectations. The role of the principal changed from school manager and school instructional leader to what has now become commonly known as school reform leader.

Today's principal has become more responsible for teaching and learning in their schools. Researchers have identified leadership, specifically the principalship, as a key component of successful schools. Furthermore, sustaining quality leadership is equally as important as having quality teachers serve students in every classroom (Darling-Hammond, Lapointe & Meyerson, & Orr, 2007; Davis 1979). Within the last 10 years, there have been substantial initiatives undertaken to increase educational accountability. With increasing demands and changing expectations in the role of school administration, researchers, practitioners, policy makers and departments of education have become preoccupied with educational accountability (Normore, 2004). Educational accountability has changed over time and has become more complex. Reform efforts have shifted accountability to the schools where the principal is ultimately responsible for student achievement. As long as school administrators represent the managerial function at the organizational level and the leader function at the
individual level, the senior level administrator will continue to be held exceedingly more responsible and accountable (Normore, 2004).

Research suggests that a leader’s influence is critical for student learning and sustaining quality school leadership is essential to a high performing school (Davis, 1998; Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Reynolds & Teddlie, 2000). The responsibility for carrying out the duties of an instructional leader becomes a clear expectation for principals who should be spending more time on instructional tasks. However, finding the time for these responsibilities is difficult. In addition to the increased levels of accountability placed on the shoulders of the principal, recent studies have noted the increase in the principal’s job responsibilities, stress, and demands on a principal’s time (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran 2003; Walker, 2009).

In addition to carrying out managerial functions, school principals are expected to lead, persuade, insist, discipline, innovate, supervise, threaten, beg, and otherwise blend adaptation and leadership in highly, well-principled ways (Robertson, 2006). Furthermore, principals are expected to be educational visionaries, instructional and curriculum leaders, assessment experts, disciplinarians, community builders, public relations/communications experts, budget analysts, facility managers, special programs administrators, as well as guardians of various legal, contractual, and policy mandates and initiatives (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007).

The results of a survey released in 2002 by the National Association of Secondary School Principals suggested that nearly half of the 1,400 respondents reported that they work 60 hours a week or more, up from 12% in 1965. Many researchers (Adams, 1999; ERS, 2000; Fennell, 1999; Lankford, O’Connell, & Wyckoff, 2003; Moore, 1999; Whitaker & Vogel, 2005) point to
the increased responsibilities, stress, and longer hours without monetary compensation as the likely causes of the diminishing number of under-qualified applicants and, because of these demands, fewer apply, and those who do apply are less likely to be highly-qualified individuals, as these individuals are more likely to have more attractive opportunities elsewhere.

Research conducted by Papa and Baxter (2005) in New York State showed that there were a large number of individuals certified to be principals who were not serving as principals, at the time of the study, and yet schools were finding it difficult to attract qualified individuals into this position. To explain this paradox, many observers argue that, relative to readily available employment alternatives, the financial compensation of school leaders does not warrant the extraordinary demands placed upon them (Papa & Baxter, 2005). The average salary paid to principals with 6 to 10 years of experience is less than the average salary paid to teachers with 20 years experience. With increasingly difficult working conditions, such as increased responsibilities, higher stress levels, and the increased pressure for accountability in schools, it is likely that principals’ salaries are not high enough to provide sufficient incentive to seek a principalship (Papa & Baxter, 2005).

The number of educators certified as principals in the United States indicates that there should be more than enough qualified applicants. According to a survey by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, (as cited in Joerger, 2000) the reasons why teachers are not entering into administration include increased demands on principals, long work hours, and a low starting salary.

While there are studies that point to the various reasons why teachers are not interested in becoming a principal, there are also studies that suggest that teachers who hold administrative certification are not prepared to take on the various responsibilities. According to the Southern
Regional Education Board (2004), many teachers with administrative certification do not intend to become principals; rather, these teachers obtain this certification to obtain higher pay. There are also teachers with administrative certification who have the potential to be principals, but their graduate educational leadership program did not provide them with the knowledge and skills required to succeed as leaders in this 21 century’s accountability environment (Bottoms, O’Neill, Fry & Jacobson, 2004).

It is clear from the research that there is no one reason why teachers are not entering into administration. Instead, there are a multitude of factors that deter this group from advancing into this position (Denny, Hewitt & Pijanowski, 2008). Today’s principals put in more hours than teachers do and have a starting salary that, when broken down by the hour, is less than what a tenured teacher earns each year, making it more difficult to convince experienced teachers to wish to advance (Joerger, 2000). Additionally, in schools where resources are scarce and budgets are tight, teachers’ frustration levels run high, and they are unwilling to take on the additional responsibilities and stress that come with the job (Joerger, 2000). The principalship is not only complex, but vulnerable to a variety of political, organizational, and performance-related pressures. In a study conducted by RAND Corporation, as reported by Samuels (2012), about 20% of principals new to a school leave their position within 1 or 2 years, especially if test scores decreased under their leadership: These early departures by principals can also have a negative impact on school morale and the overall operations of the school.

Schools today are facing a leadership crisis as it is becoming more difficult to recruit new principals while at the same time, teachers represent the group from which the largest number of new principals are drawn. To further complicate this problem of teachers who are unwilling to assume the principalship, a study by MetLife Survey of the American Teacher (2012) found that
teacher job satisfaction has recently plummeted, and 29% of teachers say they are likely to leave the teaching profession within the next 5 years – up from 17% in 2009. This study also found that only 44% of teachers are “very satisfied” with their jobs, down from 59% in 2009, in addition to the 34% of teachers who experience a lack of job security (Heitin, 2012). This decrease in job satisfaction by teachers only compounds the existing problem of teachers who are unwilling to assume leadership positions. If teachers are not satisfied with their current position, it is unlikely that they will aspire to a principalship.

A potential leadership crisis exists as schools are finding it more difficult to recruit and retain qualified principals. This impending shortage can become more problematic if schools and policymakers do not address this issue. While there are educational leadership programs designed to train and cultivate teachers, research suggests that teachers are not willing to assume these positions due to a variety of reasons. While many of these reasons have been identified through survey research, it is important to gain a deeper understanding of how teachers perceive the role of principal. It is also important to investigate how teachers may envision a principalship in the future if they were to assume this responsibility.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to explore the reasons why teachers who hold administrative certifications are not pursuing the principalship. In today’s educational climate and with the current changes in our country’s educational system, it is imperative to understand and tackle the dilemma of why teachers who hold administrative certification are not pursuing a principalship, as the anticipated shortage of principals becomes an impending reality. Principals are caught between the expectations of parents, the disinterest of students, the concerns of the faculty, and the unreasonable demands of school boards (Worzel, 1998). Moreover, the increased time
demands, greater accountability for student achievement, lack of job security, and inadequate financial compensation are preventing teachers from pursuing a career in administration. It is important for current school leaders and policy makers to better understand why teachers do not want to advance into administration, which will in turn, assist school districts in successfully recruiting future teacher leaders.

While there have been quantitative studies conducted in this specific area by Kossack (2006), Hewitt, Pijanowski, and Denny (2009), and Harris (2011) which identified high stress, longer hours, increased accountability for achievement, and insufficient compensation as deterrents why teachers may not be aspiring to the position of principal, there is a lack of literature that addresses this area qualitatively. This particular study is a qualitative study of teachers who hold administrative certifications who are not entering the field of administration.

**Research Questions**

The duties and responsibilities of the principal have changed, and it has become increasingly difficult to recruit and retain qualified administrators. The following guiding questions assisted in answering the research problem:

1. What factors initially motivated teachers to seek administrative certification?
2. How do teachers with administrative certifications perceive barriers for not pursuing the principalship?
3. To what extent do these identifiable barriers inhibit teachers with administrative certifications from pursuing a career as principal?
Conceptual Framework

“General job satisfaction is a universal aspect of career development” (McNeese, Roberson & Haines, 2009, p.1). Theorists are likely to assume that job satisfaction correlates with a higher quality of performance (Gruenberg, 1979; Jepsen & Sheu, 2003; Maslow, 1954). If this is true, then job dissatisfaction may lead to a lower quality of work and in some cases, may cause a person to leave a job or even change careers. According to Stempien and Loeb (2002) and Fullan (2005), there is a definite link between job satisfaction and the tendency to leave a job: Employers should understand what motivates people to remain in their current job in addition to understanding what motivates people to excel in their field. Pearson (1998) discovered that school leaders who do not participate in leisure activities tend to develop higher levels of stress, which can lead to burnout or other health issues; these factors ultimately impact job satisfaction and performance. Fullan (2005) advocated that leaders must find time for positive rituals and activities that will help balance their professional lives; without these activities, people will become dissatisfied and may even burnout which may result in leaders exiting the field of education. With the anticipated shortage of principals due to retirement and other reasons associated with the demands of the job, it is important to understand what motivates and deters people to or away from a principalship and to better understand what attracts individuals into leadership positions.

“Understanding what motivates people in all walks of life is basic to all who aspire to management” (Ball, 2003, p.1). There are several motivational theories that have been applied in education to explain and understand a teacher’s behavior and motivation to leave the classroom and advance into administration. These reasons are often a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors. When these theories are applied specifically to education we glean possible
insight into some of the potential drives of teachers moving through the education system (Morgan & Baker, 2012). According to Bolman and Deal (2008), one of the most cited and influential theories regarding human needs is Abraham Maslow’s (1954) need hierarchy model, which organizes human motivation and the need to reach his or her highest level of potential. In this model, the lowest level needs that human beings must meet are biological, and the highest level is self-actualization or a state of fulfillment. Maslow’s theory of motivation provides a model for understanding personal growth and emphasizes that low level needs must be met before reaching the self-actualization stage. Furthermore, when analyzing the job of principal, this theory applies to how principals experience the job. “When principals are stressed, constantly under fire from stakeholders, or continuously engaged in high-energy demanding activities, they may feel they are functioning at the level of safety or survival rather than the level of self-actualization” (McNeese, Roberson & Haines, 2009, p.5).

Clayton Alderfer (1969) further developed Maslow’s hierarchy of needs by categorizing the hierarchy into his ERG theory. Alderfer’s three needs of existence (E), relatedness (R), and growth (G), or ERG, correspond to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. The existence needs are similar to Maslow’s physiological and safety categories; the relatedness needs are similar to the belongingness, social, and love category; and, the growth needs are similar to the esteem and self-actualization categories (Gibson, Ivancevich, Donnelly, & Konopaske, 2006). In contrast to Maslow’s theory, Alderfer’s ERG theory suggests that in addition to the satisfaction-progression process of needs, a frustration-regression process is also at work (Alderfer, 1969). “For example, if a teacher is continually frustrated in attempts to satisfy growth needs, such as creating unique lessons for his or her students, then relatedness needs, such as having esteem among colleagues, tend to reemerge as a major motivating force, causing him or her to redirect efforts toward
exploring new ways to satisfy this lower-order need category” (Morgan & Baker, 2012, p. 2).

Similarly, when the pressures of a job increase, become unmanageable, or the work environment becomes too cumbersome, burnout can likely occur, which can often result in employee turnover and low job satisfaction (Cooley & Shen, 2000; Olsen, Maple & Stage, 1995). This model can be used to assist in understanding how people are motivated and what must occur for someone to advance within their profession. Correspondingly, this model can be applied in understanding what initially motivated teachers to seek their administrative certification, but then choose not to pursue a leadership position such as a principalship.

Frederick Herzberg (1959) introduced the two-factor content theory of motivation (Herzberg, Mausner, & Synderman, 1959). The two factors are the dissatisfiers-satisfiers, hygiene-motivators, or the intrinsic-extrinsic factors. According to Herzberg, et al (1959), there are six motivators that lead to strong levels of job satisfaction. They include achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth. On the contrary, hygiene factors or external factors that serve as incentives or punishments to coerce someone into doing something fail to provide job satisfaction. Hygiene factors include company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relationships, and working conditions. Herzberg, et al (1959) also argued that continual job enrichment rooted in challenging work with increased responsibility is intended to bring out the employee’s full potential and can positively impact intrinsic motivation and increase an individual’s job satisfaction. Herzberg’s (1959) study of 200 accountants and engineers resulted in two specific conclusions.

“The first being the extrinsic conditions, the job context, include pay, status, and working conditions. The presence of these conditions to the satisfaction of the employee does not necessarily motivate them, but their absence results in dissatisfaction. The second conclusion, a set of intrinsic conditions, the job content, is also present. These conditions
include feelings of achievement, increased responsibility, and recognition. The absence of these conditions do not prove highly dissatisfying, but when present, they build strong levels of motivation that result in good job performance” (Morgan & Baker, 2012, p. 3).

According to Morgan and Baker (2012), in order to preserve the health of an educational system, it is important for administrators to take hygiene factors and motivators into account. If these fundamentals are overlooked, then low performance, absenteeism, and turnover of teachers and other professional educators can result.

This particular study of teachers who hold administrative certification is based upon the premise that they were motivated to pursue administrative certification with the intentions of pursuing a principalship. However, based upon the literature, a problem exists as schools are having trouble attracting candidates to this position. It has been suggested that administration would become a more attractive profession if there was less stress involved, thus boosting job satisfaction and a willingness to remain in this field; understanding what motivates and deters those from a principalship is equally important to assist in the recruitment, training, and retention of qualified teacher-leaders to fill the anticipated vacancies in administration (Fullan, 2005; Stempien & Loeb, 2002;).

**Design and Methodology**

This was a qualitative multiple case study designed to gain the perspectives of teachers who hold administrative certifications and their reasons for not pursuing a principalship. Qualitative research provides a framework for those to express their points of view so others can understand and appreciate their experiences and interpretations of their surroundings (Patton, 2002).
I developed a series of interview questions that would elicit meaningful data to better understand why teachers obtained their administrative certification and then decided to remain in the classroom. I developed these interview questions by linking my research questions to theories of motivation discussed in the conceptual framework of this chapter. Understanding what motivates and deters teachers from the principalship is an important aspect of recruitment, particularly in this new era of more intensive educational accountability.

After reviewing quantitative studies that have been conducted in this area, I began to generate a list of questions that could be used in a qualitative study. I then grouped each of my questions into the following headings: background information, motivators, deterrents, and other. The other heading focused specifically on increased demands on the principal, financial compensation, job security, increased accountability, new federal guidelines, and the ideal principalship. Following the development of these questions, I consulted with two administrators and one veteran teacher who reviewed the interview questions. I also piloted the interview protocol with two teachers who held administrative certification. These individuals provided me with feedback, which assisted in finalizing my interview questions.

I conducted semi-structured interviews with nine secondary (grades 7-12) teachers with administrative certification in five Long Island, New York school districts. Each interview was approximately 45-55 minutes in length and was held in a private location within the participant’s home school district. Prior permission was obtained from the superintendent of schools in each district, in addition to obtaining permission from each individual teacher who voluntarily participated in this study.

Following each interview, I used open coding to create a preliminary set of codes that helped to collapse the data into recognizable language that tied directly to my research questions.
Following this practice of coding, I created categories and themes the codes could be placed into. This allowed me to understand and analyze my data in a concise, decipherable and uniform manner.

**Participants**

The population was a purposeful sample consisting of nine teachers with administrative certification in five school districts in Long Island, New York. There were no restrictions based on gender, age, race, or ethnic origin and the subjects successfully completed an educational leadership program resulting in at least one of the following administrative certification areas: School Building Leader, formerly, School Administrator/Supervisor; School District Leader, formerly, School District Administrator; and School District Business Leader, formerly School Business Administrator.

**Significance of the Study**

A problem exists due to the inability of who or what to “attract” candidates into the principalship (Educational Research Service, 2000; Pounder & Merrill, 2001; Shen, Cooley, & Wegenke, 2004). With the increased number of administrators eligible to retire and the changing nature and additional responsibilities that the principal continues to face, it is important to recruit strong levels of leadership from the educational arena. Traditionally, the teacher pool is where principals and other administrators have come from. If teachers who hold administrative certifications continue to remain in the classroom and decide not to pursue a career in administration, candidates from outside the educational field may be called upon to fill these vacancies, thus compromising educational leadership at all levels, including the superintendent who serves as the district chief executive.
The significance of this study is intended to reveal in-depth reasons why teachers are not interested in pursuing a principalship, and how, if at all, the job of principal could be transformed into a position that is perceived as more desirable by teachers who hold administrative certifications.

The results of this study will be used to add comprehensive, in-depth knowledge to the existing literature in this field about the specific experiences and perceptions of teachers with administrative certifications. The results of this study can also be used to influence how building administrators interact and mentor their teachers and encourage them into administrative positions. The results may also prove helpful to graduate leadership programs responsible for instructing future principals by offering meaningful coursework that is relevant to the actual experiences, contrary to perceived experiences of school administrators. The results may also encourage operational changes within school buildings to reorganize and restructure administrative roles and responsibilities. It is also important for district and building level administrators to understand how increased accountability has changed the role of the principal and understand why teachers may lack the desire to pursue this position as future career advancement.

This study is important to all levels of educational leadership, including educational leadership graduate and graduate degree programs where teachers are trained to be effective school leaders. A review of the professional literature suggests that more research was needed to understand why there is a shortage of qualified candidates pursuing careers in school administration. The literature also suggests that a qualitative study be conducted to determine if the reasons why teachers are not pursuing a principalship are consistent with the quantitative research that has been performed. A graduate educational leadership program may also consider
developing strategies to address factors influencing individuals prior to choosing or not choosing administration as a career. The results of this study are intended to offer insight as to why teachers pursued their administrative certification and then decided not to enter the field. In addition, school boards of education may choose to review hiring practices and related policies to attract and retain teachers with administrative certifications who may be interested in pursuing the position of principal.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

This is an exploratory qualitative study that collected interview data from nine teachers in five Long Island, New York school districts who hold administrative certifications who decided not to pursue the position of principal. A limitation of this study is that the sample size, though purposeful, is small and diminishes the probability of generalizing the findings to all teachers with administrative certifications in Long Island, New York or other locations. Furthermore, I only collected data during the school calendar year 2012-2013. Another limitation is that I provided the interview questions to the participants in advance, which provided them with the opportunity to prepare prior to the interview. Furthermore, I gathered my data through one on one, in-person interviews which prevented me from gathering any additional findings that may have been discovered upon a second interview.

A delimitation of this study is that I selected a purposeful sample of teachers to be interviewed and only qualitative data was collected from teachers in Long Island, New York. The superintendent of each school identified respondents and I interviewed both male and female teachers with administrative certifications. These teachers held their certification for various time periods, so I was able to gain various perspectives on why these individuals chose not to pursue the position of principal. Two of the seven teachers entered the field of education as
second career; one teacher owned retail stores and the other teacher worked in corporate America.

**Definition of Terms**

*Accountability* is an obligation or willingness to accept responsibility or to account for one's actions.

*Administrative certification* is a certificate that endorses that an individual completed the certificate-level training in education administration for a principal, administrator or supervisor position, which is comprised of both classroom instruction and an internship with a mentor.

*Annual yearly progress* is a measurement defined by the United States federal No Child Left Behind Act that allows the U.S. Department of Education to determine how every public school and school district in the country is performing academically according to results on standardized tests.

*Deterrent* is anything that inhibits, restrains or impedes the advancement of something or someone.

*Educational accountability* is the act of being responsible and holding schools, teachers, and administrators accountable for students' academic progress.

*Educational administrators* are individuals who hold a variety of different positions and work in varied capacities in an education office, an education department, a school district or a school. Educational administrators' jobs may vary, but ultimately they serve to lead and manage both teachers and learners.

*Educational Leadership Program* is a post-secondary institution that prepares graduate students for strategic leadership in schools, school systems, and educational organizations on how to be effective leaders, agents of change, academic researchers and teachers.
Financial compensation is a fixed compensation for services, paid to a person on a regular basis.

Instructional leader is someone who is involved in setting clear goals, allocating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, and evaluating teachers. He/she also shares, facilitates, and guides decisions about instructional improvement for the betterment of the students’ education.

Manager is a person responsible for controlling or administering all or part of a company or similar organization.

No Child Left Behind is a United States Act of Congress concerning the education of children in public schools. NCLB supports standards-based education reform, which is based on the belief that setting high standards and establishing measurable goals can improve an individual’s outcome in education. The Act requires states to develop assessments in basic skills to be given to all students in certain grades, in order for those states to continue to receive federal funding for schools. The Act does not assert a national achievement standard; standards are set by each individual state.

Principal is an individual holding the building level administrative position in which he/she supervises and facilitates the daily operations of a school, and is characterized as the leader of the school. Principals have expectations for effective performance in areas such as, but not limited to: establishing visions and goals for high levels of student performance, having high expectations for student achievement, creating a positive and supportive school climate, promoting a safe and orderly school environment, maintaining high visibility among school populations, and responding to all matter that arise in a school setting.
Qualified candidate is an individual who has the abilities, qualities, and attributes necessary to perform a particular job or task.

Reform leader is an individual who identifies the needed change, creates a vision to guide the change through inspiration and organization, and executes the change with the commitment of the members of the group.

School Building Leader is the certification title appropriate for building principal and below. This title was formerly known as School Administrator/Supervisor in 2006.

School District Business Leader is the certification title appropriate for district-wide service. This title was formerly known as School Business Administrator in 2006.

School District Leader is the certification title appropriate for district-wide service. This title was formerly known as School District Administrator in 2006.

Tenure is the status granted to an employee, usually after a probationary period, indicating that the position or employment is permanent.

Summary

This chapter presented background information pertaining to reasons that may be preventing teachers with administrative certification from pursuing administrative careers. It introduces the parameters of the purpose, the problem, the research questions, the significance of the study, and the definition of key terms used in the study.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter represents a review of the literature and research relevant to the topic of this study. To determine what barriers are preventing teachers who hold administrative certification from pursuing a position as principal, it was first necessary to develop an overview of the building level principalship and how the increased accountability and time demands have made this position unattractive. The main areas of literature reviewed in this chapter are (a) the importance of effective school building leadership, (b) the shortage of qualified principal candidates, (c) the increased time demands and responsibilities on the principal, (d) educational accountability placed on the principal from No Child Left Behind, and (e) the lack of financial compensation for principals.

Effective School Building Leadership

Research over many years has established that principals’ successful leadership positively affects school outcomes including student achievement (Brewer 1993; Edmonds, 1979; Jacob & Lefgren, 2005; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). For decades, principals have been recognized as important contributors to the effectiveness of their schools. In this new era of educational accountability, school leadership is a significant factor in determining the success of schools (Rice, 2010). According to Hallinger and Heck (1996) and Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2008), principals make the greatest impact by influencing teacher quality and focusing on building relationships. The principal’s role has evolved over the past several decades from serving as a building manager to leading school improvements, increasing student learning, and helping staff
grow professionally. As a result, the principalship has become far more complex than ever before (Stronge, 2013).

According to The Wallace Foundation (2013), there has been an educational shift that has impacted principals. Principals are no longer simply managers of people and their buildings; rather they are responsible for a variety of outcomes. Wallace’s work since 2000 suggests that principals are now responsible for shaping a vision of academic success for all students, creating a positive climate that supports education, cultivating leadership in teachers, improving instruction to foster teacher and student learning, and managing people and data to increase academic achievement.

Instructional leadership focuses on promoting and supporting teaching and learning. According to Hallinger (2005), principals support instructional leadership by sustaining a school vision of learning, sharing leadership opportunities with teachers, leading a learning community and monitoring and supporting high-quality curriculum and instruction. Principals are responsible for communicating a shared vision that capitalizes on teachers’ leadership and instructional strengths (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). Effective principals are aware of instructional practices in their school and are knowledgeable about curriculum standards (Cotton, 2003).

According to Kythreotis, Pashardis and Kyriakides (2010), effective principals influence school climate by involving all stakeholders and building and sustaining trust. Furthermore, principals foster stakeholder buy-in by fostering positive relationships between parents and the school, ensuring professional relationships with their staff, and providing outreach to parents and the community. Effective principals are aware that trust is an important component of creating a positive school culture and climate (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Principals are involved in every
aspect of their school's operations; from assigning students to classes, to evaluating teachers, enforcing the rules, and handling parent concerns. The principal is the school leader and sets the climate of the building. As the school leader, the actions of the principal are noticed and interpreted by others as what is important, and the school's culture will likely reflect those values (Lashway, Mazzarella, & Grundy, 1997).

Effective principals are responsible for recruiting and hiring high-quality teachers (Hallinger & Heck, 1996). Furthermore, principals who combine an understanding of instructional needs with the ability to target resources often hire the best teachers and provide them with the professional development necessary to maintain the excellence of their schools (Grissom & Leob, 2009). In addition to hiring high-quality teachers, effective principals also understand the importance of managing daily school operations, such as coordinating a safe learning environment, maintaining facility maintenance, using data to drive instruction, managing fiscal resources and incorporating technology advancements into their schools (Stronge, Richard & Catano, 2008). According to Cotton (2003) and Marzano, Waters and McNulty (2005), a principal must focus their time and efforts not only on improving student learning and teacher development but on the secondary responsibilities of managing a budget and ensuring the safety of their buildings as well.

Effective principals are those who participate in continuous professional development. According to a study conducted by Boris-Schacter and Merrifield (2000) on why good principals stay in the profession, professional development was of significant importance. Another study conducted by LaPointe and Davis (2006) also found that effective principals attended more professional development sessions and were more likely to engage their teaching staff in professional development opportunities. Furthermore, these principals also spent time visiting
with other schools, collaborating with other principals, and serving as a mentor to new principals.

Research has confirmed that effective schools have effective leadership. According to Doud and Keller (1998), there are several characteristics that are important in providing sound leadership. A good principal recognizes teaching and learning as the main business of the school; communicates the school's mission clearly and consistently to staff members, parents, and students; fosters standards for teaching and learning that are high and attainable; provides clear goals and monitors the progress of students; spends time in classrooms; listens to teachers; promotes an atmosphere of trust and sharing; makes professional staff development a top concern; and does not tolerate poor teaching.

According to recent work by the National Center for the Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research, the quality of a principal affects a range of school results including teachers' satisfaction, parents' perceptions of their child's school and academic performance of the school. The study also provided evidence that the principal's job is complex and multifaceted and the effectiveness of a principal is based upon their level of experience, their sense of efficacy on particular tasks and their allocation of time across daily responsibilities. Furthermore, effective principals are less likely to work in high-poverty, low-achieving schools, raising equity concerns about the distribution of quality principals (Rice, 2010).

The National Center for the Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research (2009) also discovered the following in a study that analyzed large Florida schools along with the principal of each school. "If consistent and experienced school leadership matters to student achievement, our research suggests that low-income students, students of color, and low-
performing students are at a distinct disadvantage compared to their peers. These students are more likely to attend a school that has a first-year principal, a principal with less than average experience, a temporary or interim principal, a principal without a master’s degree, and a principal that went to a less selective college as compared to their counterparts (Horng, Kalogrides & Loeb. 2009, p. 28).” While this study found that less effective principals are found in low-achieving schools, the National Center for the Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research (2009) reported that a study in Texas schools revealed that effective principals are likely to remain in their schools. Therefore, if effective principals are leading low-performing schools, they are likely to remain in that school raising student achievement and promoting a positive culture to improve the performance of their schools (Branch, Hanusheck, & Rivkin, 2009).

In a recent study conducted by Branch, Hanushek and Rivkin (2013) that analyzed longitudinal data from the University of Texas at Dallas Texas School Project it was found that highly effective principals raised the academic achievement of a student between 2 and 7 months of learning in a single school year. The study also showed that ineffective principals could lower academic achievement by the same amount. These impacts are somewhat smaller than those associated with highly effective teachers because teachers have a direct impact on only those students in their classroom; whereas, principal quality has an impact on every student in the school.

It has been documented that school leadership has an impact on the overall school culture and the job satisfaction of teachers (Berry, 2009). In 2001, TIME Magazine selected six Schools of the Year all of which shared a common theme – a dynamic, dedicated principal who inspired teachers, parents, and students to go above and beyond their capabilities. However, analyses of
the school principalship in the United States makes it clear that, for a variety of reasons, the next
decade will see the need for many individuals to move towards positions in this key educational
role (Daresh & Marsha, 1994). “Results strongly suggest that school-level change in the ways
schools are led and managed provides the greatest likelihood of success in improving the
effectiveness of schools. An increased focus on the ways in which schools are led and managed
amplifies the importance of attracting and retaining high quality principals” (Papa & Baxter,
2005, p.2).

**Shortage of Qualified Principals**

The United States Department of Labor (as cited in Blackman & Fenwick, 2000)
estimates that 40 percent of the United States 93,200 principals are nearing retirement and that
the nation’s need for school leaders will increase 10 to 20 percent through 2005. Also the
Educational Research Service (1999) reported that nearly 40% of all public school principals will
retire or leave the position for other reasons before 2010, causing a dramatic increase in the
principal vacancy rate throughout the United States. Furthermore, the Educational Research
Service (1998), in conjunction with the National Association of Elementary School Principals
and the National Association of Secondary School Principals, predicted a shortage of competent
school leaders.

According to Howley, Andrianaivo, and Perry (2005), school districts are finding it
increasingly difficult to recruit highly-qualified new principals. To complicate this potential
problem, school administrators are now reaching retirement age. The National Commission on
Teaching and America’s Future asserts that more than half of the nation’s teachers and principals
are baby boomers and over the next several years schools could lose a third of these educators
and leaders to retirement. According to Shelton (2012), research shows that principal turnover
averages every 3 or 4 years which has a negative impact on student achievement. A study conducted by Beteille, Kalogrides, and Loeb (2011), which examined Miami-Dade County Public Schools, revealed that students attending schools with new principals made lower achievement gains in math than they had under the previous principal. It was also discovered that when challenging schools lose an effective principal, that principal is likely to be replaced with a less effective principal which may once again negatively impact student achievement as reflected in lower scores (Beteille, Kalogrides & Loeb, 2011; Branch, Hanushek & Rivkin 2013).

Research conducted by Loeb, Kalogrides, and Horng (2010) revealed that consistent leadership has a positive impact on a school’s performance. However, low performing schools serving disadvantaged students have shown inconsistent leadership patterns. Principals in low performing schools are leaving for principalships in high performing schools, which has led to many of these schools hiring inexperienced and less qualified principals. To compound this issue, once these inexperienced principals become seasoned, they too often leave for principalships in high performing districts. Consistently replacing principals for less qualified individuals can be harmful to students, teachers, and the overall performance of schools (Beteille, Kalogrides & Loeb, 2011).

According to the National Association of Secondary School Principals (2002), principals have taken on additional responsibilities that have increased job-related stress. In a new era of accountability, new curriculum standards, and serving a diverse student population, principals are finding it more difficult to lead their schools. Increased responsibilities and accountability without fair compensation have negatively impacted school district’s ability to attract quality candidates. Superintendents have also cited the most frequent barrier being unfair compensation for the position which is consequently discouraging potential candidates.
In a study conducted by Guterman (2007), the National Association of Elementary School Principals experienced a shortage of applicants applying for a principalship. Another survey conducted by Carnine, Denny, Hewitt, and Pijanowski (2008) revealed that 197 school districts in Arkansas experienced a decrease in the number of qualified candidates for the principalship over the 10 years prior to this study. Also, superintendents of these districts reported that less than half of those who applied for the job met the required criteria. In a study by Cusick (2003), Michigan schools found it difficult to recruit and retain principal candidates because the pool of qualified applicants was found to be shrinking. According to Cusick, “Teachers represent the vast majority of principal candidates, and fewer Michigan teachers are willing to take on the job. This phenomenon is not limited to Michigan. In a recent national study, sixty percent of superintendents say their district faces a shortage of qualified principal candidates” (Cusick, 2003, p.1).

Although the literature supports a potential shortage in various geographical locations such as Massachusetts, which reported that 63% of current principals intend to leave the profession within the next 5 years (Gajda & Militello, 2008), a closer examination questions the extent of this shortage. According to Pijanowski, Hewitt, and Brady (2009, p.85), “The research literature on the principal shortage is inconsistent regarding the actual scope of the shortage and a clear articulation of factors contributing to the successful recruitment and retention of today’s school leaders.” The literature also suggests there is not a shortage of individuals with administrative certification; rather there is evidence that reveals a shortage of teachers aspiring to this position (Grubb & Flessa, 2006).

Qualified applicants have become scarce for the position of principal for various reasons with rural schools facing even harder times attracting applicants; with smaller budgets rural
districts are unable to compete with suburban and urban schools (McKay, 1999). According to a study conducted by Pijanowski, Hewitt, and Brady (2009) on superintendents’ perceptions of the principal shortage, superintendents underestimated the principal candidate pool in their own districts. Furthermore, compensation continues to be an obstacle to attracting qualified principal applicants. For this reason, rural schools are at a disadvantage compared with urban and suburban schools in search for new principals.

The anticipated shortage affects city schools as well. At the beginning of the 1999 school year, 195 public schools in New York City opened without a principal, which was the highest vacancy rate in 5 years (Natt, 1999). Research compiled by the National Center for Policy Analysis reported that of the 403 school districts surveyed nationally, almost half reported having trouble filling the position of principal in the 1998-1999 academic year.

According to a report of an ongoing evaluation of The Wallace Foundation’s Principal Pipeline Initiative (2013), “The priority of drawing a larger pool of stronger applicants encompasses challenges of both quantity and quality. These challenges are salient to different degrees across the districts. The challenges of filling principal vacancies with strong candidates appears most dramatic in New York City, where the sheer size of the school system and the need to hire as many as 200 principals each year are continual drivers of priorities and strategies” (p.7).

Interestingly enough, findings also show that there are more than adequate numbers of qualified candidates who are not applying for the openings. In Pennsylvania, 5,242 people earned elementary and secondary principal certificates between 1995 and 1999, which is 26 percent more than the number of certificates issued between 1989 and 1994 (McKay, 1999). A study conducted in 2003 by RAND Education for the Wallace-Reader’s Digest Funds (as cited in
Burkhauser, Gates, Hamilton, & Ikemoto, 2012) reviewed and analyzed existing data and found little evidence of a nationwide crisis in the market for certified school administrators. Nevertheless, the study did identify several key areas of concern: A significant portion of the administrative population nearing retirement, substantial variation in career-incentives on the state and local levels, and barriers to entry that affect teachers’ willingness to become school administrators.

According to a New York Times article titled, “Shortage of Principals Is Feared as a Wave of Retirements Looms,” a large number of Connecticut’s urban school district administrators are expected to retire. According to Richard W. Lemons,(as cited in Noor, 2008) assistant professor at the University of Connecticut’s Neag School of Education, “The percentage of good candidates has decreased. Where we used to have 10 qualified people for a job, we now have 5. There are fewer names in the hat.” In addition to the retirements, there has been a trend for young educators to move from job to job; this group is also leaving mid-career further shrinking the pool of experienced candidates (Noor, 2008).

Noor (2008) also reported that The Wallace Foundation found that there is likely a shortage of principals in urban areas of Connecticut that resulted in about 60% fewer applications for principal openings. The study also found that urban districts are finding it more difficult to attract quality candidates due to the challenging work conditions, a larger concentration of impoverished students and lower per-pupil expenditures. The study also concluded that urban districts paid lower salaries. With these factors in mind, school officials are seeking solutions by identifying and mentoring a new group of potential principals in their districts.
As the literature suggests there may not be a shortage of certified administrators, but it does point to a shortage of individuals who are applying for principalships by teachers who typically advance into these leadership positions. It is imperative for schools and districts to attract highly-qualified potential administrators from the teaching pool and provide incentives that will draw some teachers into school administration (Gates, Ringel, & Santibanez, 2003).

There may be sufficient numbers of individuals qualified to apply for principal vacancies, but they are not pursuing the job (Winter & Morgenthal, 2002). Additionally, a study conducted by the American Enterprise Institute (2001, as cited in Hess, 2003) concluded that administrative certification programs are not properly preparing future leaders to assume leadership positions such as the principal. In an era of high stakes testing and educational accountability, it is imperative that principal preparation programs integrate a more comprehensive approach to preparing these future leaders (Hess, 2003).

Over the past decade, researchers have accounted for the increasingly large number of available principal positions (Adams, 1999; ERS, 2000; Jordan, 1994; Moore 1999; O’Connell, 2001). Although the literature points to possible shortages due to retirement, Papa and Baxter (2005) claim there is uncertainty about an actual shortage; rather, there is an increased demand for school principals. The question remains, If there are certified individuals able to fill vacant principalships, why are there reports of fewer and under-qualified applicants applying for these positions? Some practitioners suggest that the baby-boomers have clogged the pipeline leading to school leadership positions (Papa & Baxter, 2005). In addition, researchers (Fennell, 1999, ERS, 2000; Lankford, O’Connell & Wyckoff, 2003; Whitaker, 1998) proposed that increased responsibilities, stress, and longer hours without compensatory pay were reasons why there may be a less qualified pool of candidates. They also suggested that these added demands caused
fewer applicants to apply for the positions, and the current incentive structure is insufficient. As a result, teachers who may be considered qualified were not entering into leadership positions.

One way to enhance the current incentive structure would be to increase the available resources and funding available to schools. Lankford, O'Connell, and Wyckoff (2003) claim that it would take an additional 10,000 dollars or more to entice individuals into administration. Interestingly enough, 85% of those teachers who obtained administrative certification reported that they pursued this degree with the intention of entering administration. However, the majority of this group refrained from applying for these positions.

A study conducted by Papa and Baxter (2005) found that the principal shortage with respect to New York, the third largest state school system in the nation, to some extent was self-imposed. However, they did determine that many first-time principals hired in 2000 were as likely to retire during the time period from 2005-2010 as were the principals hired in 1990. They also claimed that if younger first-time principals were hired during the late 1990s, the impending increase in the need for new principals would have been diminished. This study also examined the paradox of why there is a large pool of potential school leaders and yet schools are finding it difficult to attract highly qualified individuals into principalships. They found that as of the year 2000, there were approximately 4,400 principalships throughout New York and there were more than 7,000 New York state public school employees below 45 years of age who were certified to be principals.

Similarly, as reported by an article in the Los Angeles Times 2001 (Orozco & Oliver, 2001) California was producing 2,000 to 3,500 newly licensed administrators each year, yet only 38 percent actually assumed leadership positions in California schools. “To explain this
paradox, many observers argue that relative to readily available employment alternatives, the
compensation of school leaders does not warrant the extraordinary demands placed upon them
and that this is especially true in urban schools where working conditions are most difficult”
(Papa & Baxter, 2005, p.8).

Historically, teachers have represented the group from which the largest numbers of
schools administrators was likely to be drawn, but fewer of them seem willing to pursue
administrative positions (Howley, Andrianaivo, & Perry, 2005). Teachers are all too aware of
the challenges confronting administrators and are reluctant to embrace these positions (Walker &
Qian, 2006). Daresh (2002) suggests that the accelerated demands of external accountability
contribute to the lack of interest to a principalship by potential candidates.

A study conducted by Winter, Rinehart and Munoz (2001) revealed that long hours, less
vacation time, lack of job security, and less family time contributed to candidates not applying
for principalships. Also, McCreight (2001) discovered that as early as 2001, studies of a
principal shortage identified higher accountability as a factor influencing teachers’ decisions not
to pursue an administrative career. Another study of teachers who hold principal certification
indicated that fewer than half were willing to consider the job (Cusick, 2003).

Along with the shortage of principal candidates reported in the United States, other
countries are experiencing a similar trend. According to Cranston (2007) and Brookings (2008)
there has been a reported declining interest in the principalship in Scotland and New Zealand’s
schools respectively, as the position of principal has evolved over the past several decades. The
role has become more stressful and the job has become less appealing. At the same time, the
position has become more demanding and increasing amounts of responsibility have been placed on the principals (Hinton & Kastner, 2000).

The recruitment of outstanding individuals to serve as principals has become and will continue to be a challenging task. However, the principal has an opportunity to make a fundamental as well as structural change. Sound constructive change not only improves the lives and education of students in a school, but also improves the lives of teachers and support staff (Malone & Caddell, 2000).

**Increased Time Demands on the Principal**

“Policies embedded in No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top represent the culmination of three decades of almost continuous education reform in the United States. A central factor mediating the success of federal and state policy efforts at educational reform lies in the leadership capacity of the nation’s school principals and teachers” (Hallinger & Murphy, 2012, p.1).

Due to these changes in education, policymakers have focused their attention on the principal who is tasked to serve as the instructional leader of their buildings (Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Schoen & Fusarelli, 2008).

“Scholars have, for many years, described forces that draw principals away from rather than toward engagement in instructional leadership. Any policy-driven effort to foster sustainable instructional leadership in American schools must take these forces into account or accept the predictable consequences of principals who suffer from unfulfilled expectations, disappointment, guilt, and burnout. Thus, we assert that if America’s education policymakers wish to employ instructional leadership as an engine for school improvement, more comprehensive and practical solutions must be employed that do not leave principals ‘running on empty’” (Hallinger & Murphy, 2012, p.2).
Studies point to an increasingly large number of available school leadership positions, many of them principalships (Adams, 1999; ERS, 2000; Jordan, 1994; Moore, 1999; O’Connell, 2001). At the same time, anecdotal reports indicate that the applicant pools for these positions have been small and filled with under-qualified individuals, which makes policymakers increasingly concerned about a potential shortage of school leaders. Some practitioners suggest that the baby-boomers have clogged the pipeline leading to school leadership positions, thus impeding the advancement of younger, certified individuals (Papa & Baxter, 2005).

At the same time, many researchers (Adams, 1999; ERS, 2000; Fennell, 1999; Lankford, O’Connell, & Wyckoff, 2003; Moore, 1999; Whitaker, 1998) point to increased responsibilities, stress, and longer hours without compensatory pay as a likely cause of the small and under-qualified applicant pools. As a result of these demands, fewer applicants apply and those who do apply are less likely to be qualified individuals as they are more likely to have other, more attractive options available to them. In other words, many individuals who are certified to be school administrators may consider the position, but find the incentive structure inadequate and choose not to pursue leadership positions.

“The No Child Left Behind act has made a challenging job even more daunting with its requirements to achieve academic gains on a yearly basis and to provide all children with the opportunity to obtain a high-quality education” (Brown, 2006, p.525). Studies of successful schools continue to show a direct correlation between strong school instructional leadership and higher student achievement (Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000; Nettles & Herrington, 2007). However, there are questions regarding the principal’s role as an instructional leader due to the multiple managerial responsibilities and conflicting time demands that are now associated with this position. This expanding role and layering of responsibilities
(Duffie, 1991; Portin, Shen, & Williams, 1998) generally extend the principal’s job from anywhere to 60-80 hours per week, which includes supervision of weekend and evening activities (Cushing, Kerrins, & Johnstone, 2003; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Ferrandino & Tirozzi, 2000; Pierce, 2000; Yerkes & Guaglione, 1998).

The Association of Washington School Principals (as cited in Portin, Shen, & Williams, 1998) conducted a statewide survey of its membership to determine the changes in the educational environment and its influence on the principalship. More than 90% of the respondents reported an increase in the scope of their responsibilities, with 81% indicating a substantial increase in managerial responsibilities.

A recent MetLife Survey of the American Teacher (2013) discovered that three out of four K-12 public school principals feel that the job has become too complex. One third of those surveyed said they are likely to leave the profession within the next 5 years, irrespective of the types of schools they work in. According to a survey, conducted for MetLife Inc. by Harris Interactive, the majority of principals say school leadership responsibilities have changed significantly over the last 5 years. Nearly half the principals surveyed indicated that they feel under great stress several days a week. And job satisfaction among principals has decreased notably, from 68% indicating they were very satisfied in 2008 to 59% saying so in this year’s survey” (Heitin, 2013). According to the survey, 83% of school leaders rated addressing individual student needs as challenging or very challenging, while 78 percent rated managing the budget and resources as challenging or very challenging. It was also reported that more than half of the principals claimed their school budget decreased in the last year, while 35% say it has remained the same. Principals also reported that dealing with parental problems and implementing the Common Core State Standards were significant challenges.
The Metlife Survey of the American Teacher (as cited in Heitin, 2012) also found that

"evaluating teacher effectiveness ranked lower on the list, with 53 percent of principals indicating it is a challenge. The survey found that many principals view key challenges facing their schools as being outside of their control. For example, only 22 percent of principals say they have a great deal of control in making decisions about finances. According to the MetLife Survey, only 43 percent of principals say they have control when it comes to removing teachers, while 42 percent say they have control over curriculum and instruction. More than three-fourths of principals, however, do acknowledge having control over teacher hiring and schedules" (Heitin, 2012).

Principals generally noted the increasing amount of time spent on managerial tasks versus instructional leadership tasks (Shen & Crawford, 2003; Worner & Stokes, 1987), yet many scholars believe that the instructional role, as opposed to the managerial role, influences student learning (Leitner, 1994). Given the amount of time spent on day-to-day managerial operations (Cunard, 1990; Institute of Educational Leadership, 2000), principals continue to assume the accountability and responsibility for instructional leadership, yet are still spending less than one-third of their increasing work week on curriculum and instructional activities (Cooley & Shen, 2003; Eisner, 2002; Goodwin, Cunningham & Childress, 2003; Schiff, 2002).

The growing and varied aspects of the job create frustration and tension as a result of the time constraints (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). As Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, and Orr (2007) affirm principals must be educational visionaries and change agents, instructional leaders, curriculum and assessment experts, budget analysts, facility managers, special program administrators, and community builders. Most school leaders did not become principals to be managers and see these two roles as a disconnect (Donmoyer & Wagstaff, 1990; Goodwin et al., 2003; Portin et al., 1998). The increase in principals’ responsibilities and the
incongruences between what instructional leaders want to do and in actuality have the time to do, create serious consequences for school leaders (Worner & Stokes, 1987). A recent survey conducted by Murphy (2010, as cited in Olsen & Brown, 2012,) “revealed that among his sample of school leaders attending a professional programs on self-knowledge, 89 percent reported feeling overwhelmed, 84 percent neglected to take care of themselves in the midst of stress, and 80 percent scolded themselves when they performed less than perfectly” (p.1).

Over the years, studies have revealed that the principal’s job has become increasingly multifaceted and complex. According to the Hechinger Report (2011), principals formerly served as building managers and disciplinarians. Today’s principals are expected to be agents of change capable of increasing academic performance, changing a school’s culture, ensuring the safety of all students in addition to serving as a liaison to the central office and the school community. The report also indicated that the conventional role of manager has become more complicated, especially with new accountability mandates. Districts are now accountable for raising achievement like never before, and the pressure falls on the shoulders of the principal. The Hechinger Report (2011) also claimed, “Many principals have become constant data-crunchers, with the burden of qualifying for federal aid hinging on their submission of regular reports. In some large urban districts, including New York City and Washington, D.C., principals have been given greater autonomy over budgeting and personnel decisions – they have a lot of latitude in how to spend money and whom to hire. But such increases in responsibility have led some principals to feel the need not only for more training but also for more authority”

In a study conducted in 1984, (as cited in Fullan, 1998) 137 Toronto principals and vice-principals 90% of them reported an increase in their 11 key areas of responsibility, while 92% complained that demands on their time had increased. According to Fullan (1998), the role
overload intensifies principals' tendencies towards conservatism and dependency. With too much to do in too little time, the temptation to avoid the difficult and sometimes fruitless work of fostering substantive change is just too great.

A study conducted in Kentucky revealed that principals were working an average of 10 hours a day and spending an average of 67% of that time on managerial issues, leaving only 29% of their time allotted for instructional tasks (Shellinger, 2005). Beteille, Kalogrides, and Loeb (2009) conducted a study looking at longitudinal data of principals in the Miami-Dade County Public Schools. This study analyzed the relationship between principals' time use and efficacy and their schools' educational effectiveness. The study found a correlation between time spent on organizational management tasks and principal effectiveness. However, principals spent most of their time disciplining students, supervising students, observing classrooms, developing internal relationships, complying with requirements and managing budgets. Principals spent the least amount of time developing external relationships, coaching teachers, using data and assessments, providing professional development for teachers, seeking professional development opportunities for themselves, and teaching students.

The results revealed that principals allocated their time on school leadership tasks by the following: 27% spent on administrative tasks; 21% spent on organizational management; 6% on day-to-day instruction; 7% on instructional programs; 15% on internal relations; 5% on external relations; and, 19% on other tasks (Brown, 2006).

Among the many jobs in the education system today, that of the principal is the most difficult (Worzel, 1998). The changing job descriptions compounded with the increased accountability have increased the time demands on this position. The literature suggests that the role of the principal has become increasingly overwhelming and requires greater leadership skills
than ever before. According to Archer (2002), schools have shouldered more of the responsibilities once assumed by families, social service agencies, and even churches, with schools increasingly offering before and after-school programs for children of parents who cannot afford childcare. In an article by Archer (2002) titled, “Principals: So Much To Do, So Little Time” a principal from the Meadowbrook Middle School in Poway, California responded during an interview, “We basically have 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. activities in our school, and the parents expect it.” Another principal from Mattahunt Elementary School in Boston, Massachusetts said, “I think what has changed is the expectations of doing more and more with less and less.” Other principals reported that their time is also consumed by attempts to follow federal rules on special education (Archer, 2002).

According to a recent Florida study conducted by Horng, Klasik, and Loeb (2009), principals engage in over 40 different types of tasks daily. Thirty percent of their time is spent on administrative activities including student supervision, scheduling, and compliance issues; 20% is spent on organizational management tasks including personnel and budget issues; and less than 10% is spent on instructional-related activities such as classroom observations and staff professional development. This study also revealed that there is a positive correlation between time spent on organizational management with positive school outcomes measured by test scores gains and teacher and parent assessments of the educational climate.

**Educational Accountability**

Beginning in the 1990s, signifying a standards movement, the development of *A Nation at Risk* called for high expectations for all learners by instituting a system of standards for our schools. Following this report, in January 2002, the *No Child Left Behind* Act was commissioned to revitalize the deteriorating status of American education by raising the
educational performance of all school children in America. According to Coleman (2013),

“There are many dimensions of action affecting this moment in time—a renewed focus and emerging consensus regarding the kinds of learning outcomes essential for success in today’s globally connected world; significant efforts to promote innovation affecting all facets of education, particularly regarding new teaching and learning strategies and opportunities; and a renewed focus on key elements of necessary systemic change, in which the roles of the federal government, the states, school systems and schools are better aligned and more coherently understood.”

Recently, in this new era of accountability, there has been a major shift towards a stronger focus on summative and formative assessments as key factors for improving teaching and learning. Additionally, schools are tasked with tracking and monitoring student progress as a way to determine the schools’ effectiveness. While NCLB has been idealistically embraced, its objectives have proved to be unrealistically unattainable in many regards. Consequently, the policy continues to be implemented nation-wide through mandatory standards, accountability, and sanctions. However, without adequate funding, the outcomes of the policy’s high expectations for academic success are becoming counter-productive (Sogunro, Farynjarz, & Rigazio-DigiLio, 2009).

Much has been written about student, teacher, and school accountability. With 49 states now adopting common core state standards to measure student achievement, it is important to understand how these changes have impacted the roles of school administrators. With increasing demands and changing expectations in the role of school administration, researchers, practitioners, and policy makers have become socially preoccupied with educational accountability (Normore, 2004).

In addition to the pressure schools and administrators are faced with from NCLB, Race to the Top has also changed the evaluation system for both teachers and principals. President
Obama and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan introduced *Race to the Top* in 2009. This 4.35 billion dollar competition was designed to encourage reforms in K-12 state and local school districts. The *Race to the Top* competition required states to reform certain educational policies, such as performance-based standards for teachers and principals, complying with nationwide standards, and promote charter schools. State applications for funding were scored on selection criteria. In the area of “Great Teachers and Leaders” were the following criteria: improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance; ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals; providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals; providing effective support to teachers and principals; and, improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (United States Department of Education, 2010). However, across the United States, the new standards movement is deteriorating amidst unfulfilled expectations, and too many students are failing to meet benchmarks for graduation (Bottoms & O’Neill, 2001).

In New York State, according to *Education Law §3012-c* and the new Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) guidelines, schools are required to adopt a new performance evaluation system for teachers and principals. New York State is also expected to implement a comprehensive evaluation system in school districts. The evaluation system is designed to measure teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance, including measures of student achievement and evidence of effectiveness in meeting New York State teacher or school leader standards. The results of the evaluations will be a significant factor in employment decisions, including but not limited to promotion, retention, tenure determination, termination, and supplemental compensation (New York State Board of Regents, 2011).
These new guidelines and reforms are affecting schools across the country and accountability has changed nearly everything. State legislation has established urgency for improved student achievement in an educational system where too many students are not succeeding against the new standards.

“The design of educational accountability in the United States has long been the subject of fierce debate, especially in the years since the NCLB law's enactment. A central concern is the perceived rigidity of the law's mandates for identifying low-performing schools and the steps required to intervene, including corrective actions and restructuring that may involve removing teachers or converting to a charter school. In addition, many educators and analysts say U.S. policymakers rely too heavily on standardized tests to measure student learning and school quality. The pushback is especially pronounced given the widespread belief that the tests most states administer for accountability purposes under the law provide limited information on student achievement” (Robelen, 2012, p. 1).

Throughout the country, various states, administrators, and teachers have opposed high stakes testing. According to Paton (2013), the New York Principals Association recently issued a letter about the unintended negative consequences high stakes tests have on students. The Montgomery County Public Schools in Maryland has called for a 3 year moratorium on standard testing, and in Texas, superintendents of high-performing school districts signed a letter that explained how high-stakes testing is strangling public schools. Currently, 880 districts in Texas have adopted a resolution opposing standardized tests.

According to a 100 year analysis of testing research completed by Phelps (2011), 93% of studies on student testing, including the use of large-scale and high-stakes standardized tests, found a positive effect on student achievement. However, standardized testing has not improved or increased student achievement. After No Child Left Behind (NCLB) passed in 2002, the United States slipped from 18th in the world in math on the Programme for International Student
Assessment (PISA) to 31 in 2009, with an analogous drop in science and no change in reading. Similarly, a National Research Council report (as cited in procon.org, 2013) found no evidence to show that test-based incentive programs were working. A study conducted by the Thomas Fordham Foundation and Accountability Works (2004, as cited in Cross, Rebarber, Torres, & Finn, 2004), which evaluated accountability systems in 30 states, gave states mediocre marks for the extent to which accountability systems were based on solid academic standards and tests that matched individual state standards.

According to Elmore (2002), a capacity gap exists in school districts, especially in low-performing schools due to a lack of resources. The Center on Education Policy (2003, as cited in procon.org, 2013) reported that policy experts were concerned that the pressures of NCLB would force schools to lower their standards in order for students to meet the federal and state prescribed goals. States are not only seeking to hold schools more accountable for results, increasingly they are also holding students accountable for individual performance. Standardized testing is a reliable and objective measure of student achievement. However, standardized tests are an unreliable measure of student performance. According to Loveless (2001), a study by the Brookings Institution (2001) reported that 50-80% of year-over-year test score improvements were temporary and caused by other variations not connected to long-term changes in learning. According to late education researcher Gerald Bracey, (as cited in Strauss, 2011) standardized tests cannot measure student creativity, motivation, persistence, curiosity, endurance, reliability, enthusiasm, empathy, self-awareness, self-discipline, leadership, civic-mindedness, courage, compassion, resourcefulness, sense of beauty, sense of wonder, honesty, integrity.

In this new era of educational accountability, teachers and administrators are now
pressured to increase student achievement. According to a 5 year study conducted by the University of Maryland, (as cited in procon.org, 2013) teachers feel pressured to teach to the test. The study concluded that teachers and administrators felt that the enactment of NCLB has decreased students’ abilities to think critically as well (procon.org, 2013). Furthermore, a study conducted by the College of William and Mary (2010, as cited in procon.org, 2013) revealed that students’ test scores had decreased since 1990 on the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking, which has led to a possible creativity crisis. According to Kozol (2005), instruction time is being consumed by monotonous test preparation, and some schools dedicate more than a quarter of the year's instruction to test prep.

A national study by the Center on Education Policy (2007, as cited in procon.org, 2013) reported that since 2001, 44% of school districts have reduced instructional time in the areas of science, social studies, art, and the arts by an average of 145 minutes per week, spending the majority of that time on instruction of math and reading. Standardized testing is also a root cause of stress in younger students. According to education researcher Cizek (2001), students are being negatively affected by the amount of high stakes tests they are required to take leading to increased reports of anxiety in children.

The United States Department of Education (2001) reported that the enactment of NCLB was designed to overhaul our education system to increase student achievement and hold states and schools more accountable for student progress. NCLB requires that 100% of United States students be proficient on state reading and math tests by 2014. Furthermore, President Obama’s implementation of the Race to the Top has altered the manner in which teachers and principals are evaluated (Race to the Top Executive Summary, 2010). According to a study conducted by Lyons and Algozzine (2006) that measured perceptions of principals in North Carolina on the
new accountability system, principals rated the following areas as unfavorable: the expectation for schools to meet adequate yearly progress (required under NCLB), the testing requirements for limited English proficiency students, the testing requirements for exceptional students, the sanctions for schools that do not meet expected growth goals, and the school status designation labels assigned to schools based upon student academic achievement as measured by test scores.

"As never before, the education enterprise is being challenged by the public and its federal, state, and local agents to improve student achievement. The federal government is putting pressure on representatives of the states who are pressing local governing bodies and superintendents to raise school performance. Of course, local leaders are tightening the vise by calling on principals to make a difference in their schools and the job becomes nearly undoable as the limits of power settle far above the individuals charged with change" (Lyons & Algozzine, 2006).

No Child Left Behind has resulted in dramatic shifts in the responsibilities of teachers and administrators (Goldberg, 2004, 2005; Ladd & Zelli, 2002; McGhee & Nelson, 2005; Tucker & Codd, 2002). Given the many and often conflicting role demands, it is no surprise that fewer candidates are applying for principal positions (Tucker & Codd, 2002). Furthermore, difficulties in finding educational leaders could not come at a more challenging time as principals are tasked with meeting federal and state guidelines under NCLB (Cusick, 2003; Ladd & Zelli, 2002; Olsen, 1999).

According to Bottoms and O’Neill (2001), these new state accountability systems are placing much of the burden of school success and individual achievement on the principal’s shoulders. The principal’s job description has expanded, and school leaders are expected to perform in the role of chief learning officer, with ultimate responsibility for the success or failure of the business of learning. In this environment of high-stakes accountability, school districts are finding it increasingly difficult to recruit new leaders to take the place of retiring administrators.
These new leaders must be prepared to tackle the many obstacles of educational accountability. This difficult challenge demands a breed of school leaders, with skills and knowledge far greater than those expected of school managers in the past.

**Principal Compensation**

The recruitment of outstanding individuals to serve as principals has become a challenging task for superintendents and school boards alike because the duties and responsibilities of the principal have become progressively more demanding. The principal is expected to be a manager, instructional leader, motivator, lay psychologist, and public relations expert. In addition, principals, particularly at the secondary level, spend after-school hours that equal or exceed the hours of a school day (Malone & Caddell, 2000).

According to the results of the National Survey of Salaries and Wages in Public Schools (2010), the average salary reported by school districts for middle level principals in 2009-2010 is $95,003 while high schools principals average $102,387. Principals' salaries vary by geographic region, the size of the school district, and per-pupil expenditure. Principals residing in the mid-east states tend to have the highest average salaries, while those living in the southwest or Rocky mountains tend to have the lowest. The National Association of Secondary School Principals (2010) reported that high school principals in the mid-east states earn an average salary of $122,119, which is 19.3% more than the average salary for high school principals across all of the regions. The average salary of high school principals in the Rocky mountains is $89,501 which is 12.6% lower than the average salary overall. The data also shows that principals from districts with fewer than 2,500 pupils tend to be paid substantially less than their peers from larger districts. High school principals from districts with over 2,500 students earn salaries in excess of $100,000. Those from districts with less than 2,500 pupils earn salaries averaging
$87,550, which is over 20% less than their larger counterparts (NAASP, 2010).

Outstanding individuals who are considering the principalship as a career are seriously evaluating the pay scale incongruities of these jobs. If a high school principal job pays $75,000 for a 240-day contract, and a teacher at the top of the pay scale receives $52,000 for a 180-day contract, the differential in pay could be viewed as very small. When one compares the demands of the two jobs, including after-school events and facility responsibilities, the salary differentials appear unjust. While there is a high level of competition for quality candidates in education, businesses and industry are also looking for similar skill sets and characteristics that principals possess to fill CEO or middle-management positions. When comparing the two positions, in general, being a principal requires time commitments that are typically more highly compensated in businesses paying average middle-management wages (Malone & Caddell, 2000).

The education community views the opportunity to work longer (240-day contract versus 180-day contract) as an appealing incentive in administration because a longer contract equates to higher pay. However, Americans no longer embrace this view. At one time, the 40-hour work week was unattainable, and now it is common for a laborer to negotiate for 35-hour weeks. But the 35-hour weeks do not exist for principals, and the demands of a principalship do not coincide with today’s work week. It is also expected that regardless of time or energy the principal get the job done. With such demands, potential candidates for the principal position are opting to enter the business sector (Malone & Caddell, 2000).

A study conducted by Shen et al. (2004) identified eight factors influencing the application for principal positions. Of these eight factors, workload and compensation issues were highlighted as disincentives for the position. According to Carrigan, Brown, and Jenkins (1999) and the Institute for Educational Leadership (2000) inadequate salaries may also play a
role in a lack of desire to enter a principalship. Principals are being asked to do far more without commensurate compensation, providing less incentive to leave the classroom. Almost two decades ago, Lortie, Crow, and Prolman (1983) found that veteran principals identified two factors that attracted them to a principalship, increased income and greater influence. The study by NAESP, NASSP, and ERS (2000) asked superintendents interviewed to identify factors that they perceived were discouraging people from applying for a principalship, and the top ranked barrier was that salary and compensation were not sufficient compared to the responsibilities.

A study conducted by the Education Policy Center of Michigan State University (as cited in Cusick, 2003) discovered that elementary principals made only $2,000 more than teachers in rural and eastern suburban districts. The difference in pay increased to $4000 for western suburban districts, $7,000 for mid-state urban districts, and $15,000 for mid-state suburban districts. The study also notes that principals worked between 20 to 40 more days per year than teachers with 10 to 12 hour workdays.

Compensation of principals is often cited as a reason why there has been a decrease in the number of candidates applying for leadership positions. There has been some discussion proposing an increase in principals' salaries as a way to entice candidates into this position (Pijanowski & Brady, 2009). Pounder and Merrill (2001) discovered in a survey that only a third of teachers aspiring to the principalship found the job to be attractive or very attractive even though 40% were likely or very likely to apply for a high school principal position. Pijanowski and Brady (2009, p.29) reported, “Levine (2005) argued that since 96% of public school districts in the US award salary increases for teachers based on advanced degrees or course credit, many school leadership preparation programs enroll students who do not have an interest in pursuing a principal position. Instead, these teachers are interested in improving their salaries by increasing
their position in the teacher salary schedule. When investigating the critical factors that influence a candidate to pursue a school leadership position, salary and personal stress consistently rate as important. In a survey by Cooley and Shen (2000), teachers were asked to rank 31 possible factors that would influence their decision to apply or not apply for the principalship in an urban setting, and lack of financial compensation ranked fifth.

In a study conducted by Hancock and Bird (2008) that surveyed teachers about what prevented them from advancing into a principalship, it was found that a small salary differential between teachers and administrators was a one of several reasons why they were uninterested in the position. Other reasons were loss of tenure, increased paperwork, and a lack of autonomy in this role. In a study conducted by Lankford, O'Connell, and Wyckoff (2003) who surveyed 2,800 public school teachers with administrative certification found that more than 80% reported their initial motivation for obtaining certification was to serve as an administrator; however, many candidates never applied for an administrative job due to a lack of financial compensation. According to Pijanowski and Brady (2009, p.30), “Concern about the longer hours required to do the job seem to be exacerbated by the perception that salaries have not kept up with the increasing demands of the principalship. Even when asked to compare leadership salaries to others positions in their own profession, 46% of current school administrators responded that their own salary increases are not as strong as teacher salary increases.”

The decision to pursue a career in administration early in a teacher’s career may be attributed to an increase in salary. Entry-level administrative positions often have salaries that are similar to veteran teachers; however, these entry-level positions come with additional workdays and extended hours and responsibilities. The attractiveness of administrative positions late in a teacher’s career is lessened due to a lack of additional financial incentives (Papa, 2004).
A study conducted by Poppink and Shen (2003) of secondary school principals’ salaries revealed that over a 12-year period, after principals’ salaries were adjusted by the Consumer Price Index from 1988 to 2000, the average increase was only 6.8%. Given the increase in principals’ responsibilities, the real increase of average salaries appears to be negligible.

According to Goldhaber (2007), few data sources provide detailed information on the use of various principal compensation structures to determine whether principals are on a salary schedule, or whether performance incentives are included in their contracts. It appears that most principals are compensated using a single salary schedule earning annual increases, which is similar to that of a teacher salary schedule. According to Goldhaber (2007), the Fordham Foundation’s 2003 compensation reform reported that principals’ base pay should be at least 150% of what their schools’ highest paid teachers receive. Unfortunately, without more information on the structure of principal compensation, it is difficult to know whether becoming a principal is an attractive position for teachers. According to Goldhaber (2007, p.2),

“We have good reasons to be concerned about the quality of the nation’s principals and the influence of compensation in determining it. We also have reason to believe that compensation reform is a promising strategy for improving principal and subsequently school quality. Yet the near total lack of evidence on the efficacy of reforms, such as pay for performance, points to data and research deficiencies that must be addressed in order for us to learn more about their effects and make sound public policies.”

In a report titled, “Strong Leaders Strong Schools: 2009 School Leadership Laws”, Shelton (2012) reported that states have developed compensation and incentives to recruit and retain qualified leaders, particularly in low-performing schools. In this report, six states passed legislation during 2009 to help recruit and retain effective school leaders.

“Arkansas appropriated $90,000 for bonuses for master principals who are serving as fulltime principals in Arkansas public schools. Master principals receive $9,000 annually for five years, while
those serving full-time in “high needs” schools receive $25,000 annually for five years. Through its newly created Educator Identifier System and Pilot Program, which assigns unique identifiers to teachers and principals, Colorado will use data to recognize, reward and develop the careers of individual educators. Georgia will compensate educators for their leadership degree only if they are serving in a leadership position. Maine legislation encourages alternative compensation models for teachers and school administrators. North Carolina ensures that teachers who become assistant principals will be paid at least as much as they were earning as teachers. Washington allows national board certified teachers who become public school principals to continue to receive a $5,000 annual bonus for as long as they are principals and maintain the national board certification. Washington also created a working group to recommend details of an enhanced salary allocation model that aligns educator certification with the state’s compensation system” (Shelton, 2012, p.12).

While some states have initiated improvements in their salary structure for principals, the modern-day principal’s compensation is still viewed as inadequate when compared to the long hours and increased responsibilities that come with the territory. Teachers must trade their 180-day work year to one that exceeds 240-days and be willing to take on a tremendous amount of responsibilities, lose their job security by giving up tenure, just to earn a small amount of money more on a daily basis. Although these factors may influence a person’s decision to enter administration, it is important to note that some people find the intrinsic reward and satisfaction of the job more important than the salary (Malone & Caddell, 2000).

The primary theme is not just that the money is insufficient, but more specifically that the money is not enough to compensate for the stress and working conditions of the job. Moreover, potential leaders report that if the working conditions were to dramatically change many of them would consider serving as school leaders (Pijanowski, Hewitt & Brady, 2009). The pay changes at different stages of the leadership pipeline are less significant as people grow closer to the job. If fiscal incentives diminish as stress increases compensation will be less of a motivating factor.
In summary, the research on the demands and expectations for principals has never been higher. Among other expectations, principals are being held accountable for student performance in an increasingly complex environment. Yet, the data reveals that principals have not experienced a significant increase in their salaries (Poppink & Shen, 2003). "Although recruiting efforts and pay incentives are most attractive to those who have never served in a leadership position, it appears that those who have had experience in the job and leave are more concerned with quality of life and working conditions. Extrinsic motivation may draw them in, but it is the intrinsic rewards that most influence if they will stay" (Pijanowski & Brady, 2009, p.31).

Summary

Over the course of many years, the landscape of educational leadership has changed as result of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which has led to an increase in principal accountability. Research clearly shows that effective principals can make a profound impact in improving the overall performance of their schools.

As a result of the increased accountability standards, the principal’s role has become more complex and multifaceted. In addition to meeting state and local benchmark performance measures, principals must navigate additional challenges from the central office, parents, students, and legislators. These added demands and pressures have led to an increase in job related stress for principals as they are working anywhere between 60-80 hours per week without additional compensation.

Increased responsibilities and accountability without fair compensation have negatively impacted school district’s ability to attract quality candidates. While there have been predictions of a shortage of principals due to the large number of retirements, research shows there is an
abundance of individuals who are certified to be principals. With fewer individuals applying for this position, it will be more important than ever to attract and retain highly effective individuals to fill these positions.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to explore the reasons why teachers who hold administrative certifications are not pursuing the principalship. In this chapter, details and descriptions are given of my background, research design, sampling, profiles of the districts, schools and participants, data analysis, and procedures utilized in this study.

Background

In my experience as an educator, specifically serving as an Assistant Principal for the past 9 years, I have encountered numerous teachers who pursued additional schooling to obtain their administrative certification but have expressed an unwillingness to leave the classroom to pursue leadership positions such as a principal. In my conversations with teachers in various school districts on Long Island, where I have served as an assistant principal, I have yet to understand the root motivations and deterrents of why teachers chose this path in obtaining administrative certification, but elected to remain in the classroom. While there are motivators and deterrents that have been identified through quantitative research, little qualitative work has been done on this topic. Therefore, this became a strong topic of interest for me and I created a study to explore this phenomenon to understand what prevented teachers from advancing. After all, this group possessed the certification necessary to obtain leadership positions, such as principal.

Although these deterrents varied teacher by teacher, I often questioned the future of our education system. Our education system could be compromised in the near future if we do not recruit and retain qualified leaders to serve at the building level. If teachers are not pursuing educational leadership positions, then who will be called upon to fill principal vacancies? As
previously noted, the teacher pool is primarily drawn upon to fill educational leadership positions. Not only is it important for teachers who are knowledgeable in the field of education to advance into leadership positions, but it is important for the sustainment of a quality educational system as well (Howley, Andrianaivo, & Perry, 2005).

In my quest to better understand teachers’ motivations to become certified in administration and then be deterred from seeking the principalship, it was important for me to interview individuals who fit my criteria. I was also interested in this particular area of research due to the numerous conversations I have had with teachers over the past 9 years. There has been an abundance of teachers who possessed the necessary skill set to serve in leadership positions, but never pursued administration. What is especially interesting, is that many of these teachers understand how a building operates; they also share visionary ideas on how to improve the imperfections that currently exist in education today with respect to increased testing and new accountability mandates placed upon schools. Knowing there are qualified teachers with administrative degrees who are not pursuing this position not only compounds this problem, but it also inspired me to further understand their points of view as well. It is especially important during this particular time in education, with new accountability standards being applied to teachers and administrators alike, to understand what is motivating and deterring qualified candidates to and from the principalship. Delving into teachers’ thoughts and perceptions through the interview process could help educational leadership of all levels understand what motivates and deters people from this position and how to improve the recruitment of qualified teachers into the ranks of administration, specifically the principal.
Research Design

The research design utilized in this study was a qualitative multiple case study. Research is a process of understanding the complexities of human experiences. Through systematic and collaborative efforts, I collected information, reflected on the meaning, drew conclusions, and put forth an explanation most frequently in written form (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Qualitative research provides a framework within which people can respond in a way that represents accurately and thoroughly their points of view of the world or a specific program. Furthermore, qualitative findings have a simple, yet elegant way of transporting the reader into the research setting to understand other people’s points of view (Patton, 2002).

Qualitative researchers are interested in understanding how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences (Merriam, 2009). Qualitative research is unlike quantitative research as the data collected is in the form of words and expressions rather than numbers and equations. Qualitative interviews are meant to connect the experiences of those interviewed with those who read the study by way of sufficient, rich, in-depth details to understand and to learn from the experiences of others. Patton (2002) explains, “We interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe... We cannot observe feelings, thoughts, and intentions. We cannot observe behaviors that took place at some previous point in time... We cannot observe how people have organized the world and the meanings they attach to what goes on in the world. We have to ask people questions about those things. The purpose of interviewing, then, is to allow us to enter into the other person’s perspective” (pp. 340-341).
Through the interview process, I gathered essential, descriptive data that expressed the thoughts and experiences of those interviewed to understand what motivated teachers to obtain their administrative certification with the intention to pursue a principalship, but later decide not to enter into this field. Interviewing is necessary when we cannot observe behavior, feelings, or how people interpret the world around them (Merriam, 2009). Understanding this occurrence not only raises awareness for others in educational leadership, but it also adds to the current literature in education as well. In this study, I conducted semi-structured interviews with nine teachers with administrative certification in five Long Island, New York school districts. Patton (2002) stated that the purpose of interviewing is to allow us to enter into the other person’s perspective and to try and understand their feelings, thoughts, intentions and behaviors. The rationale behind the semi-structured interviews was that it is in-between structured and unstructured, which allowed me to be more flexible in the wording of my questions. The largest part of the interviews was guided by a list of questions to be explored, and the exact wording or order of the questions was not pre-determined, permitting me to respond to new ideas or topics that developed during the interview process (Merriam, 2009). This afforded me the opportunity to ask the participants follow-up questions to their responses, allowing them to elaborate on their experiences. It also allowed me to ask questions about topics that came up that may have been unexpected or even surprising.

I conducted 45-55 minute interviews with each participant in their home school district. After selecting a mutually agreed upon date and time with each participant, I traveled to each district, not only to make the process more convenient for the participant, but to also make the individuals feel more comfortable and relaxed in their home schools. Each interview was held either during school hours or after school hours in a private office, conference room, or library.
This privacy encouraged the participants to speak freely about their experiences. "Thus, the interviewer-respondent interaction is a complex, phenomenon. A skilled interviewer accounts for these factors in order to evaluate the data being obtained. Taking a stance that is nonjudgmental, sensitive, and respectful of the respondent is but a beginning point in the process" (Merriam, 2009, p. 109). Prior permission was obtained from the Superintendent of Schools in each district to conduct research in their district, in addition to obtaining permission from individual teachers who voluntarily participated in this study. Prior to each interview, participants signed an informed consent form.

**Sampling**

The population was a purposeful sample consisting of nine secondary-level, grades 7-12 teachers with administrative certification from six schools in five Long Island, New York school districts. Patton (2002) and Chein (1981) explain that the more appropriate sampling strategy and most common form is purposeful sampling. "Purposeful sampling is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned" (Merriam, 2009, p. 77). For the study of subjects, there were no restrictions based on gender, age, race, or ethnic origin. All subjects had successfully completed an educational leadership program, resulting in at least one of the following administrative certification areas: School Building Leader, formerly, School Administrator/Supervisor; School District Leader, formerly, School District Administrator; and School District Business Leader, formerly School Business Administrator.
Profiles of the School District Sites

In order to maintain the confidentially and anonymity of the school districts, I have coded each district by number. All of the districts and schools are located on Long Island, New York. Long Island is comprised of two counties, Nassau and Suffolk, and has a total of 127 public school districts. The only geographical information that has been included in this study is the location of each district by county.

District 1

District 1 is located in Nassau County, Long Island and is a public K-12 school district. It is comprised of one pre-K school; four elementary schools, grades K-4; one grade school, grades 5-6; one middle school, grades 7-8; and one high school, grades 9-12.

District 2

District 2 is located in Nassau County, Long Island and is a public central high school district. It is comprised of one junior high school, grades 7-9; one high school, grades 10-12; and two junior-senior high schools, grades 7-12.

District 3

District 3 is located in Suffolk County, Long Island and is a public K-12 school district. It is comprised of one elementary school, grades K-2; one grade school, grades 3-6; and one junior-senior high school, grades 7-12.
District 4

District 4 is located in Nassau County, Long Island and it is a public K-12 school district. It is comprised of four elementary schools, K-5; two middle schools, grades 6-8; two high schools, grades 9-12; and one alternative school high school, grades 9-12.

District 5

District 5 is located in Suffolk County, Long Island and it is a public K-12 school district. It is comprised of one primary school, grades K-1; two elementary schools, grades 2-6; and one junior-senior high school, grades 7-12.

The demographics displayed in Table 1 are from the New York State Department of Education website under the district’s “Comprehensive Information Report.” The most recent data available was from 2010-2011. In order to divide each district, I broke down each school district’s demographics by the following: district’s total enrollment, the percentage of students passing the Comprehensive English Regents and Integrated Algebra Regents, percentage of students graduating with Regents diplomas, percentage of post-secondary plans, and families receiving public assistance. I reported the percentage of students passing the Comprehensive English Regents and Integrated Algebra Regents as a measure to show each district’s academic performance as measured by state-mandated testing. The Comprehensive English Regents and Integrated Algebra Regents are state tests that all students must eventually pass in order to graduate from public high school in New York. The districts were assigned a random number and are not in any particular order other than numerical sequence by district.
Table 1

Summary of Demographic Information for Each District (Most Recent Data 2010-2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>%Pass Comp. English/ % Pass Int. Algebra</th>
<th>% Graduating Regents Diploma</th>
<th>% Post-Sec. Plans</th>
<th>% Receiving Public Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,306</td>
<td>77% / 66%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>4-yr. college 33%</td>
<td>41-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-yr. college 43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Military 3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment 17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,692</td>
<td>98% / 89%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4-yr. college 73%</td>
<td>1-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-yr. college 44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Military 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment 3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,788</td>
<td>99% / 91%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>4-yr. college 77%</td>
<td>1-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-yr. college 17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Military 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment 5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,347</td>
<td>98% / 84%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>4-yr. college 86%</td>
<td>1-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-yr. college 11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Military 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>97% / 99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>4-yr. college 96%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-yr. college 2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Military 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profiles of the School Sites

In order to maintain the confidentially and anonymity of the schools and subjects who participated in this study, I have coded each school by letter and each participant by number. In total, I interviewed nine teachers with administrative certification. My goal was to interview a total of 10 teachers, two per district. However, one participant from District 3 dropped out of the study and the Superintendent was unable to identify a second teacher who fit my criteria. The Superintendent of each district identified teachers who fit my criteria with the exception of two
candidates who were identified via snowball sampling. "Snowball, chain, or network sampling is perhaps the most common form of purposeful sampling. This strategy involves locating a few key participants who easily meet the criteria you have established for participation in the study. As you interview these early key participants you ask each one to refer you to other participants" (Merriam, 2009, p.79). The superintendents of each district emailed me the name(s) of teachers, and I contacted them via email to set up a mutual date and time to meet. Some of the superintendents sent out my solicitation letter to teachers and the teachers emailed me to set up a mutual date and time to meet.

In total, I visited six separate schools in five Long Island school districts that represented various levels of socioeconomic status (SES) over a 2 month period beginning in February 2013 and ending in April 2013. The socioeconomic status was determined by the percentage of students eligible for free and reduced-priced lunch and the racial/ethnic origins of the students. The most recent data available was from the New York State Department of Education website under each district’s Report Card. The most recent data available was from 2010-2011. In order to divide the range of schools, I broke down the demographics for the schools within which each subject was displayed in Table 2 by the following: teacher who participated in the study, school type, school enrollment, percentage of students eligible for free and reduced lunch, and percentage of students’ racial and ethnic origin. Table 2 below is not in any particular order other than numeric to match the school district order displayed in Table 1.
Table 2

*Summary of Demographic Information for Each School (Most Recent Data 2010-2011)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>School (District)</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>% Eligible Free/Reduced Lunch</th>
<th>% Racial/Ethnic Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>Middle School A</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Black/African American 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(District #1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jr./Sr. High School B</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Black/African American 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(District #2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jr./Sr. High School C</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Black/African American 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(District #2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jr./Sr. High School D</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Black/African American 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(District #3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 8</td>
<td>Alternative High School E</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Black/African American 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(District #4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multirracial 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>Jr./Sr. High School F</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Black/African American 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(District 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Native Hawaiian 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White 97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profiles of the Participants

Each teacher selected for the study must have successfully completed an educational leadership program that resulted in administrative certification in one of the following areas:

School Building Leader, formerly, School Administrator/Supervisor; School District Leader, formerly, School District Administrator; and School District Business Leader, formerly School
Business Administrator. The participants’ teaching experience varied, and they also completed their certification at various points in time, which gave me a deeper perspective on how their view of a principalship may have changed over time. Additionally, one participant entered teaching as a second career, which also brought another perspective to this study. Furthermore, each participant’s leadership experience varied as they all served in different leadership capacities throughout their teaching careers. However, none of the participants ever served as principal.

Teacher 1

Teacher 1 works in middle school A, grades 7-8, located in district 1 which is a public K-12 District in Nassau County, Long Island. She is a female English teacher who has been teaching for 13 years in School A. She has held the School District Administration (SDA) certification for the past 7 years and serves as a Teacher on Special Assignment (TSA). As a TSA she is responsible for overseeing 7 grade testing for the English Department. Her motivation for obtaining administrative certification was to have the “freedom” to be an administrator if she felt the time was right and to “challenge” herself. However, she was deterred from pursuing a principalship because of her “comfort level” at her current school and that it would be “scary” to have to “start new” where she would have to “prove” herself again.

Teacher 2

Teacher 2 works in junior-senior high school F, grades 7-12 located in district 5 which is a public K-12 District in Suffolk County, Long Island. She is a female physical education teacher who has been teaching for 16 years in School F. She has held the School District Administration (SDA) certification for the past 8 years and has assisted her administration in
scheduling and completing paperwork. She has also served as a mentor to student-teachers. Her motivation for obtaining administrative certification was to “challenge” herself and felt that this would also “open up more opportunities just in case there were cutbacks in personnel.” “Personal accomplishment” and the ability to earn more money also motivated her “because in this school district…when you move across and have different credit numbers, you get a pay increase.” However, she was deterred from pursuing a principalship because she has “young children at home and not willing to give up my summers with them.” “Perhaps if the salary was a bit higher…maybe my husband would think about dropping back his hours…the increased hours that you would take on as a principal and then with the salary…doesn’t fit at this point for my family.”

Teacher 3

Teacher 3 works in junior-senior high school F, grades 7-12 located in district 5 which is a public K-12 District in Suffolk County, Long Island. He is a male social studies teacher who has been teaching for 14 years in school F. He has held the School District Leadership (SDL) certification for 1 year and served as a department chairperson 2 years ago in 2011 until the district cut this position. When he served as a department chairperson, he was responsible for scheduling, budget, and observing teachers. Currently, he does not serve in a leadership capacity at his school. His motivation for obtaining administrative certification was to obtain his 75 credits and in this district “you have to have a concentrated program to get to 75.” He also thought that this “was the next logical step in the classroom...the next step would be an administrative job.” Furthermore, a superintendent who saw potential in him inspired him to pursue his administrative certification. He thought that he would “see what this is all about.” However, he was deterred from pursuing a principalship because of his “security” in his position.
as a teacher. Furthermore, he “probably makes more than most beginning assistant principal jobs…I would actually be taking a pay cut right now.”

**Teacher 4**

Teacher 4 works in middle school A, grades 7-8, located in district 1 which is a public K-12 District in Nassau County, Long Island. She is a female special education teacher who has been teaching for 31 years. She served as a special education teacher for 5 years at a middle school and then stopped to teach at a community college for 12 years. She then went back to the public school system and has served as a teacher at the middle school level where she has been for the past 10 years in school A. She has held the School District Administration (SDA) certification for the past 8 years and currently serves as a building representative in the teachers union. Her motivation for obtaining administrative certification was because “it was 30 free credits” and it cost her “minimal.” She also “liked the idea of learning the law” as a special education teacher. Furthermore, “it was a good way to get across and not take a lot out of pocket.” However, she was deterred from pursuing a principalship because she felt like she “wasn’t ready.” She then “looked at some of the salaries” and “definitely wasn’t going to make” what she makes now because of all her credits.

**Teacher 5**

Teacher 5 works in junior-senior high school B, grades 7-12 located in the public central high school district 2 in Nassau County, Long Island. He is a male physical education teacher who has been teaching for 26 years in school B. He served as a coach and substitute teacher before securing a full-time position in his current district. He has held the School District Administration (SDA) certification for the past 14 years and serves as the department head for
health and physical education. He has also served as the dean of special education and athletic coordinator for the junior-senior high school. His motivation for obtaining administrative certification was because he “wanted to move up the ladder and thought teaching might not be fulfilling for a 30 year career.” He also thought he “could have a greater impact on things.” “Money” was also a motivator and “it’s about an $11,000 difference when you have a master’s or a master’s plus 60 credits.” Finally, it was something that he could “fall back on” if physical education positions were cut. However, he was deterred from pursuing a principalship because of “job security.” Additionally, “You never see the Indians when you’re in a leadership position, but you’re pulling arrows out of your back all day long.” Even though he would put his “heart and energy” into the position, he “does not know” who he would “be working with…and that’s a big problem.”

Teacher 6

Teacher 6 works in alternative high school E, grades 9-12, located in district 4 which is a public K-12 District in Nassau County, Long Island. He is a male social studies teacher who has been teaching for a total of 12 years in this district and has spent the past 4 years in school E. Prior to teaching, he was in the computer field for 25 years and “got fed up with the corporate world.” He has held the School District Leadership (SDL) certification for the past 5 years and serves as the director for his high school teachers union. Upon completion of his administrative certification, he enrolled into a doctoral program because he “fell in love with the coursework.” His motivation for obtaining administrative certification was because he “was looking for ways to maximize...income...towards my pension.” “My original motivation was really financial, but then I really began to enjoy what I was doing.” Finally, he thought he could be hired from within as an administrator. “Another motivation for me was the potential that if “Joe” left, there
would be a job here for me.” However, he was deterred from pursuing a principalship because of the “risk verses reward.” He likes being a teacher and to give it up would generate “limited rewards.” Furthermore, “it would be hard to move from this kind of environment into a traditional high school.” “If I were unhappy here, I might be motivated, but there are no push factors at all.”

Teacher 7

Teacher 7 works in junior-senior high school D, grades 7-12, located in district 3 which is a public K-12 District in Suffolk County, Long Island. She is a female teacher of Languages Other Than English who has been teaching for 12 years in school D. Prior to teaching in Long Island, she was a teacher in Mexico City, Mexico for 5 years. She has held the School District Administration (SDA) certification for the past 9 years and serves as a turnkey trainer within her department. She is also a member of her school site-based committee. Her motivation for obtaining administrative certification was because she is “organized” and “likes to serve.” Her “previous supervisor was highly disorganized and ineffective” and she felt that she “could do it better.” She also “wanted to be in a leadership position” so she “could help develop the curriculum” for her subject area because she “loves curriculum.” However, she was deterred from pursuing a principalship because she finds it “unappealing that you are solving problems...in the building...with the staff...students...parents.” Furthermore, she does not like the “politics” and “accounting” aspects and does not like to “crunch numbers.”

Teacher 8

Teacher 8 works in alternative high school E, grades 9-12, located in district 4 which is a public K-12 District in Nassau County, Long Island. He is a male music teacher who has been
teaching for 21 years in school E. Prior to teaching, he owned several retail stores. He has held the School District Administration (SDA) certification for the past 8 years and currently serves as a professional development trainer for teachers to help improve their practice in their classroom. His motivation for obtaining administrative certification was to get “more credits for my pay scale...that would be worthwhile for the future if I wanted to have a future in administration.” Additionally, he wanted “to learn about the administration and more about the workings of our industry.” However, he was deterred from pursuing a principalship because of “contentment right now.” “Also, the job market...I have yet to find something interesting elsewhere.”

Teacher 9

Teacher 9 works in junior-senior high school C, grades 7-12 located in public central high school district 2 in Nassau County, Long Island. He is a male physical education teacher who has been teaching for 13 years in school C. He began working as a teaching assistant and then landed a full-time position in his current district. He has held the School District Administration (SDA) certification for the past 7 years and currently serves as the lead teacher for the physical education department. Prior to this position, he served as the athletic director for 4 years in a middle school in the same district. His motivation for obtaining administrative certification was because “it was very convenient.” The university he obtained his certification from was offering administrative classes, as a cohort program in his school, so he would just “run up the stairs and be at class.” He also thought he might “want to be a district athletic director in the future.” However, he was deterred from pursuing a principalship because of the “hours.” “If you are the leader of the school, it’s your ship, you really have to be there as much as possible.” Furthermore, “the pressure that’s now on the principals is growing and growing
and growing.” “I compared it to a president...when they first come into office...their pictures are great...smiling, they look good...then you see their picture...4 or 8 years later...and they look...physically beat up.” Similarly, “lots of principals I see...they’re just physically and mentally beat up from everything that’s going on now.”

Validity and Reliability

In order to achieve reliability in the methods of data collection in this study, I consulted with a jury of experts, in this case, two school administrators and one senior teacher who reviewed the interview questions. I also asked two teachers with administrative certification to provide feedback after their pilot interviews.

The interview questions were reviewed by a total of five individuals over the course of 3 days. Three of the five individuals provided feedback with regard to questions 3.2, 3.3, and 4.2. In question 3.2, the word deterrents replaced the original word factors. The original question 3.3 was deleted because it was repetitive of 3.2, which remained as one of the interview questions. Question 3.3 was also deleted because it could have been used as a follow up question if necessary to elicit additional information from the participants. Question 4.2 was also reworded to compare current salary and job security with reasons why an individual may not have pursued a principalship. The pilot interviews took place during school hours with two non-participating teachers holding administrative certification. Following the pilot interviews, I used member-checking (Creswell, 2003) by transcribing the data and allowed the participants to review the transcript to ensure that the data was accurately reported.
Data Collection

I collected qualitative data from nine participants through the interview process. Prior to each interview, each participant was emailed a copy of the interview questions. Each interview was approximately 45-55 minutes in length and I asked 19 semi-structured interview questions in addition to various follow-up questions. All interviews were conducted between the months of February and April in the year 2013. The subjects participated voluntarily without any additional incentives and all subjects understood that the interviews were confidential and anonymous. All interviews were digitally recorded and I also took notes during each interview.

Throughout the interviews, I used my notes to generate various follow-up questions and utilized a probing method in an effort to dig deeper in order to extract additional relevant data from each participant. Merriam (2009) explained that probing is a skill and the researcher must listen carefully and be sensitive to the feedback they are receiving during the interview process. Following each interview, I transcribed the data into typewritten form and shared the transcription with each participant to ensure its veracity. All subjects approved their interview transcriptions without making any changes to the document, with the exception of one subject who made two spelling corrections. These interviews helped me to understand why teachers pursued their administrative certification and then chose not to pursue a career as a principal. The interviews also gave me insight into how the new federal guidelines of principal accountability have impacted teachers’ attitudes towards this position. Tables 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 provide an overview of the research questions and overarching questions that were used to collect data. Table 4 provides an overview of sample interview questions and the relationship between job satisfaction and the theories of motivation discussed in the conceptual framework in Chapter 1.
Table 3

*An Overview of Questions Utilized to Collect Data*

**Research Question 1:** What factors initially motivated teachers to seek administrative certification?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Questions</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What factors motivated teachers to pursue administrative certification?</td>
<td>Interviews with teachers</td>
<td>To understand what motivators propelled teachers to seek administrative certification; to understand their intentions for pursuing this position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do teachers rank these motivating factors?</td>
<td>Interviews with teachers</td>
<td>To understand how each motivating factor played a role in seeking certification. (Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of the principalship do teachers find appealing?</td>
<td>Interviews with teachers</td>
<td>To understand teachers’ views and attractions towards the principalship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon certification, what were teachers' intentions for pursuing a principalship?</td>
<td>Interviews with teachers</td>
<td>To understand the objectives of teachers with administrative certifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would motivate teachers to accept a principalship in the future</td>
<td>Interviews with teachers</td>
<td>To understand what would influence teachers to pursue this position in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*An Overview of Questions Utilized to Collect Data*

**Research Question 2:** How do teachers with administrative certifications perceive barriers for not pursuing the principalship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Overarching Questions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Data Source</strong></th>
<th><strong>Objective(s)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of the principalship do teachers find unappealing?</td>
<td>Interviews with teachers</td>
<td>To understand teachers’ views and dislikes towards the principalship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors caused teachers not to pursue a job as principal?</td>
<td>Interviews with teachers</td>
<td>To understand what deterrents caused teachers with administrative certification to be pushed away from this position. (Extrinsic vs. Intrinsic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the greatest deterrent for teachers not to pursue a job as principal?</td>
<td>Interviews with teachers</td>
<td>To understand the level of significance of each deterrent and its influence on teachers’ decisions not to pursue a principalship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have teachers’ opinions towards the principalship changed over time?</td>
<td>Interviews with teachers</td>
<td>To understand the attitudes of teachers towards the principalship in this new era of accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What continues to prevent teachers from pursuing principalship opportunities in the future?</td>
<td>Interviews with teachers</td>
<td>To understand what deterrents influence teachers in this new era of accountability from pursuing a principalship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

*An Overview of Questions Utilized to Collect Data*

**Research Question 3:** To what extent do these identifiable barriers inhibit teachers with administrative certifications from pursuing a career as principal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Questions</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How have the demands of the principalship impacted teachers’ decisions to remain in</td>
<td>Interviews with</td>
<td>To understand how the increased demands on the principal have influenced teachers’ decisions to remain in the classroom in this new era of accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the classroom?</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have financial compensation and job security impacted teachers’ decisions to</td>
<td>Interviews with</td>
<td>To understand how tenure and the salaries of principals influenced teachers’ decisions to remain in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remain in the classroom?</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the increase in principal accountability affected teachers’ decisions to</td>
<td>Interviews with</td>
<td>To understand the attitudes of teachers towards principal accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remain in the classroom?</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have the recent federal guidelines on how principals are evaluated impacted</td>
<td>Interviews with</td>
<td>To understand the attitudes of teachers towards the new Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers’ outlook on the principalship?</td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do teachers envision the ideal principalship?</td>
<td>Interviews with</td>
<td>To understand what would make the principalship appealing to teachers with administrative certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Sample Interview Questions Proposed by Conceptual Framework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Interview Questions</th>
<th>Conceptual Framework</th>
<th>Theorist(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What factors motivated you to pursue administrative certification?</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Maslow, Gruenberg, Fullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation (Intrinsic/Extrinsic)</td>
<td>Herzberg, Alderfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon certification what were your intentions for pursuing a principalship?</td>
<td>Motivation (Intrinsic/Extrinsic)</td>
<td>Herzberg, Alderfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors caused you not to pursue a job as principal?</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Maslow, Gruenberg, Fullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation (Intrinsic/Extrinsic)</td>
<td>Herzberg, Alderfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the increase in principal accountability affected your decisions to remain in the classroom?</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Maslow, Gruenberg, Fullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation (Intrinsic/Extrinsic)</td>
<td>Herzberg, Alderfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would motivate you to accept a principalship in the future?</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Maslow, Gruenberg, Fullan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation (Intrinsic/Extrinsic)</td>
<td>Herzberg, Alderfer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis**

Following each interview, I transcribed the data and began to make sense of the information by finding common language, patterns, and emerging themes. First, I read through each document once and took notes on a separate sheet of paper about emerging words, phrases, and possible themes that were recurring in each transcript. Following Merriam’s (2009) suggestion, I then read each document a second time and began to identify segments in my data that were responsive to my research questions. I used open coding (p. 178) to write down phrases or words that were relevant to my study on a separate sheet of paper. After analyzing these words, I went back to each notation and began to create a preliminary set of codes that I used and applied to each document. This preliminary set of codes helped to collapse the data into user-friendly and recognizable language that tied directly to my research questions. I also created additional codes when necessary in an effort to further organize and collapse the data. I then went back to my documents and wrote these preliminary codes in the margins of each document.
transcript. Table 5 displays a preliminary set of codes that I created during this stage of analysis. Following this practice of coding, I created categories and themes that the codes could be placed into. “The challenge is to construct categories or themes that capture some recurring pattern that cuts across your data” (Merriam, 2009, p. 181).

Table 7

*List of Preliminary Codes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$^+/-$</td>
<td>salary/financial gain/loss</td>
<td>hrs</td>
<td>hours/time demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chlg</td>
<td>challenge/self-rewarding</td>
<td>acct</td>
<td>accountability demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opp</td>
<td>opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>resp</td>
<td>responsibility of the position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peracc</td>
<td>personal accomplishment</td>
<td>prts</td>
<td>parent demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lrn</td>
<td>passion for learning</td>
<td>pol</td>
<td>politics of the position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑ldr</td>
<td>advancing career</td>
<td>tchr</td>
<td>teacher demands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hlp</td>
<td>helping others/working with students/staff</td>
<td>APPR</td>
<td>Annual Professional Performance Review guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jobsec</td>
<td>job security/tenure</td>
<td>unprep</td>
<td>unprepared to become principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ledr</td>
<td>serving in a leadership position</td>
<td>prob</td>
<td>problem solving for students/teachers/parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm</td>
<td>working with the community</td>
<td>press</td>
<td>pressures of the position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chng</td>
<td>change agent/to make positive impact</td>
<td>cont</td>
<td>contentment as a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>envir</td>
<td>environment of a school</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>summers off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rspt</td>
<td>respect on the job</td>
<td>kids</td>
<td>small children at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tchng</td>
<td>teaching satisfaction</td>
<td>test</td>
<td>state testing mandates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frdm</td>
<td>freedom to advance</td>
<td>bud</td>
<td>budget cuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mot</td>
<td>motivated by others</td>
<td>paper</td>
<td>paperwork/state reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Single-Case Analysis

I first analyzed each document using a single-case analysis. This intensive, holistic description is paramount in the beginning stages of analysis (Merriam, 2009). This type of scrutiny provided me with the proper insight into each participant’s experience and their specific reasoning for pursuing an administrative degree. I was also able to ascertain each participant’s reasons why he/she chose not to pursue a principalship. “Although the final write-up or case report may have greater proportion of description than other forms of qualitative research in order to convey a holistic understanding of the case, the level of interpretation may also extend to the presentation of categories, themes, models, or theory” (Merriam, 2009, p.204). In many cases, the participants verbalized similar motivations and deterrents while other participants’ answers varied greatly. Each person brought with them a different perspective, which provided new meaning to this study. By examining each case, I was able to develop codes that were important to each person’s experience. As I continued to code each document thereafter, I began to notice recurring codes. These recurring codes later helped me create the necessary categories and themes that would be important in sorting this data.

Cross-Case Analysis

Following the single-case analysis, I then utilized a cross-case analysis where commonalities and differences were compared between the participants. According to Miles and Huberman (1994), a researcher can strengthen the validity and reliability by analyzing a range of similar and contrasting cases. Furthermore, a cross-case analysis seeks to build generalizations across cases and it leads to building categories and themes that conceptualize the data from all the cases; cross-case analysis can also result in building upon theory which provides an
integrated framework to further examine the data and results of the study (Merriam, 2009). After reading through each document, recurring codes began to present themselves, which I categorized into themes. For example, the code “$+” which means salary increase was mentioned by seven of the nine participants as a motivator to obtain administrative certification. Interestingly enough, when analyzing why teachers decided not to pursue a principalship, the code “$-” which means “salary decrease” was mentioned by three of the nine participants. These participants felt that their salary as a teacher was similar to a beginning principal which caused them to remain in the classroom.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study is to explore the reasons why teachers who hold administrative certifications are not pursuing the principalship. This study also investigated key variables of how increased accountability, increased time demands, job security, and lack of financial compensation have impacted teachers’ decisions not to pursue a career as a principal. The questions developed for the interview protocol were based upon the relevant literature in education. Each question is relevant to the research questions being investigated. This chapter is a summary of my background, the research design, the sampling technique, the demographics of the districts and schools, the interview questions utilized in this study to collect data and methods of data analysis.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to explore the reasons why teachers who hold administrative certifications are not pursuing the principalship. It is vital to understand why these groups of teachers are not entering into this leadership position during this new era of increased educational accountability. This study will also examine how the demands of this position, financial compensation, job security, and the implementation of new federal guidelines have impacted teachers’ outlook on a principalship. Qualitative research methodology was utilized to gain a deeper understanding on this particular area of research. In this chapter, I will present the findings of the interviews by organizing them according to the major themes that emerged as a result of the coding process. This chapter presents and analyzes these findings.

Nature of the Study

The research sample selected for this study consisted of secondary level teachers with administrative certification who have chosen not to pursue a principalship. A total of nine subjects participated, which represented a 90% participation rate. The participants were asked a total of 19 questions. The first set of four questions provided basic information about each participant’s teaching experience, length of time in the classroom, and leadership positions held as a teacher. The second set of five questions asked the participants about their impetus to seek administrative certification as it related to intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors, their intentions to pursue a principalship and aspects of the principalship they found appealing. The third set of five questions asked participants about the deterrents in seeking a principalship as it related to intrinsic and extrinsic disincentives and how their view of the principalship has
changed over time. In the fourth set of five questions, four of the questions asked participants to discuss how the demands of a principalship, financial compensation, job security, increased accountability, and new federal guidelines have impacted their decision to remain in the classroom; the fifth question asked participants how they would envision the ideal principalship if they were to pursue this position.

Presentation and Analysis of Findings

All nine interviews took place in a private office, empty library, or conference room during and after-school hours.

Background Information

The first set of four questions gained basic information about each participant’s background. These background data were utilized in an analysis of the teacher responses to determine if patterns existed, specifically when analyzing their leadership capacities as teachers.

Years in Teaching

A total of nine teachers were interviewed. Of these teachers, five were male and four were female, although gender was not a factor in this particular study. The number of years the participants served as teachers in the classroom ranged from 12 to 26 years. The average number of years participants served as classroom teachers was 17 years.

Administrative Certification Type and Years Certified

All of the participants successfully completed an educational leadership program that resulted in administrative certification; this certification qualifies an individual to serve in a leadership position at the building level and district level. Seven of the nine participants
possessed the School District Administration certification and two of the participants possessed the School District Leadership certification. The title of the certification changed from School District Administration to School District Leadership in the year 2007; both certifications represent the same designation. The average number of years participants have possessed an administrative certification was eight years.

**Teacher Leadership Positions**

All nine participants assumed various leadership roles at their current school and/or former school(s) throughout their teaching career. Currently, seven of the nine teachers (78%) continue to serve as teacher-leaders in their schools.

**Analysis of Interview Discussions**

**Research Question 1:**

What factors initially motivated teachers to seek administrative certification?

**Motivation to seek administrative certification**

The second set of five questions asked participants to discuss reasons why they pursued administrative certification as it related to intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors, their intentions to pursue a principalship and aspects of the principalship they found appealing.

For the first interview question in the second set of questions (2.1) as it relates to research question 1, I asked each teacher the following question: What factors motivated you to pursue your administrative certification?
Each participant discussed various motivations for pursuing their administrative certification for a total of 10 reasons. Seven of the nine teachers interviewed (78%) explained that money (extrinsic) was a motivating factor. Teachers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 pursued certification in an effort to move across the pay scale by earning more credits, which would increase their salary. Teacher 3 stated, “It got me to my 75 credits, because in our district you have to have a concentrated program to get to 75 [credits].” Teacher 5 said, “It was about the money, it’s about an $11,000 difference when you have a master’s [degree] or master’s plus 60 [credits].” Teacher 8 stated, “The only way you make more money is to get more credits.” Teacher 6 entered education as a second career; he earned his certification in an effort to increase his salary for his pension.

Four of the nine teachers interviewed (44%) explained that they earned their administrative certification because they enjoyed learning (intrinsic). Teacher 4 enjoyed learning about educational law and how it pertained to special education students. Teachers 6 and 8 enjoyed learning about administration and the work it entails. Teacher 6 “fell in love with the coursework.” He enjoyed his administrative experience so much that he enrolled into a doctoral program to earn his Ed.D. Teacher 8 felt that his learning experience would give him an honest perspective on the background of administration. Teacher 7 said, “I love curriculum. That’s where my passion is. I wanted to be in a leadership position so I could help develop the curriculum for my subject area.”

Four of the nine teachers (44%) aspired to move up the ladder and advance within the field of education (intrinsic). Teachers 3 and 5 pursued administrative certification as the next logical step in their careers. Teacher 5 stated, “I thought teaching might not be fulfilling for a 30
year career.” Teacher 9 aspired to become a district athletic director in the future and pursued his certification for this position.

Three of the nine teachers (33%) felt as a principal, they could make a greater impact on the lives of both students and teachers (intrinsic). Teacher 5 stated, “I thought that I could have a greater impact on things as an administrator than I could as a teacher. I thought that some of the policies and decisions I could make on behalf of the school or a district or a building would have a greater impact on the entire student body and not just the students I come into contact with.” Teacher 7 felt her previous supervisor was disorganized and ineffective and she disagreed with the top-down managerial style of leadership. She felt her leadership style and willingness to serve others would have a more beneficial impact on a school. Teacher 8 felt his role, as a professional developer would complement his ability to help others if he were to pursue an administrative position. He felt strongly about helping other administrators become better within their field.

Two of the nine teachers (22%) desired a greater challenge for themselves (intrinsic). Teachers 1 said, “It wasn’t because I necessarily wanted to be an administrator. If I ever decided to feel like the time was ready or I was ready to move on and challenge myself.” Teacher 2 stated, “I think that when I started teaching, every 3-5 years, I started wanting more of a challenge, so I started looking for things that would challenge me because I started getting kind of stagnant in what I was doing.”

Two of the nine teachers (22%) obtained certification in anticipation of budgets cuts (extrinsic). Teachers 2 and 5 were motivated to obtain certification in case of personnel cuts.
Teacher 5 especially worried about personnel cuts as a physical education teacher and needed something to fall back on in case his position was cut.

The remaining four reasons were independent of each other, which were convenience (extrinsic), personal accomplishment (intrinsic), the freedom to pursue a principalship (intrinsic), and desiring to be hired from within (intrinsic). Teacher 9 obtained certification because a university started a cohort program in his district and classes were offered in his building, which made going back to school an easy transition for him. Teacher 2 felt obtaining another degree would be another personal accomplishment as she currently holds certification in health, physical education, and biology. Teacher 1 felt having the freedom to become an administrator would place her into a more advantageous position if she were to pursue a career as a principal. Teacher 6, at the time he pursued his administrative certification, was interested in moving into a principal position within his district.

For the second interview question (2.2) as it relates to research question 1, I asked each teacher the following question: How would you rank these motivating factors from most motivating to least motivating?

Participants ranked 10 motivational factors from most motivating to least motivating. All nine (100%) participants ranked their number 1 and number 2 reasons for pursuing their certification. Three participants (33%) included their number 3 reason for obtaining certification.

The number 1 reason participants (Teachers 3, 4, 6, and 8) were motivated to pursue administrative certification was for financial gains (extrinsic); Teachers 2 and 9 aspired to move up the ladder and advance within the field of education (intrinsic); Teacher 1 wanted the freedom
to pursue administration (intrinsic); Teacher 5 wanted additional job security if he ever left the classroom (extrinsic); Teacher 7 desired to help others by serving in a leadership capacity (intrinsic).

The number 2 reason participants were motivated to pursue administrative certification was divided equally. Teachers 3, 5, and 6 wanted to move up the ladder (intrinsic) and Teachers 4, 7 and 8 had a passion for learning (intrinsic). Teacher 1 wanted to earn more money (extrinsic); Teacher 2 felt it was for personal accomplishment (intrinsic); Teacher #9 pursued certification out of convenience (extrinsic).

The number 3 reason participants were motivated to pursue administrative was financial gain (extrinsic) and wanting to acquire more knowledge (intrinsic). Teachers 2 and 5 pursued certification for financial gains and Teacher 6 had a passion for learning more about administration.

For the third interview question (2.3) as it relates to research question 1, I asked each teacher the following question: What aspects of the principalship do you find appealing?

Each participant discussed various aspects of the principalship they found appealing for a total of six facets. Eight of the nine teachers interviewed (89%) explained that working with various members of the teaching staff, student body and school community were appealing aspects of the job. Teacher 3 said, “What would be appealing to me is the ability to work with staff and faculty in a positive manner making people better.” He also believed that working together with veteran teachers and difficult students is an appealing aspect of a principalship. Teacher 4 enjoyed the idea of working with different organizations such as the PTA in order to improve the overall culture of a school. Teacher 6 viewed the principalship as a venue to
provide teacher leadership. Teacher 8 said, “Being a principal in a building is really about how can I influence people in order to move them forward.” Teacher 9 expressed that teachers feel like “big brother” is always watching and teachers do not feel supported by the administration. He desired to be a leader who can assist the faculty.

Three of the nine teachers interviewed (33%) explained they found a principalship appealing because they could serve as an agent of change in their building. Teacher 2 expressed that being an agent of change and staying current with different educational trends was an appealing aspect of the principalship. Teacher 4 wanted to develop a vision and have the ability to shape the culture of a school by working with a team of teachers and administrators. Teacher 8 stated, “To make change. To work with the kids, to work with adults, to help structure a system where we can do better and do more than what we have been doing.” He also felt that although we have been in the process of “reinventing” education and leadership, that we have also been “static” over the past 20 years. Being able to serve as a principal would provide him with the opportunity to make a positive impact on both education and administration alike.

Two of the nine teachers interviewed (22%) explained they found a principalship appealing simply because they could serve as a leader. Teachers 1 and 2 expressed that it was desirable to be a “leader of the building” and have people “looking up at you” which was an attractive part of the job.

The remaining three items teachers found appealing were independent of each other; specifically, being trusted, challenging themselves, and creating programs for students. Teacher 1 enjoyed the perception of teachers being able to trust her as a principal and Teacher 2
expressed her appeal to be challenged everyday by the numerous responsibilities associated with the position.

There was one outlier that existed in this particular question. Teacher 7 stated that there was nothing appealing about a principalship. She stated, “None, absolutely none because you are dealing with all of the problems. I find it horrendous.”

For the fourth interview question (2.4) as it relates to research question 1, I asked each teacher the following question: Once you received your administrative certification, what were your intentions for pursuing a principalship?

Each participant discussed their intention or non-intention to pursue a principalship after receiving their administrative certification. Seven of the nine teachers interviewed (78%) did not have any intentions of pursuing a principalship. Of these seven teachers, four (57%) expressed an interest in pursuing a position other than the principal. Two of the nine teachers (22%) intended to pursue a principalship.

Teacher 1 liked the idea of having her certification in her back pocket knowing there was flexibility to move forward. Teacher 2 stated, “When I first came out with the degree or as I was thinking about pursuing the degree, I really did not think I wanted to be a principal.” Teacher 3 was not actively looking for a principalship because it was challenging enough for him to take administrative classes and continue with his coaching responsibilities. Teacher 4 felt her administrative internship never prepared her for a principalship. She said, “I was really hesitant with the building experience, it was not going to happen. And then the district, I just felt it was too big a job. So, I did not go anywhere with that.” Teacher 5 previously served as an athletic director but decided this position was not fulfilling so he returned to the classroom. Teacher 7
simply stated, "I did not study administration to be a principal." She found this position to be unappealing due to the responsibilities associated with this position. She also commented, "I feel as a principal, you lose your cohort, your basic companionship with equals. No one is at the exact same level as you. I do not enjoy being alone at the top, managing people with problems all the time." Teacher 9 was not ready to sacrifice his coaching responsibilities to be a principal and said, "To be honest, I never really thought about being a principal."

Although seven of the nine teachers (78%) did not intend to pursue a principalship, four of these teachers (57%) expressed an interest in pursuing other positions. Teachers 2, 5 and 9 were all interested in pursuing the position of athletic director. Teacher 7 expressed her desire to be a director of foreign language and stated, "So, if once going to a chairperson or director of foreign language, I would have loved to move on to a New York State position or somewhere I can help people with curriculum. I really always wanted to do that kind of administrative position, never to principal, always curriculum."

Two of the nine teachers (22%) intended to pursue a principalship. Teacher 6 applied internally for an assistant principalship and other positions, which he did not reveal. He only applied for positions in districts that he was familiar with. He said, "There were districts where I knew people or I knew of people and I would apply for positions there." Although he did apply for positions, he did not feel confident due to his age as an older candidate. He also felt that working in an alternative high school might work against him. Ultimately, he claimed, "I was a finalist internally for a couple of positions, but did not get, which I am certainly not sorry about." Teacher 8 said, "My thought for the future would have really been to possibly go back into the city [New York City] as a principal." However, in the end, he has not pursued this position but claimed, "That is still on the back burner, but not as much as it was in the past."
For the fifth interview question (2.5) as it relates to research question 1, I asked each teacher the following question: What would motivate you to accept a principalship opportunity in the future?

Participants discussed various reasons that would influence them to accept a principalship in the future for a total of eight incentives. Five of the nine teachers interviewed (56%) explained the environment and philosophy of the district must balance their individual needs. Teacher 3 stated he would accept a principalship in the future but only in an environment in which his educational philosophy coincided with the district’s philosophy. Teacher 5 said, “I would need to know what the staff was like, what type of support they offer, are they a collegial group or are they a backstabbing, spoiled, over-indulged unionized group who cries when they are told that their lesson plans need improvement and that they do not have the critical components of a lesson in their lesson when they are observed.” Teacher 6 would be motivated to accept a principalship if was in a unique environment similar to his alternative high school. He also said, “I love this job, I love what I do, I love the people I work with, I love the kids I work with. So, just looking at risk versus reward, it just does not make sense to me now unless it was a very special opportunity.”

Three of the nine teachers interviewed (33%) explained a salary increase would be an appealing factor to advance into a principalship in the future. However, participants expressed that currently the financial gain is small considering the increased hours and responsibilities that they would incur as a principal. Teacher 4 commented, “I am eight years away from retirement and I am at the top of the scale, so I do not know that I would ever get the money I am going to have. That is part of the problem too.” Teacher 5 felt that it was difficult to walk away from a salary that pays $140,000 with extra stipends he receives as an athletic coordinator and coach.
Furthermore, he felt that a starting principal’s salary would not be sufficient. He stated, “I would have to say at least 30% [of my current salary] over what I am making.” Teacher 9 compared the salaries of teachers who are active outside of the classroom and starting principal salaries and expressed that they are too similar. He discussed a conversation with a former assistant principal seven years ago who left the classroom because he received a 40% increase over his teaching salary. However, he is no longer motivated to pursue principalship opportunities because the salary is too low. “Administrators put in a lot of nights. Eighty nights out of the year, to be totally honest, for nothing extra.”

Two of the nine teachers interviewed (22%) explained if their children were older they would pursue a principalship in the future. Teacher 2 said her number one reason for not advancing is because she has small children at home and working in the summer would keep her away from her family. She stated, “As a principal, I would want to be available after school for different school events. I would want to be available on the weekends, so at this point right now, I know that because of my family situation, I would not be able to put in the time that I know is necessary to be an effective principal.” Teacher 9 also expressed that he would be interested in a principal position if he did not have two children at home. He also mentioned that as his children grow older that a part of him would enjoy leading a school and serving as a principal.

The remaining five reasons that teachers stated they would be motivated to advance into a principalship in the future were independent of each other such as job security, the responsibilities of the position, to be challenged, loss of their current job, and to move up the ladder and advance within the field of education. Teacher 5 expressed he could not sacrifice tenure at his current salary unless he had job security as a principal. He said, “How do you walk away from a job where you are getting paid $140,000 dollars and you love what you are doing to
go and roll the dice for a job that you do not have tenure in.” Teacher 7 had no intention of pursuing a principalship and said, “If I knew it [principalship] lasted very few years and it was a perfect stepping stone to another position.” Teacher 8 would accept a principalship if he felt disenfranchised in his current position. He said, “It would have to be my wanting to change me again, to re-invent myself would be really the case, which would have less to do with the school system, but more for me to change myself.” Teacher 4 stated, “Because of the APPR, if I lose my job in 3 years, I want to start a charter school.” She felt that the only way she would accept a principal position is if she was fired from her current teaching job. If she was fired, she expressed an interest in opening her own student-centered charter school.

Summary of research question 1

Participants were motivated to seek administrative certification for a variety of reasons. Of these reasons, the majority of participants were intrinsically motivated by a passion to learn and a desire to advance into a higher position within the field of education. However, the number 1 reason for seeking administrative certification was due to an extrinsic motivation, which was for financial gain. The majority of participants found a principalship appealing because they had the ability to work with and support members of their staff in addition to being an agent of change in their schools. However, the majority of participants did not have any intentions of pursuing the principalship even after they received their administrative certification.

Research Question 2:

How do teachers with administrative certifications perceive barriers for not pursuing the principalship?
Deterrents to the principalship

The third set of five questions asked participants to discuss aspects of a principalship they found unappealing, reasons why they did not pursue a principalship as it relates to intrinsic and extrinsic disincentives, the greatest deterrent to a principalship, and how their view of a principalship has evolved over time.

For the first interview question in the third set of questions (3.1) as it relates to research question 2, I asked each teacher the following question: What aspects of a principalship do you find unappealing?

Participants discussed unappealing aspects of a principalship for a total of 10 factors. Four of the nine teachers interviewed (44%) explained that dealing with the multitude of problems associated with unions, teachers, students, and parents were all unappealing elements of the job. Teachers 5 and 8 commented that they would not want to deal with teachers who complain. Teacher 5 said, “They [teachers] should not be in education. It’s 1% of the kids that cause 99% of the problems. So what do you do? Many of the teachers burn out and say all that negative stuff because they focus 99% of their energy on that 1%.” Teacher 3 felt that the most unappealing aspect of a principalship is dealing with parents, especially the complaining parents. He said that parents who call to complain about a teacher, a class, or a program being cut are the worst. He said, “As it is with any job, you know, dealing with the complaints aspect of it. Especially depending on the district you are in, some parents have more to say than others and some parents get more credence than others in certain districts. Some districts are old school where you have the blue collar mentality.” He also pointed out how parents in wealthy districts complain by using the line “I pay the taxes for that district and this is what I want to see and I am
not going to be quiet until you do it my way.” Teacher 7 said, “I find it unappealing that you are solving problems whether it’s problems in the building, problems with the staff, problems with the students, problems with the parents.”

Three of the nine teachers interviewed (33%) explained the increased time principals spend at work was an unattractive aspect of the job. Teacher 1 simply stated, “I think the time you have to put in is unappealing.” Teacher 8 claimed in his district it is expected that the principal attend every event and said, “That they expect you to be there 24-7 and I think that is a totally unrealistic expectation. I think that is a big deal today where we almost have to be there for everything which, not that we should not, but that’s almost unrealistic. And if we do not delegate for other people or divvy it up, that becomes unfair to the principal.” Teacher 9 disliked the idea of attending night events. He recognized the importance of working from seven o’clock in the morning until five o’clock in the afternoon, but he was not in favor attending the numerous evening events. He claimed, “It is the 60 to 80 nights a year that you have to be there. You have to be there to be a good administrator. People want you to be around and I think you have to lead by example. You have to be there if you expect your teachers to be there.”

Three of the nine teachers interviewed (33%) explained dealing with the politics associated with the position and having to navigate various groups of people is an unpleasant aspect of a principalship. Teachers 4 and 5 disliked the politics associated with central office administration and the personal agendas of various community members. Teacher 4 said, “The idea that you have to shake in your pants when the superintendent calls. If our superintendent is letting everyone know that he is coming down, principals in this district jump through hoops to make sure silly things are in order. Using our principal as a model, he jumps through hoops for the superintendent and he hand picks what teams the PTA parents are going to get.” Teacher 6
discussed how the new evaluation system is closely tied to political agendas that do not have students’ best interest in mind and said, “You have to be a real politician I think to be successful. I guess I would categorize that as unappealing. You cannot go out and always just do the right thing for the right things sake. There is always a spin involved.”

Two of the nine teachers interviewed (22%) explained that the new principal evaluation system has become an unappealing aspect of a principalship because they are evaluated based upon student achievement data, which can be an unfair measure to assess a principal’s performance. Teacher 4 said, “I think that you can have great staff members and you can have great program going on in your school and everybody is working collaboratively together, but if all of a sudden a test score comes back and it is not so favorable, now everybody kind of looks at you and what you have done wrong.” Teacher 6 expressed his distaste regarding education and how it has shifted to measure students’ test scores, which can reflect poorly on principals. He commented, “There is this move towards quantification which I think is absurd because I do not think education is something that is necessarily quantifiable, so I think there is a scrutiny that is going on that does not make sense.”

Two of the nine teachers interviewed (22%) explained being in the public eye is a disagreeable aspect of the principalship because the public and central office is scrutinizing principals’ decisions. Teacher 1 said, “You are the first to blame if anything goes wrong. It is that you take risks and that there is nowhere to hide if things falter and you have to be very strong which is good and bad, but I think that the fact you are the first one to put your neck out is a risk.” Teacher 6 said, “Education is under attack, teachers are under attack, schools are under attack and principals are in the most difficult position between the community and the teachers and there are a lot of aspects to the job that are just unwinnable.”
Two of the nine teachers (22%) expressed making difficult decisions and dealing with confrontation from others are unappealing aspects of a principalship. Teacher 2 said, “Sometimes you are viewed as the bad guy. If you have to tell different people that work underneath you that they cannot do something or that it is now going to be your way. There is no negotiation.” He also disliked the idea of making cuts to programs or personnel due to budgetary constraints and justifying or defending your decisions to the public and community, especially if the community disagrees with your decisions. Teacher 3 also found that making budgetary cuts to programs and staff difficult aspects of a principalship and commented, “How do you tell somebody that you are losing a position, your income, your livelihood is going to be taken from you. To inform the person of that decision, to have to look the person in the eye and just say basically, good luck, it is tough. That might actually be the toughest part of the whole job, letting someone know they are not returning.”

The remaining four reasons teachers found a principalship to be an objectionable position were independent of each other such as increased responsibility, paperwork, inability to coach, and inadequate salary. Teacher 2 expressed the reality of being a principal means being more accountable and stated, “When you take on a principal role, you definitely know going into it that you are going to be taking on more responsibility.” Teacher 4 assisted her principal writing Adequate Yearly Progress reports and disliked the paperwork aspect associated with state reporting mandates. Teacher 9 said, “I still have a lot to do as far as my coaching career goes and that is something that keeps me out of the principalship.” He also commented that his salary and a beginning principal’s salary are too similar and the extra responsibility he would assume as principal was uninviting to him.
For the second interview question in the third set of questions (3.2) as it relates to research question 2, I asked each teacher the following question: Explain what factors caused you not to pursue a job as principal?

Participants discussed reasons why they chose not to pursue a job as principal for a total of nine disincentives. Four of the nine teachers interviewed (44%) explained that they were unwilling to give up tenure and enter into a position without job security (extrinsic). Teacher 1 commented, “Comfort level of where I am now. I think it is scary sometimes to have a change and to start new and meet new people and to have to prove yourself again.” Teacher 3 was unwilling to pursue a principalship because he is the breadwinner and could not risk taking another position where he may not receive tenure. He was also fearful of applying for other administrative positions and commented, “With districts cutting positions and condensing positions and combining positions, for me to give up right now in the department, I am probably right in the middle of 12 people, so unless we had a drastic cut, I am pretty safe in my department.” He was also worried that assistant principal positions would be “farmed” out to deans, which is also scary as these positions are often the stepping-stone to the principal. Teacher 6 did not feel the rewards outweighed the risks and said, “I like what I do too much here to give this up for what I see as limited rewards.”

Three of the nine teachers interviewed (33%) explained that a principal’s salary (extrinsic) was insufficient, which prevented them from pursuing this position. Teacher 2 commented, “Perhaps if the salary was a little bit higher, you know, maybe my husband would think about maybe dropping back his hours so then he would be able to provide more child care for my children.” Teacher 3 expressed, “Currently, to move into an administrative role, I probably make more than most beginning assistant principal jobs, which is where I would have
to start. I would actually be taking a pay cut right now.” Teacher 4 analyzed salaries of principals and decided at this point in her career that she was not going to pursue a principalship. She commented, “I was making more as a teacher because I had 60 credits and I had years in. I had a kid in college, just starting college. Yes, salary was definitely a deterrent.”

Two of the nine teachers interviewed (22%) explained the increased hours and time demands (extrinsic) of the position deterred them from pursuing a job as principal. Teacher 2 did not pursue a principalship because of child care issues and stated, “I’m the one that is providing child care in the summer and the increased hours that you would take on as a principal and then with salary, it does not fit at this point for my family.” Teacher 9 was also deterred by the number of hours principals spend at their schools. He said, “If you are the leader of the school, it is your ship, you really have to be there as much as possible. In order for you to be an effective administrator, people have to see you around. You cannot hide behind any closed doors. I think you have to be around not only during the school day, but I think you have to be at a lot of events that are going on.”

Two of the nine teachers interviewed (22%) explained they enjoyed teaching and working with students (intrinsic). They also felt that they would lose contact with students if they left the classroom. Teacher 6 stated, “I like what I do too much here to give this up for what I see as limited rewards. If I did not like what I was doing, if I was unhappy here, I might be more motivated, but there are no push factors at all. I think I would be further removed from the kids which at some point in time might not be such a bad thing, but these days I do not want to do that. That is what I get pleasure out of.” Teacher 8 expressed, “Contentment right now. Being content with where I am with my job presently. If I am discontent, I would pursue.”
Two of the nine teachers interviewed (22%) explained that the politics (extrinsic) associated with a principalship caused them not to pursue a position as principal. Teacher 6 disliked the idea of working with unfamiliar staff and not being able to trust his colleagues. He said, "There is an analogy. You never see the Indians when you are in a leadership position but you are pulling arrows out of your back all day long. You don’t know who is two-faced. I do not know who I am going to be working with and that is a big problem.” Teacher 7 disliked playing politics with the central office and explained, “I do not like politics. I do not like that you need new windows and you are going to put that in your budget and guess what, you are not going to get them no matter how much. Maybe you have to schmooze a little bit, maybe you have to negotiate, maybe you think you have an in with your central office, nut nothing is written in stone or is clear. Depending on who you have in the central office, you think it is your building, but it is not really your building.”

The remaining four deterrents that caused participants not to pursue a principalship were independent of each other, which were not feeling prepared to pursue this position (intrinsic), not wanting to manage the budget (extrinsic), dealing with teacher, parent, and student problems (extrinsic), and having to navigate the changes associated with the new Annual Professional Performance Review regulations (extrinsic). Teacher 4 felt unprepared to move into a principalship and said, “I was not comfortable going for building principal when I had never done my internship there. Maybe if I had played my internship out differently, but I never went into it thinking that I was going to pursue this.” Teacher 7 did not want to deal with the statistical aspect of the job, which plays a large role in evaluating teachers and students. She stated, “The accounting of it. I don’t like to crunch numbers and I find that they [principals] have to crunch numbers a lot with all different things. The statistics are so important now, I
don’t like that.” Teacher 9 felt education has changed and principals are faced with new pressures from the state. He equated change to the new evaluation system in which principals are scrutinized under and maintained, “The pressure that is now on principals is growing and growing and growing. A lot of principals I see that they are just physically and mentally beat up from everything that is going on now. I think there are so many unanswered questions right now that it would be hard to be a principal because your people are looking for you to give them answers and you as the leader do not have answers because you are not receiving the answers from the people above you and you are not receiving answers from the state.”

For the third interview question in the third set of questions (3.3) as it relates to research question 2, I asked each teacher the following question: In your opinion, what is the greatest deterrent for not pursuing the principalship?

Participants listed their greatest deterrent to a principalship for a total of nine reasons. Three of the nine teachers interviewed (33%) stated that job security and their unwillingness to give up their tenure was the main deterrent to a principalship. Teacher 3 stated, “Right now, it is the economy. It is that security thing. It is the idea of, I could move, go into a great district and all of a sudden, you get a new superintendent and they say, you know what, we have too many administrators, and we are cutting back. So, security is a big thing for me right now.” Teacher 5 was also worried about not being successful in the role of principal and said, “The only two people I know who pursued it are now out of work or in lower positions making less money than they were when they left teaching.” He also commented that advancing into a principalship is like taking a step back before taking a step forward because you give up tenure as a teacher. Teacher 6 did not want to risk tenure at this point in his career because he was near retirement. He said, “If I was 10 years younger, I might be looking at this very differently.”
Two of the nine teachers interviewed (22%) explained the time demands and number of hours principals are required to spend on the job was the main deterrent to a principalship. Teacher 8 was deterred by what he called an "unrealistic expectation" to have to be at school 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. He also expressed the responsibilities and evening events should be divided between the principal and assistant principal. Teacher 9 expressed the number of hours expected of principals at school would not work for him because of his children at home.

The remaining four reasons that participants felt were the greatest deterrents to a principalship were independent of each other, which were navigating the changes associated with the new Annual Professional Performance Review regulations, not being fairly compensated, lacking confidence to pursue a principalship, and wanting to advance into a different administrative position other than the principal. Teacher 4 expressed his distaste towards the new evaluation system that measures a principal's effectiveness based upon student achievement data. He claimed, "I would not want to be, just like the teacher does not want to be rated on the kids' test scores. I would hate to be the poor principal that has to be rated on the teachers' scores. That is horrible because not every teacher works up to their ability." Teacher 2 felt she would make less money when she compared her hourly salary as a teacher with the hourly salary of a principal and stated, "I would say probably salary is the major one just because I have been in my district for 16 years and for me to start off in a principal role in another school district and working the extra hours, if you looked hour by hour it would come out with a salary decrease." Teacher 1 lacked the confidence in serving as a principal and did not feel her personality fit this position. She also disliked the idea of making important decisions that would ultimately funnel through the superintendent. She compared the role of principal to the president of the United States and said, "In that kind of position, you have to be driven, not only by power, but also by
control and being super confident in yourself. You have to have a good self-image. You really have to think highly of yourself to know that your decisions are the last. You have to have a lot of confidence and charisma and know how to talk to people and network and stroke.” Teacher 7 did not want the additional responsibilities associated with a principalship. She simply stated, “The greatest deterrent is not being able to work in my favorite field which is detailed curriculum writing and development.”

For the fourth interview question in the third set of questions (3.4) as it relates to research question 2, I asked each participant the following question: How has your opinion of the principalship changed from the time you obtained administrative certification until now?

Participants discussed in-depth reasons about how the role of the principal has changed over time. It is important to note that each participant interviewed had various experiences in education, including various leadership positions held and time spent teaching in the classroom, ranging from 13-26 years. It is also important to consider that each participant obtained their administrative certification at different points in time, between 1999-2012, which may or may not factor into their perception of how the role of principal has changed.

All nine participants discussed similar responses to explain how the principalship has changed over time and discussed the following themes: various pressures the principals face, new accountability mandates, state testing, increased time demands, and the challenges associated managing the building budget.

Participants expressed that principals today must come with multifaceted experience to perform their jobs and teachers may be fearful of a principalship because the public judges principals so harshly. Principals today must have the confidence to succeed in education because
scores and student achievement data are being published and criticized in the news media. Participants stated that principals are more worried about the public’s perception as it pertains to their ratings and how the level of competition between schools has increased as a result of the new testing mandates. Principals are also more accountable as a result of the implementation of the new APPR regulations. The principal has an enormous responsibility for teachers and students to perform well on state examinations. Furthermore, principals today must focus their attention on numbers rather than the whole child and deal with pressures to either remain at the top or improve greatly. Teacher 5 expressed that the new APPR regulations have created a top-down approach which can negatively impact the culture of a school. In his experience, he has watched the culture of his building be negatively impacted as a result of the increase in state testing mandates. He felt the Superintendent is pressuring the principals, the principals are pressuring the teachers, and the teachers are pressuring the students to perform well on state assessments.

Participants discussed the challenges principals face in managing their budgets with respect to budget cuts. Furthermore, principals must also manage their buildings with less staff as schools are cutting various personnel positions. Teacher 2 said, “They are decreasing the assistant principals that they have, the clerical staff they have, the custodians that they have or having to be put in a position where they [principals] are forcing people to do more than their share of what they are supposed to be doing.” Teacher 3 and 4 discussed the impact of the 2% tax cap, which has also impacted school budgets. Teacher 4 stated, “The tax cap is killing programs. How is a principal supposed to run a school with say, 10-15 teachers less the next year? If you cut your English teachers, you also cannot offer extra services. Principals now are
stuck between a rock and a hard place because their staff is cut. But if you cut a music program or an art program, those parents appear. The accountability would be way over my head.”

Participants expressed that principals spend more time on non-administrative tasks such as returning phone calls, attending meetings, dealing with parents, handling teachers, and managing students. Participants felt the principal has to do more with less in education today as there is decreased funding from the state in addition to managing other people’s problems. Participants discussed how principals today are limited in their ability to implement a new vision due to the new APPR regulations and instead spend their time preparing students for state assessments. Teacher 4 said state assessments have become “a way of life” for principals. She also commented, “We got a grant for iPads. We are doing too much test prep that we can only bring in the iPads once every 3 weeks, maybe. So, kids are not going to get to use them.”

Participants felt it is unfair to rate principals on teacher and state assessment data. Teacher 5 claimed, “Now they [principals] are under the gun too and this pressure, the APPR bologna. Ninety-seven percent of the teachers have gotten either approaching or excellent. What the heck is the sense of this APPR stuff? So, it makes even more work for them.”

Participants expressed that prior to the implementation of the APPR regulations, principals could manage and motivate people more easily as compared with today. They also claimed that the principalship is virtually a thankless job and is poorly compensated for the added responsibilities. Teacher 6 felt otherwise with respect to new accountability mandates. He agreed that there has been an increase in principal accountability, which has resulted in additional pressures and said, “I think that as funding becomes tighter and as there is greater public scrutiny and we hear talk about accountability. Maybe there is a little bit more spin involved, maybe a little bit more pressure involved, but it is the same job. I do not know that my opinion of it has really
changed.” On the contrary, teacher 9 stated, “Principals are being evaluated on how the teachers are doing, who are now evaluated on how the children are doing. I think that we are more concerned with our teachers being successful according to assessments from the state and that is a major change because when the emphasis comes off children and goes to adults, how is that education?”

With respect to politics, participants felt that the principal is at the mercy of others including the central office, teachers, parents, and even students. Teacher 7 felt the principal is expected to solve everyone’s problems. She expressed during her administrative internship she was more open-minded about pursuing a principalship, but now she sees what it entails and no longer finds the job appealing during this time in education. Teacher 8 expressed principals today are less knowledgeable and are entering this position without the proper skill set to be effective leaders. He also discussed how principals today are not using educational research to make the best decisions for their schools. He stated, “I think they are coming in less knowledgeable about the craft. I think they come in less knowledgeable about the theory, about the actual workings of what we do.”

Participants also felt that No Child Left Behind and the Common Core State Standards are negatively impacting students and teachers. Teacher 9 felt teachers are focused on preparing students to take tests rather than focus on creativity in the classroom. Teacher 8 expressed his concern that the CCSS was implemented by states without experimentation of the curriculum. He thought this approach was backwards and counterproductive. Furthermore, he felt educational leadership programs have become less stringent in their acceptance process allowing anyone to enter the program. In addition, he said there are numerous fast-tracked educational
leadership programs, which are not preparing teachers to become future leaders, thereby impacting leadership positions in a negative way.

For the fifth interview question in the third set of questions (3.5) as it relates to research question 2, I asked each participant the following question: Currently, what continues to keep you from pursuing principalship opportunities?

Participants discussed current disincentives that prevented them from pursuing a principalship in today’s educational climate for a total of 10 reasons. Five of the nine teachers interviewed (56%) expressed a desire to remain in the classroom because they enjoyed working with children. Teacher 4 expressed, “I still love being in the classroom. I still love working with them. I am still happy in the classroom.” Teacher 6 expressed he enjoyed using his leadership skills and training he received in his administrative program to benefit his students in the classroom. He stated, “I am getting some of the same opportunities and satisfaction while continuing to do the job that I love. So, I consider myself very lucky.” Teacher 8 serves as a professional developer and commented, “I have got the best of both worlds. It is kind of like the best job in education I would say.” Teacher 9 said, “I enjoy coaching. I like being out there with the kids and I like that every year it is changing. So every year, one group graduates and I am one of the varsity football coaches. It is constantly changing and you never know what to expect the next day out there on the field.”

Four of the nine teachers interviewed (44%) explained they were content with their teaching salary and were unwilling to leave the classroom to assume a principalship for a small increase in remuneration. Teacher 1 expressed she is currently the breadwinner in her family and was afraid to pursue a principalship because of the risk involved during this time period in
education. Teacher 2 commented, “As of right now, I make more money than my husband does, so I am kind of the breadwinner. So for me to give up a job where I have a lot of job security and go into a position where I could lose my job, it could be a big hit for my family.” Teacher 3 stated, “The idea that right now it is probably a pay cut for me which at this point, with my wife being on maternity leave, is not really a feasible thing for me.” Teacher 5 also felt he was financially stable in his teaching career and was not willing to pursue a principalship.

Four of the nine teachers interviewed (44%) explained they were unwilling to pursue a principalship because they did not want to lose their tenure in this economy. Teacher 2 discussed the importance of having job stability and feared that as a new principal she may be terminated if her school did not perform well. She commented, “Job stability is another reason that I have not mentioned before but that is another big one. If your school is not performing that well, you are the first person they get rid of. There is not as much job stability.” Teacher 3 felt job security was of high importance and asserted, “If somebody could guarantee and say, if we hire you for this position, you are always going to have this job. It is never going to go anywhere.” Teacher 5 felt that leaving a tenured position after 26 years in the classroom would be far too great a risk. Teacher 6 said, “The risk verses reward scenario. If I saw an opportunity with the right people and the right place at the right time, I would consider it, but I have no desire to give up what I am doing.”

Three of the nine teachers interviewed (33%) explained they were unwilling to pursue a principalship because of their family. Teacher 1 felt her family was far too important to become a principal today. She was unwilling to sacrifice time with her family to endure the numerous challenges associated with a principalship. She also stated it was scary to take a leap into a principalship knowing she had a small child at home. Teacher 2 also felt leaving the classroom
would impact her family and she was not willing to disrupt her home. She said, “Family is
definitely something that is always in the back of my mind when I think about the principalship.”
Teacher 9 said his family life at home prevents him from seeking principalship opportunities
because he is not willing to spend more time away from his two small sons at home.

Two of the nine teachers interviewed (22%) explained they were unwilling to pursue a
principalship because of their coaching responsibilities. Teachers 5 and 9 were both unwilling to
give up coaching to become a principal. Teacher 9 said, “I cannot see giving that up for the
future.”

The remaining five reasons why participants felt they were unwilling to pursue a
principalship in today’s educational climate were independent of each other, which were feeling
content in their current job, being too close to retirement, not feeling prepared to serve as a
principal, not having any interest in the position, and not being able to find a principalship in a
district of their liking. Teacher 1 expressed it is difficult to leave a position where she has built a
reputable name for herself and stated, “I think the comfort level, the blood, sweat and tears that I
put in where I am, the respect that I get, the responsibilities that I have now.” Teacher 4 is not
only near retirement age, but he felt he did not receive the proper training during his
administrative internship. Teacher 5 explained she had no interest in becoming a principal and
commented, “I know it is an area that I have no interest in doing. I just do not like it. I do not
like the position itself. And, that is another reason why I feel so cozy in the whole curriculum
development because I am really good at that. In that, I can be as zany and as weird and funny
and as hyperactive as I am. Development and putting it on paper and creativity and that will not
be happening in a principalship.” Teacher 8 stated, “I have yet to find something interesting. I
have yet to have a place talk me though an ad or have a conversation with somebody who works
in the district that says, yeah, we are really modern, we really want to move forward, we really want to experiment, and we really believe that education can change.”

Summary of research question 2

Participants revealed there were various aspects of the principalship they found unappealing. The majority of participants were deterred from a principalship due to extrinsic reasons such as lack of job security, insufficient salary, increased hours, increased accountability, budget cuts, and new testing mandates. Finally, the majority of participants were intrinsically motivated to remain in the classroom because they enjoyed working with children and were not willing to sacrifice this to pursue a principalship.

Research Question 3:

To what extent do these identifiable barriers inhibit teachers with administrative certifications from pursuing a career as principal?

Present day challenges and principal accountability

The fourth set of five questions asked participants to discuss how current day demands of a principalship, financial compensation, job security, increased accountability and new principal evaluation system has impacted their outlook on the principalship.

For the first interview question in the fourth set of questions (4.1) as it relates to research question 3, I asked each teacher the following question: Explain how the demands of the principalship have impacted your decision to remain in the classroom?

Participants elaborated on how the present-day demands on a principalship have impacted their decision to remain in the classroom for a total of seven reasons. Six of the nine
teachers interviewed (67%) explained the new state mandates and challenges associated with the new APPR regulations continue to deter them from a principalship. They specified that these new mandates have placed more responsibility and accountability onto the principal. Additionally, they also felt that the new teacher and principal evaluation system is flawed.

Teacher 1 expressed that the position of principal is no longer safe and said, “Nobody knows what is going to happen and it seems like the principal will be the first to go on the chopping block if the school is not where it needs to be or meeting the expectations that are set for the state.” She further elaborated on the benefits of being in a classroom in today’s educational climate because teachers have the ability to “manipulate the kids” and work with students who are struggling and improve their test scores. She also commented, “You know which kids you can work with to make the data look good.”

Teacher 2 also discussed the additional testing that has been mandated by the state. He equated job stability to testing and felt principals are now faced with losing their positions if their scores do not meet the state standards. Teacher 4 thought it was easier to serve as a teacher in the classroom managing a small group of students rather than serving as principal. He also expressed it is easier to teach test preparation to students than perseverate over an entire building of students’ scores. He said, “I can still stay in my classroom and I can still teach my kids even if it is test prep. I can still have that contact with kids that I like and we can play test prep. But I do not have the stress of saying I have 300 kids that need AIS services, yet I only now have four teachers left instead of nine teachers. I do not have those worries. It is much easier being in the classroom.”
Teacher 5 expressed, “Standardized testing is a major roadblock to quality education. And that is what we are facing. Yes, it is a terrible, it is terrible.” Teacher 7 discussed how the Common Core State Standards have impacted the job of the principal. She described her principal by saying, “Our guy, he is just so much busier than he ever has been. I know that this man has less time to his life.” She also discussed an encounter she had with another principal who has been impacted by new state mandates who began to cry because of the pressure she was under. She said, “And she is thin as a rail, she barely eats, and she says I just cannot get it done. She does not have an assistant principal to help her so she has to observe all the teachers of a K-2 building. She was breaking down crying. I have never seen her do that. She is always the most responsible, professional, normal, how do you say, levelheaded person I know and she started to cry. The new things, with all the student learning objectives and the local parts and all the APPR in general.”

Teacher 9 talked about the unknown as a principal. He felt that principals today are being impacted by different rules and regulations the state is requiring of schools. He discussed how principals are unaware of the new regulations because they are not receiving proper direction from the state, which has resulted in confusion and questions by various stakeholders. He also discussed how his principal had difficulty answering teachers’ concerns throughout the year regarding the new APPR regulations. He worried that he would be unable to answer questions as well and this made him uncomfortable. He commented,

“I think the unknown of what is expected of you is more of a deterrent. The idea that they [New York] send down these regs and then somebody will question it and nobody knows the answer to it. They cannot get us answers on something as simple as what are we supposed to assess our kids on physical education. I understand there is a test. Here is the pre-test or baseline and here is the post-assessment,
but what are we supposed to do for physical education. So all these questions are coming up and we are not getting answers back. If they would just send down the regs and we were able to take those regs and put them into our classroom and it would all make sense.”

Three of the nine teachers interviewed (33%) explained the increased time demands have deterred them from a principalship. Teacher 1 said, “The time that the principal has to put in, being a teacher, it used to be like that, like it is the best job for having a family because you are off in the summers and you are home at 3:00 for your kids. When you are a principal, it cannot be like that. You have to be the last one to leave a lot of times, probably all of the time.”

Teacher 2 discussed how the expectations on the principal have increased and they are expected to be everywhere. She commented, “I mean it has always been expected of them to go to after-school functions, to work all summer, but I just feel with all the demands now with testing, it is even longer and longer hours that they are expected to be here at the schools. There are more meetings, there are more parent meetings, there are more board meetings, especially with the problems with budgets that they have in different school settings.” Teacher 8 compared his time spent at work to his current principal and expressed he would rather be with his family instead of working additional hours as principal. He also discussed the importance of delegating responsibilities as a principal. If principals do not delegate their time to others, their health may be compromised. He explained,

“I start at about 8:00 a.m. and I am home at 4:30 p.m. usually. That is a decent day. My principal is there till 9:00 p.m. at night and he starts the same time I do. It is a lot of time. It is also a lot of time to be away from your family. It is a lot of time for weekends. If it requires the time and you do not want to put in the time, then the job is going to be miserable. I am 47 years old. When 5 o’clock rolls around and you are still there, 9 o’clock rolls around and you are still there, the games, the sports, the events. So it does take a lot.”
Two of the nine teachers interviewed (22%) stated that giving up tenure as a teacher in this job market and starting over as an administrator have deterred them from a principalship. Teacher 1 worried about tenure and commented that politicians are not supportive of tenure. She also feared as a principal, you are the first person to be blamed and without tenure there will be little tolerance for new principals to make mistakes and worry that their job would be in jeopardy. Teacher 6 felt apprehensive about pursuing an administrative job because he would have to sacrifice his tenure as a teacher. He was unwilling to do this so late in his career.

Two of the nine teachers interviewed (22%) explained they enjoyed working being in the classroom and working with students and are not willing to give this up to become a principal. Teacher 5 felt as a teacher, he had a greater influence on the lives of his students compared to an administrator. He believed his interactions with students far surpass the relationships a principal may have with students. He also believed he had the ability to influence the future of students’ lives more than any principal. He said, “This morning I spoke to four parents and three coaches about colleges and money. What am I going to do if I am a principal? Teacher 6 also felt passionate about remaining in the classroom. He commented, “I love what I am doing and do not want to do anything different.”

The remaining three reasons why participants felt they were deterred from the demands of a principalship in today’s educational environment were independent of each other, which were handling budget and personnel cuts, having a negative perception of the principalship, and having to solve problems on a daily basis. Teacher 5 commented that he did not want the stress of having to prepare students for additional tests with fewer personnel. He stated, “The cuts are killing the principal. I do not have the stress of saying I have 300 kids that need AIS services, yet I only have now four teachers left instead of nine teachers.” Teacher 3 was deterred because
of his perception towards the principalship. He felt that his current principal has tainted his
tattitude towards the principalship because of his top-down style of leadership. He stated, “I
think a lot of it is the perception of the position that has kind of hindered me. I just think it is
more of being a little sour on the position itself because of the way you have seen some people
handle it.” Teacher 7 expressed her distaste at constantly having to solve other people’s
problems. She felt serving as a problem solver took away from the enjoyment of going to work.
She said, “The demands in my opinion you are always solving problems. So, where is the
pleasure of going to work? You are always solving problems. I think it is just the negativity of
the job and that it does not have what I love.”

For the second interview question in the fourth set of questions (4.2) as it relates to
research question 3, I asked each participant the following question: How has financial
compensation and job security factored into your decision to remain in the classroom?

All nine participants discussed comparable responses to explain how money and
sacrificing tenure has played a role in their decision to remain in the classroom. Eight of the nine
teachers interviewed (89%) explained that principals are not fairly compensated especially with
the added responsibilities associated with the position while one of the nine teachers (11%) expressed that money was not an issue.

The majority of participants felt principals are not being fairly compensated today for the
increased time and responsibility they assume in their positions. Participants also compared their
current teaching salary to a beginning principal’s salary and felt the pay increase was not
substantial enough to leave their current position. Participants also claimed they would take a
pay cut if they assumed a new principalship. Teacher 3 disliked the idea of having to work
during the summer and attend numerous evening events and not be fairly compensated for his
time spent on the job. He said, “You are working an extra 30 to 45 days a year and you are
making less money. That does not make a lot of sense.” Teacher 6 felt it did not make sense to
leave the classroom today because the salary difference is not large enough. Additionally, he is
currently enrolled in a doctoral program and when he graduates, it will place him in a favorable
position across the teacher’s salary schedule. Teacher 7 revealed that she makes $106,000 and to
leave for a principalship would be a risk. She also felt the economy is not doing well and she is
high on the “totem pole” of teacher seniority and is not willing to sacrifice her position. Teacher
9 compared his hourly salary to a principal and felt he was better compensated as a teacher.
However, he did not think principals were paid accordingly based upon the number of hours they
spend on the job. Teacher 8 was the only one to express that money was not an issue because of
his success as a previous business owner.

Seven of the nine teachers (78%) explained that they were not willing to leave their
tenured position to advance into a non-tenured principalship while two of the nine teachers
(22%) would relinquish tenure to advance into a principalship.

With respect to job security, the majority of participants did not want to sacrifice tenure
for a principalship. Participants also felt that they could not sacrifice tenure because of their
family obligations at home. Teacher 1 and 3 were hesitant to leave their position because they
were in the middle of the teacher seniority list. Teacher 1 said, “You never want to be the last
one hired because you will be the first one fired. It is a scary leap to take once you put in all the
time and work your way up the seniority ranking and teaching in the classroom.” Teacher 3 said,
“I would be able to make more money as a principal, but it is more time, it is more nights, it is
later days, later hours. So it defiantly does play a big factor.” Teacher 4 stated, “I would not
want to have to be tenured again. I have not got too many years to take that chance now.” She did
mention that at the beginning of her teaching career, job security and tenure did not enter into the
equation. However, she is at the end of her career and sacrificing job security is a major factor in
not pursuing a principalship. Teacher 5 equated tenure with his family, security, oil bills,
mortgage and his home. He feared bad politics would play a role in receiving tenure. He
communicated, “I have seen them fill big time administrative positions with horrible people to
say that they have a position and then get rid of that person the next year. It is cut throat, it is
devious.” Teacher 8 stated, “No job is secure today in my mind. And it will not be in the
future.” However, he articulated that he would sacrifice his tenure for the right position in a
district that met his needs. Teacher 9 also explained, “It is nice to have job security, but I do not
think that weighs heavily on my decision to stay as a teacher.”

For the third interview question in the fourth set of questions (4.3) as it relates to research
question 3, I asked each participant the following question: How has the increase in principal
accountability affected your decision to remain in the classroom?

Participants discussed various aspects of increased principal accountability and how it
has impacted their outlook on the principalship and their decision to remain in the classroom.
Six of the nine teachers interviewed (67%) explained the increase in principal accountability has
not impacted their outlook on a principalship. The majority of participants felt that teachers and
principals alike should be responsible for the outcomes of their schools.

Teacher 2 articulated, “There is always going to be accountability in education and there
is always accountability for a principal, so that is not really a major deterrent for me to pursue
the principal’s role.” She also thought the new APPR regulations might be non-existent in the
future. Teachers 3 and 6 felt principals have always been accountable for the success of their students, teachers and overall operations of the building. They described principal accountability as being the same with the exception of the state highlighting the importance of teacher performance and student achievement. Teacher 5 was not concerned with the increased accountability. However, he expressed he would not want to be linked to a teacher with a poor reputation who closed the classroom door and collected a paycheck. Teacher 8 embraced accountability and stated, “Accountability would never be an issue, never in a million years. It would actually be a benefit of the job. That would be something that would be more of a challenge actually.” Teacher 9 did not fear accountability, but he was concerned about the increase in state testing. He expressed, “I think that some of the regulations coming down from the state are setting education up for failure. If a child does not enjoy going to school, they are not going to be as successful as the child who enjoys going to school. And I do not care how smart they are or not. If you enjoy going to school, I believe you are going to do better than the child who might be extremely smart but is absolutely miserable when going to school.”

Three of the nine teachers (33%) expressed that the increase in principal accountability has affected their outlook on a principalship, which has deterred them from pursuing this position. Teacher 1 detailed, “It is scary. It probably has 70% to do with remaining in the classroom. The accountability on everyone is terrifying I think right now. I guess maybe I am not as confident in taking on that leadership role being the one in charge.” Teacher 4 did not feel comfortable being evaluated under this new system because principals are being linked to teachers’ scores. She said, “I am staying in the classroom. I am not going to let another teacher’s score affect my job.” Teacher 7 felt the new APPR regulations have placed educators in the public eye with nowhere to hide. Furthermore, these regulations are insulting
administrators because the observation process has become more complicated. She also expressed the evaluation system is flawed because the state continuously changes directions and percentage scores and guidelines, which ultimately impact a principal’s rating. She said, “It is absolutely unfair.”

For the fourth interview question in the fourth set of questions (4.4) as it relates to research question 3, I asked each participant the following question: How have the recent federal guidelines on how principals are evaluated impacted your outlook on the principalship?

Participants considered how the implementation of a new principal evaluation system has impacted their outlook on the principalship. Participants also discussed how the new evaluation system has impacted education. Nine of the nine teachers (100%) expressed that the new evaluation system has negatively impacted education while seven of the nine teachers (78%) explained the new evaluation system has altered the way in which they now view the principalship.

Teacher 1 felt teachers who come to work and collect a paycheck have ruined it for all the other teachers, which has made her begrudge the new changes. She said, “Now everybody has to pay, so I feel resentful in some ways.” She also felt the changes have altered the teaching that takes place in the classroom and test preparation is destroying educators’, leaders’, and students’ passion for education, teaching and learning. She explained, “It does add too much stress, we do not teach anymore, we teach to tests. Who’s passionate about teaching to a test?” She also explained the books that are now being ordered are all “test prepped.”

Teacher 3 explained the new evaluation system has placed a greater awareness onto principals who are now more accountable for their buildings. He claimed the evaluation system
forces principals to be more visible and proactive rather than sit behind their desks and delegate responsibilities from an office. He also stated the evaluation system has principals focused on test scores, which has “narrowed” teaching and learning in the classroom. He detailed, “Unfortunately, I think in a lot of districts it will change the way some classrooms function and that it will become more test prep based because the test scores are getting so much attention. I know a math teacher who only teaches the questions on the Regents and kids do beautifully. But when you get to the next year, they [students] do not have all the extra problem solving abilities.” Teacher 4 felt the evaluation system is going to weaken principals’ job security if they are being evaluated on student achievement scores.

Teacher 5 expressed the new principal evaluation system is unstable and principals are being targeted when something goes awry in their building. He felt there is too much emphasis on this new evaluation system and the focus should be on helping teachers become better at their craft. He commented, “The principalship is a huge job. Principals need leeway, plain and simple. They need time to develop teachers. They need time to evaluate teachers. Many things need to be taken into account before you evaluate a principal. I think it is crazy that they [principals] are being subject to the whole APPR nonsense.”

Teacher 6 felt principals are being restricted in a system that does not account for all aspects of their job responsibilities. He also claimed the evaluation system fails to measure leadership, vision and inspiration. He stated, “I think it is unfortunate that these guidelines are being developed and people are being forced to be evaluated in particular ways that I do not necessarily think always make sense.”
Teacher 7 expressed the new evaluation system is unfair and tedious. She said, “APPR is insulting administrators because it is saying you guys [principals] do not know how to do your job.” She also commented that principals are spending more hours completing observation reports, which is also making the job more difficult. Teacher 9 felt the new principal evaluation system is evaluating principals on things they cannot control such as student achievement scores and unmotivated teachers. He argued that principals no longer have total control over their schools or their budgets and the central office is restricting their authority. He declared, “It makes me think twice about ever pursuing that career or think three times actually because of the fact that there are so many other areas that could impact your evaluation as a principal that you may or may not have control over. I think it is very unfair to be evaluated on somebody else’s evaluation. I should be evaluated on the work I do.”

Two of the nine teachers (22%) expressed the new evaluation system has not changed their view of a principalship. Teacher 2 thought the evaluation system is good because everyone is finally being evaluated in a similar manner. However, she did mention it is unfair for a principal to be exclusively evaluated on test scores and stated, “Now principals are pretty much solely being evaluated by test scores and that is not really a fair assessment on all the wonderful things they do.” She also discussed how special education scores should not negatively impact principals. Her idea of a fair system would be to evaluate the whole child and said, “There are some students that grow tremendously in other ways, whether it is mentally, emotionally, socially, that never can be measured solely on test scores.”

Teacher 8 expressed being a principal of a school is similar to owning your own business and felt principals should be judged upon student achievement scores. He commented, “It is the pecking order. If my teachers are good, I am good. If the kids do really well, if my teachers do
really well, I really do well. That makes sense. My business.” However, he did comment that the Common Core State Standards are not providing students with a skill set necessary to navigate the world when they leave high school.

For the fifth interview question in the fourth set of questions (4.5) as it relates to research question 3, I asked each participant the following question: How do you envision the ideal principalship?

Participants discussed their perceptions of the ideal principalship and the characteristics associated with this position. All nine participants (100%) discussed alternative models of a principalship that involved the following: the autonomy to make building level decisions such as setting their own hours, managing the budget and hiring staff; an increase in principal salary; and the state having less control over principal evaluation measures.

Teacher 1 envisioned the ideal principalship in which the state had less control over the school and the principal had greater autonomy. She imagined a principalship in which the principal was evaluated in a fair manner in an educational system that promoted free-thinking instead of treating students as robots who are programmed to take tests. She asserted, “I think it is the state that makes it undesirable. Teachers are starting to feel like if they put a kid who is level two in their class, they do not want that kid. Kids are starting to be numbers and machines and it cannot be successful. Too much accountability and too much of looking at students as numbers.”

Teacher 2 envisioned the ideal principalship in which the principal had more time off during the school year to balance a family life and flexible summer hours. She would like to be responsible for all of the hiring of her staff and be supported by the central office with regard to
the budget and staffing. She believed the principal should have more opportunities to collaborate with other principals in addition to dividing the workload with other district-wide administrators. Furthermore, a new principal should be given job security for at least two years to show growth and improve student achievement scores. She believed salaries should be higher than veteran teachers and commensurate with the size of the school based upon student population.

Teacher 3 envisioned the ideal principalship in which the principal’s philosophy coincided with the district’s philosophy. The principal would have a positive rapport with the union and be in control of hiring their own staff. He also wanted more autonomy to manage the budget and implement new programs. He explained, “Having a decent budget without having to worry about cuts and trimming this and trimming that all the time, where you can actually add and not subtract, so that you can promote good programs for the kids.” He also voiced that the starting principal salary would have to surpass a veteran teacher’s salary.

Teacher 4 envisioned the ideal principalship in which the principal had autonomy from the superintendent. She wanted unlimited funding to have the freedom to offer enrichment classes to select students. For example, she said, “Blocking English and math for the kids that needed it, but then the principal can say the kids that do not need it, you can offer enrichment classes that do not necessarily fit into the guidelines of the state education department.” She desired a system in which the principal provided teacher autonomy to determine the needs of the students and curriculum rather than follow the CCSS. She also wanted a reduction in the number of tests a student must take and detailed, “I am not saying get rid of testing, I am saying less focus on testing so an eighth grader does not have to take six tests at the end of the year. That is ridiculous. Every teacher is teaching to a test and the principal is observing lessons that are test prep.” She also commented the state should abolish the new administrator’s test that aspiring
principals must take before they become certified. She felt this was a poor tool in hiring new principals and said, “I think it is ludicrous the way they [state] test for school building and school district administrators now. It should go on experience. Anything but a test score. Computerized tests to make you a principal? That is ridiculous. But that is what the new ones [aspiring principals] are facing, all day tests. Really?”

Teacher 5 envisioned the ideal principalship in which the principal controlled all of the hiring. Furthermore, a new principal should receive several years of mentoring so they can succeed rather than fail in their first few years. A principal should receive tenure before a 3 year period in addition to receiving a thirty percent raise of their current teaching salary. He argued, “I am trustworthy, I am loyal, I am obedient to my superiors and I am kind to the kids. If that is what you want, you do not need three years to know that. The post office gives 90 days probation period.”

Teacher 6 envisioned the ideal principalship as a distributive leadership model in which teams of people work together rather than follow the hierarchical leadership model. He articulated, “As far as the structure of the job, I do not believe in hierarchical leadership. I believe that you build teams, that you need to distribute leadership, that you need to be more of a facilitator than a commander.” He also discussed the importance of principals having autonomy from the board of education to make building level decisions.

Teacher 7 envisioned the ideal principalship in which the principal had the ability to hire their own staff and have autonomy to manage their building budget without being micromanaged from the central office. She also felt a new principal’s salary should surpass a veteran teacher’s salary. There should also be alternate paths to various administrative positions such as
curriculum directors. She argued that additional administrative courses should be designed to meet the needs of various administrative positions.

Teacher 8 envisioned the ideal principalship in which the principal maintained a teaching responsibility to have contact with students. Principals must have the ability to hand pick the immediate members of their cabinet and each person in the cabinet would have a specialized role. Unions would not exist and principals would have the ability to conduct a walk through in the teacher’s classroom without facing resistance. Principals would have the freedom to encourage their teachers to teach creativity and logic, not content. Principals should have the autonomy to run their schools like Google and said, “Basically, I would almost run it like Google, where there is more freedom for people and again, give people the freedom to the curriculum.”

Teacher 9 envisioned the ideal principalship in which the principal received support and guidance from the central office. Principals would be mentored and they would also have the freedom to train their teachers. Principals would have control over hiring in addition to an increase in salary. He articulated, “For this school alone, I could mention five people that should be in administrative roles that will not take it because the salary, the compensation is not there. If there are four or five people in every building in this district, there are 16 people who should be in the principal or administrative role that are not.”

Summary of Research Question 3

Participants revealed that there has been a shift in educational accountability, which has directly impacted principals of today. As a result of this shift, the majority of participants have elected to remain in the classroom. In addition to the increased time demands and additional
pressures principals face, participants also opposed the increase in standardized testing and felt the new principal evaluation system is flawed. Furthermore, lack of financial compensation and loss of tenure continue to be prominent deterrents to the principalship in this new era of educational accountability. Finally, all participants felt the new evaluation system has negatively impacted education. They expressed the federal and state government should have less control over education and provide principals with the autonomy to make the best decisions for their buildings.

Summary

The findings of this study explored reasons why teachers who hold administrative certification are not pursuing a principalship during this new era of educational accountability. In this chapter, I reported the findings of this study to answer the following research questions: What factors initially motivated teachers to seek administrative certification? How do teachers with administrative certifications perceive barriers for not pursuing the principalship? To what extent do these identifiable barriers inhibit teachers with administrative certifications from pursuing a career as principal? Throughout my description of findings, I used intrinsic and extrinsic motivational theories to support the participants’ impetus to seek administrative certification and then choose not to pursue a career as principal. In summary, participants were both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated to seek administrative certification. However, they found the principalship unappealing due to extrinsic reasons such as lack of job security, insufficient salary, increased hours, budget cuts, and new testing mandates. Furthermore, participants felt the increased time demands, new accountability mandates, and new principal evaluation system are negatively impacting education and is deterring potential candidates away from this position. The participants of this study found the possibilities of a principalship an
attractive position under many circumstances. However, their enjoyment of teaching and working with children remained an intrinsic motivator to remain in the classroom. In Chapter Five, I will provide a summary of the findings in relation to the research questions and a discussion that further relates the findings to the conceptual framework and intrinsic and extrinsic motivational theories.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study was guided by the following research questions: What factors initially motivated teachers to seek administrative certification? How do teachers with administrative certifications perceive barriers for not pursuing the principalship? To what extent do these identifiable barriers inhibit teachers with administrative certifications from pursuing a career as principal? In this chapter, I will summarize the findings of the study as they relate to these research questions. I will also discuss the relationship between the findings and previous research on the perceived barriers to the principalship in this new era of educational accountability. Furthermore, I will make additional connections to the theoretical framework with regard to intrinsic and extrinsic motivational theories. Finally, I will conclude this chapter with recommendations for further research, policy, and practice.

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to explore the reasons why teachers who hold administrative certifications are not pursuing the principalship. During this new era of educational accountability, it was important to understand why teachers pursued their administrative certifications but chose not to pursue a career as principal. Analysis of interview transcripts revealed teachers found a principalship appealing and sought administrative certification for a variety of intrinsic and extrinsic reasons. However, further examination unveiled that although teachers pursued their administrative certification, they were unwilling to pursue a career as principal for a variety of reasons, such as insufficient compensation, increased time demands, and new pressures associated with an increase in principal accountability.
Research Question 1

What factors initially motivated teachers to seek administrative certification?

Participants discussed various intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors in seeking administrative certification with a majority of reasons being intrinsic motivations. However, the large majority of participants explained that money or an increase in salary, which is an extrinsic motivation, was the number 1 reason for pursuing certification. Participants elaborated on their ability to move across the teacher pay scale, increasing their salary over $10,000 after earning credits beyond their master’s degree. Participants explained they also enjoyed learning and wanted to advance into a higher position, which ranked as the number 2 motivation for seeking certification. Although participants discussed their motivation to seek certification, they also described today’s economy and job market, which has been negatively impacted by the 2% tax cap and, as a result, were concerned about leaving their tenured position to pursue a non-tenured principalship. In this consequence, teachers felt the risk of advancing outweighed the small monetary reward they would receive in principal salary and were unwilling to sacrifice their current job security for an unsecured principalship.

A large majority of participants found a principalship appealing because they enjoyed working with various teacher-groups, parent-groups, student-groups, and community organizations. Participants felt principals could positively impact their schools by promoting a positive school culture, implementing new curricular opportunities for students, providing professional development for teachers, and being a supportive figurehead within their administrative structure. In this new era of educational accountability with changes being made at the federal and state levels, participants felt strongly about working in an environment that supports teaching and learning. Participants also felt they could serve as agents of change in
their schools and implement a vision to promote a positive school culture. One participant in this
study did not find any aspect of a principalship appealing.

Participants discussed their intention to pursue a principalship after receiving
administrative certification with only two participants intending to pursue this position. Many of
the participants felt a sense of security in obtaining their certification to provide them with the
possibility of advancing, but in reality, they never envisioned moving ahead. Although
participants did not intend to pursue a principalship, more than half desired other leadership
positions such as foreign language director and athletic director.

Participants offered reasons that would influence them to consider a principalship in the
future. The majority of participants expressed they would pursue a principalship if the culture of
the district coincided with their educational philosophy. Furthermore, participants expressed a
willingness to assume this position if principal salaries were higher and a proper mentoring
program was available to support them through the tenure process.

Research Question 2

How do teachers with administrative certifications perceive barriers for not pursuing the
principalship?

Participants discussed unappealing aspects of a principalship with the majority explaining
today’s principalship is about managing a multitude of criticisms and complaints associated with
unions, teachers, students, parents, and community members. Complaints also varied across
socio-economic levels with affluent communities pressuring principals to meet unattainable
demands.

Participants elaborated how the increase in hours without fair compensation continued to
be a strong deterrent to a principalship. Some participants disclosed their current salary to be
over $100,000 and felt a beginning principal’s salary would not be commensurate with the added demands and increased responsibility. Some participants even described having to take a pay cut to advance into this position. They were also concerned about meeting the unrealistic expectation that principals are only successful when they spend “24-7” or 24 hours a day, 7 days a week at their schools. Participants were also concerned about burnout and feared the increased hours might lead to stress-related health issues as well.

Participants felt that the current education system is “under attack” and perceived the political aspects of a principalship to be unattractive. They feared central office, namely the superintendent, who they depicted as someone who no longer supported principals. Participants also felt the central office could impede their ability to implement programs or establish a vision for their school. Instead they viewed the role of the central office as the gatekeeper of data. They also criticized the new principal evaluation system calling it flawed, as assessment scores and teacher ratings should not predominantly measure principal effectiveness. Although there has been a shift towards quantification in measuring principal performance, participants felt it was imperative to evaluate principals based upon other measures that are not quantifiable.

Participants discussed various intrinsic and extrinsic disincentives to pursuing a principalship, with a majority being extrinsic impediments. Participants expressed their unwillingness to trade their job security for a non-tenured principalship, and this was considered the greatest deterrent. Teachers who participated in this study were “comfortable” in their teaching positions due to their seniority and, as a result, were unwilling to leave the classroom to begin the tenure process all over again. Furthermore, participants felt they were unprepared to consider a principalship and did not feel confident in their leadership abilities even after completing their administrative internship. Others expressed trying to balance family
responsible for maintaining the professional demands of a principalship prevented them from pursuing this position.

Participants discussed how the role of principal has evolved from the time they obtained their administrative certification, which was between the years 1999-2012 or 1 and 14 years ago. They elaborated on the importance of preparing principals to meet new challenges associated with increased accountability mandates. They also stressed the significance of principal training and the importance of exposure to a diversity of situations during administrative internships. Principals must also be creative with their building budgets as they are expected “to do more with less” as the 2% tax cap has resulted in budgetary roadblocks for all levels of leadership.

Participants discussed the new Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) regulations, requiring principals to increase student-passing percentages on state and local assessments or fear their schools will be rated ineffective. They also felt that the new Common Core State Standards (CCSS) has negatively impacted education calling it “backwards” and “counterproductive” because teachers are compelled to narrow their teaching to accommodate a curriculum that presumes it will make students internationally competitive. Teachers expressed they feel pressured to “teach to the test” and as a result are stymied from teaching creatively in the classroom. With regard to administrative certification programs, one participant expressed a concern regarding entrance into these programs, which he believed have become too lenient granting access to under-qualified candidates.

**Research Question 3**

**To what extent do these identifiable barriers inhibit teachers with administrative certifications from pursuing a career as principal?**
The majority of participants expressed that the changes in the new principal evaluation system and increase in state testing mandates has caused them to remain in the classroom. They felt the position of principal was no longer safe when compared to teachers who have the ability to remain in the classroom and “manipulate” students’ test scores. Participants felt plagued by the various state mandates associated with the Annual Professional Performance (APPR) regulations. As a result, teachers felt that principals struggled to lead them in a positive direction as guidelines continue to mutate. In addition, they also believed that disorganization from the state has made the principalship more complex due to a lack of leadership from above. This perceived disorganization also trickled down to the central office level. Under these circumstances, participants felt it becomes a principal’s nightmare when there is a lack of vertical and horizontal leadership causing unnecessary confusion and frustration at all levels.

All participants felt the new principal evaluation system has negatively impacted education, which had a profound impact on their perceptions of a principalship. Participants balked at this evaluation system because they believe it fails to measure elements that are essential to leadership such as, the ability to change a culture, implement a vision, or the capacity to motivate and inspire others. They felt these measures should be included in the principal evaluation system, in addition to finding ways to measure principal compassion. Participants explained that the new evaluation system has forced principals to focus the majority of their attention on test preparation, which has altered classroom environments and is “destroying” educators’ passion for teaching. To further confound this issue, participants felt non-tenured principals are expected to mentor teachers and raise test scores within their first year or be subject to harsh criticism or removal from their position.
Participants discussed their perceptions of the ideal principalship. They explained that the principal should have more autonomy in hiring his or her own staff and determining budgets. Additionally, they felt that salaries should be commensurate with the added responsibilities. Finally, they stated that state governments should have less control over schools, specifically the way in which principal effectiveness is measured.

Participants viewed a principalship as a precarious position in this era of educational accountability. The new accountability mandates and changes in educational accountability systems that hold principals more liable for the success or failure of their school has altered the perception of this group of teachers. As a result, many of the participants felt they could not successfully navigate the current challenges associated with a principalship. In addition, having a secure teaching position that pays a sufficient salary outweighs the risks of advancing into a principalship that is inadequately compensated and associated with high stakes testing and new performance measures.

Discussion

This study began with the assertion that the landscape of education has changed due to the enactment of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), which was developed to promote educational excellence by increasing accountability and holding schools more responsible for student achievement (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). More recently, President Obama’s Race to the Top (RTTT) initiative has further reformed education by implementing a system that measures teacher and principal effectiveness through new performance measures (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Research over many years has established that principals’ successful leadership positively affects school outcomes including student achievement (Brewer, 1993; Edmonds, 1979; Jacob & Lefgren, 2005; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). According to
Hallinger (2005), principals support instructional leadership by sustaining a school vision, sharing leadership opportunities with teachers, and supporting quality curriculum and instruction. Effective principals also influence school climate by involving all stakeholders and building and sustaining trust (Kythreotis, Pashiardis & Kyriakides, 2010).

While *No Child Left Behind* and *Race to the Top* inaugurated a new movement in education, researchers (Carnine, Denny, Hewitt & Pijanowski, 2008; Guterman, 2007; Howley, Andrianaivo & Perry, 2005) reported that school districts were finding it increasingly difficult to recruit qualified new principals. Furthermore, a report by the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (as cited in Beteille, Kalogrides & Loeb, 2011) asserted that more than half of the nation’s principals were baby boomers and that one-third of these leaders would reach retirement age over the next several years. To further compound this issue of recruiting new leaders, principals in low-performing districts are leaving for principalships in high performing schools. While there are reports of a principal shortage, there is evidence that there are an abundance of teachers with administrative certification. However, these individuals are not pursuing a principalship due to a variety of reasons including increased time demands, lack of financial compensation, and increased accountability mandates (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Gates, Ringel & Santibanez, 2003). A problem exists due to the inability to attract and recruit candidates to serve in leadership positions such as the principal. In this new era of educational accountability, it is vital to understand how teachers’ perceptions of the principalship have been impacted.

With regard to a conceivable shortage, this investigation did support the current body of literature as the participants of this study possessed administrative certification, and they were unwilling to advance into a principalship for a variety of reasons. Grubb and Flessa (2006)
concur that the literature suggests there is not a shortage of individuals with administrative certification. Rather, there is evidence that reveals a shortage of teachers aspiring to this position. A recent report from the Wallace Foundation (2013) revealed, “The challenges of filing principal vacancies with strong candidates appears most dramatic in New York City, where the sheer size of the school system and the need to hire as many as 200 principals each year are continual drivers of priorities and strategies” (p. 7). Although this study was conducted in Long Island, which neighbors New York City, it is important to understand the magnitude of this potential shortage as it has become a reality in the most populated city in the United States.

Participants of this study link directly to research conducted by Walker and Qian (2006) and Daresh (2002) who suggested that teachers were all too aware of the challenges confronting administrators and are reluctant to embrace these positions. Furthermore, the accelerated demands of external accountability have contributed to the participants’ lack of interest in a principalship.

The number 1 ranked motivation teachers sought administrative certification was for financial gain, which is an extrinsic motivational factor. However, the insufficient salary of principals also deterred this same group of teachers from pursuing this position. In this regard, what can initially motivate someone to advance can also become the greatest deterrent not to advance. Ball (2003) proposes there are several motivational theories that have been applied in education to understand a teacher’s motivation to leave the classroom with these reasons being a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors: This was true for the participants of this study. However, the above paradox of money being a motivator that has also become what Herzberg, et al (1959) defined as a hygiene factor, which is an external factor that serves as a disincentive, fails to provide an individual with a sense of job satisfaction.
It is also important to reiterate that the participants' number 2 ranked motivation for seeking administrative certification was to advance into a higher position in education, which is an intrinsic motivation. However, the majority of participants expressed that they were deeply satisfied working with children, thus they were unwilling to leave the classroom and advance into a principalship. This anomaly directly relates to Maslow (1954) and his need hierarchy model. When the pressure of a job increases or the work environment becomes too cumbersome, individuals are less likely to experience a high level of job satisfaction. In this study, participants were less likely to seek advancement to a principalship, as they perceived this to be an overwhelming position. While the participants viewed money as a motivation to seek certification, they also perceived a principalship as difficult and stressful. Additionally, the majority of participants expressed their contentment inside the classroom. According to these motivational theories, when you parallel an extrinsic motivational factor of money with the intrinsic satisfaction of working with students, the intrinsic feelings of happiness outweigh the desire to advance into a principalship that is perceived to be unfulfilling.

In this study, participants averaged 17 years in the classroom and possessed their administrative certification for an average of 8 years. If this was an authentic example of a teacher with administrative certification, it would place this individual on step 17 and across the pay scale to what is typically referred to as the "master's plus 30" benchmark. Furthermore, this group of teachers assumed leadership positions within their schools for additional compensation, which increased their annual salary. It can be generalized that this group of teachers may have initially pursued their certification only to move across the teacher pay scale, not considering the monetary advantages of becoming a principal early in their career. Teachers who obtain administrative certification early in their career and pursue a principalship thereafter would see a
considerable increase in salary compared to those who elect to remain in the classroom for an extended period of time.

Although salary is considered a hygiene factor or extrinsic motivation in this study, participants felt their teaching salary was commensurate with their teaching responsibilities providing an incentive to remain in the classroom. Conversely, a principal’s salary has become a major deterrent in pursuing this position and it should be considered that principals are not being fairly rewarded for their work in this new era of educational accountability. This study also aligns with the existing research on principal salaries. Teachers are not contemplating becoming principals because the average principal works under a 240-day contract and a teacher under a 180-day contract. Although a longer contract may equate to higher pay, teachers expressed that the demands and increased hours of this position are not commensurate with the salary. Studies have also revealed that teachers perceive the salary differential between teachers and administrators as small, and administrators have communicated that their salary increase has not been as strong when compared to teacher salary increases (Hancock & Bird, 2008; Malone & Caddell, 2000; Pijanowsji & Brady, 2009).

The participants of this study not only obtained administrative certification, but they also possessed a capacity to lead by assuming various supervisory positions such as department chairperson, dean, athletic coordinator, and lead teacher. It can be generalized that there is a direct correlation between teachers who hold administrative certification and their leadership potential. This is an important measure of analysis when examining characteristics of potential principal candidates to determine if these teachers possess traits suitable for a principalship. While participants in this study were once motivated to obtain certification, it was not to advance into a principalship. With a large majority of participants expressing an interest in advancing
into leadership roles, it must be considered, why not the principal, as the literature suggests that teachers who obtain administrative certification typically advance into these positions (Gates, Ringel & Santibanez, 2003).

Stempjen and Leob (2002) and Fullan (2005) suggest that employers should understand what motivates people to excel in their field, and who better to advance into leadership positions than teachers who have the capacity to lead. One participant commented that a former Superintendent who saw potential in him said, “You have a good educational background. You have your feet under you. I know you have not taught a day in a classroom yet, but you are the kind of person that we need in administration.” In education, it is essential to identify leadership behaviors in teachers and mentor this group into administrative positions. Teachers who possess an inherent quality to lead may be more attracted and willing to pursue an administrative career path. Additionally, it is also significant to identify teachers who are intrinsically motivated to advance into leadership positions, as these intrinsic motivations are more likely to produce a higher level of job satisfaction. A study conducted by Lankford, O’Connell and Wyckoff (2003) found that it would take an additional $10,000 or more to entice teachers into administration. Their research also claimed that 85% of teachers reported that they pursued an administrative degree with the intention of entering administration, but the majority of this group never applied. The results of the aforementioned study are similar to this study as the majority of teachers never applied for administrative positions.

In an effort to attract quality candidates with leadership potential into a principalship, superintendents and other building-level administrators must recruit teachers early in their career before they ascend upward and across the teacher’s pay scale. In this study, the majority of participants were satisfied with their teaching salary, and they were not prepared to leave the
classroom for a small incremental increase in salary. These findings directly support previous research in the field (Goldhaber, 2007; Papa, 2004; Pijanowski, Hewitt & Brady, 2009; Poppink & Shen, 2003). If the number 1 ranked motivation for teachers to obtain administrative certification is money and the number 2 ranked motivation is to advance, then it makes sense to identify teacher leaders early in their career and recruit this group into administration while money is still a motivating factor. If teachers are not encouraged at the beginning of their career, money may soon become a deterrent to the principalship.

With the increase in educational accountability, principals are now consumed with preparing students to be successful on new state assessments. One participant explained that her school received a grant for new iPads. However, teachers were limited in their use of this creative technology because instructional time was now spent on “test prep.” Teachers in this study felt the position of principal was no longer safe when compared to teachers who have the ability to remain in the classroom and “manipulate” students’ test scores. Unfortunately, this statement challenges the idea that an increase in state mandated testing will preserve the integrity of teacher and principal performance in schools. On the contrary, circumstances that pressure teachers and principals to increase student achievement can result in tampering with scores as the pressure to receive an effective rating are of extreme consequence.

The literature suggests that an increase in standardized testing has not improved or increased student achievement nor is there evidence to support the idea that test-based incentive programs are successful (National Research Council, 2011; Phelps, 2011). Moreover, a study (2010) conducted by the College of William and Mary discovered that students’ test scores have decreased on the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking. Also, the literature revealed that the pressures of NCLB would force schools to lower their standards in order to meet federal and state
objectives (Center on Education Policy, 2003). With teachers and administrators feeling pressured to teach to the test, students lose valuable instructional time in other subject areas (Center on Education Policy, 2007).

The principal continues to be a challenging position in education, and the participants expressed that the shift towards educational accountability has negatively impacted their perceptions of advancing into a principalship. One participant stated that her perception of students being active learners has shifted to students becoming robots programmed to take tests. With standardized testing becoming a norm, it is likely that this new culture of educational accountability will continue to discourage potential candidates from pursuing a principalship. Recruiting a new breed of principals who understands how to navigate these new challenges will become an important endeavor for all levels of leadership during this time in education.

The research conducted in this study parallels the current literature that supports the premise that a principal’s job is more complex and multifaceted, as effective principals must be educational visionaries, agents of change, instructional leaders, assessment experts, budget analysts, facility managers, special program administrators, and community builders (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007). Preparing and training future principals to successfully navigate the myriad of responsibilities and comply with state mandates is an enormous task for administrative certification programs. With regard to these programs, one participant felt that the entrance requirements were not rigorous or competitive and, as a result, under-qualified candidates are entering these programs. This testimony challenges the idea that principal preparation programs are properly preparing potential candidates to assume principalships in this era of educational accountability. To further support the claim that administrative certification programs are not properly preparing teachers, participants lacked the
confidence to succeed as a principal. They felt they were not prepared to assume a principalship even after they completed their administrative internships and these feeling of insecurity and angst have contributed to their unwillingness to advance.

Today’s principal must be an exceptional visionary, extraordinary leader, and innovative intellectual. It is crucial for administrative certification programs to prepare future leaders to assume this position. In today’s educational climate, administrative certification programs must develop related curriculum and leadership experiences that expose aspiring principals to the realities of the job in addition to providing them with support. LaPointe and Davis (2006) assert that effective principals attend more professional development sessions and spend time collaborating with other principals in addition to serving as mentors to new principals. Without proper training or support systems intact, this position will continue to be perceived as unappealing and unworkable.

Participants of this study expressed concerns regarding the new principal evaluation system and APPR regulations that have been recently implemented in an effort to increase student achievement and principal accountability. While the participants expressed their dislike for this new system, the majority claimed that principals should be held accountable for their schools, but not under these existing guidelines because it does not accurately measure various components of principal leadership that are vital to a school’s success. Although proponents of NCLB and RTTT claim it will positively impact education (Coleman, 2013), the existing literature also challenges these new mandates declaring more than half of the states in the country received mediocre marks attempting to align their accountability system with solid academic standards (Cross et. al., 2004). Furthermore, principals in other states felt that these accountability expectations to meet adequate yearly progress have become unfavorable. Other
principals have opposed the new evaluation system explaining that high-stakes testing is strangling public schools (Lyons & Algozzine, 2006; Paton, 2013). Concerns that schools will lower their standards, especially in low-performing districts have become a reality as teachers and administrators continue to feel pressured to teach to the test.

The results of this study have found that the principalship has evolved into a position that is perceived to be more challenging during this era in education and participants are unwilling to leave the classroom to sacrifice tenure, deal with a multitude of responsibilities and be evaluated under a new system that measures a principal’s performance based upon student achievement data. As expressed throughout the discussion of this chapter, the participants of this study are not willing to advance into a principalship. Instead they have elected to remain in the classroom, which is now perceived to be a safer option in this new era of educational accountability.

Recommendations for Future Research, Practice, and Policy

The following recommendations for future research, practice, and policy are presented:

1. An examination of other teachers’ perceptions of the principal in the surrounding New York areas may provide additional insight into how they perceive this position and their willingness to assume a principalship.

2. Research has shown that there are different intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors that have attracted teachers into a principalship (Fullan 2005; Stempien & Loeb, 2002). Research conducted in this study proved the longer teachers remain in the classroom, the more money they make and the less likely they are to advance into a principalship. An examination of teachers’ motivation to advance into a principalship with less than 5 years in the classroom and what would attract
this particular group may prove helpful in attracting candidates early in their teaching careers.

3. Further research is needed on how principals can influence and motivate teacher leaders to enter into administrative positions. This study may also be beneficial to boards of education and superintendents to better understand the importance of recruitment strategies and practices.

4. An examination of teachers who aspire to other leadership positions should be conducted to determine if there is a correlation in motivational factors and how this compares to attracting candidates into a principalship.

5. Further research is necessary to determine if formal principal mentoring programs are having a positive impact on new principals. A comparative study that analyzes the effectiveness of these programs would be helpful in implementing formal training programs into districts. This study may prove valuable in attracting and mentoring new principals to be successful in their position. If central office administrators offer assistance to new principals and work alongside them in the tenure process, teachers may be more willing to sacrifice tenure as a teacher to pursue a principalship.

6. It would be important to conduct a similar study in other suburban and urban areas in New York and surrounding states to determine if there are geographical differences in teachers' perception of educational accountability and how this has impacted their view of the principal. Understanding geographical differences may help other teachers and administrators survive the accountability challenges that are impacting education throughout the country.
7. Throughout this study, various participants made comments about the principalship that did not align with a principal’s actual responsibilities, which further exacerbated the complexities of this position. Further research should be conducted on the actual and perceived responsibilities of a principal in an effort to attract more candidates as incongruences may be preventing teachers from advancing to a principalship.

8. Identifying teachers with leadership qualities early in their career and mentoring them for future administrative positions may increase the pool of candidates willing to assume this position. Understanding what motivates and deters those from a principalship is equally important in the recruitment, training and retention of qualified leaders (Fullan, 2005; Stempjen & Loeb, 2002; Latham, 1998).

9. Further research is needed to determine if administrative certification programs are preparing aspiring leaders to assume principalships. Additionally, examination of the curriculum and administrative internship experience would be beneficial for graduate level certification programs and other colleges and universities who are preparing students to enter into the field of education. Without a comprehensive internship, aspiring administrators will not gain the necessary skills and knowledge to be successful in leadership positions.

10. It is important to examine the entrance requirements into administrative certification programs to determine if the requirements are consistent with the demands of today’s principal.

11. Further examination is needed in the area of principal salary structure, as the lack of financial compensation has become a predominant deterrent to pursing a
principalship. This study would be helpful for boards of education and superintendents when recruiting and hiring new principals.

12. Further examination is needed on the various financial incentives that are offered to aspiring principals and if these incentives would impact teachers’ willingness to advance into the principalship. This study would benefit boards of education and superintendents who are responsible for hiring principals to determine if financial incentives are indeed attracting potential quality candidates.

13. It may be beneficial to research principals’ perceptions who received a financial incentive to advance into this position to better understand how principals perceive their remuneration as some states offer compensation packages to entice candidates (Shelton, 2012).

14. It would benefit boards of education and superintendents to research other models of principal leadership to determine if the responsibilities of today’s principal should be restructured and how principals can better manage their time to focus on the improvement of teaching and learning.

15. Further research is needed to determine if high stakes testing has truly increased student achievement because existing literature suggests otherwise (Phelps, 2011). Additional longitudinal studies in the area of high stakes testing and the impact on student achievement should be conducted to determine if this new shift in testing is the solution to the improvement of the United States education system.

16. Further investigation is needed to determine if the implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) has positively impacted student achievement. Research should also be conducted to determine if the CCSS will
make American students internationally competitive and college and career ready (ACT, 2011). Policymakers should be aware of the intended and unintended consequences of the implementation of a curriculum that has not been piloted prior to its enactment.

17. It would be valuable to determine if new state accountability systems have increased principal performance. This would be a significant study for policymakers as state and local governments continue to implement new performance measures for principals purporting it will increase principal effectiveness. Policymakers should be mindful of including non-quantifiable performance measures in the new evaluation system.
EPILOGUE

In my pursuit to discover why teachers are not applying for administrative positions such as the principal, it has become my goal to continue to encourage teachers with a capacity to lead to enter the field of administration. Without this encouragement, I fear we may lose our very best teachers who otherwise would have excelled in administration. In an effort to preserve the excellence of our schools, I find it my mission to inspire and motivate others to advance into leadership positions in an effort to improve the excellent school systems that already exist. It is my belief that in administration we can and will find a passion for teaching and learning on a more challenging level, which in turn, will lead to a deeper understanding of why we entered the field of education in the first place. Being able to impact teachers, students and parents beyond the classroom and preparing our students to meet the challenges we all face in the 21st century is fulfilling and life affirming endeavor. As principals retire, it will be vital to replace these men and women with a new kind of administrator. This new breed must be ready to tackle the challenges of what we now call educational accountability. As teachers, we impact children’s lives on a small scale, but as administrators we have the ability to move an entire student population forward. *No Child Left Behind* and *Race to The Top* have been instituted to improve our educational system. I consider these initiatives to be questionable. Standardized test scores and evaluation ratings will not prepare our future generations to take care of this world. Instead, our future generations must understand how to prepare for what is expected of them in this ever-changing realm of existence. Our ability to impact the lives of the children and teachers we work with is limitless. Teachers are the glue to keeping our students on the path to successful learning, but administrators are the key in providing the direction for a successful life.
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Appendix A

Interview Questions
Interview Questions

1. Background Information
   1.1 How long have you been teaching?
   1.2 What type of administrative certification do you hold?
   1.3 How long have you held your administrative certification?
   1.4 Have you ever served in a leadership capacity as a teacher?

2. Motivators
   2.1 What factors motivated you to pursue your administrative certification?
   2.2 How would you rank these motivating factors from the most motivating to least motivating?
   2.3 What aspects of the principalship do you find appealing?
   2.4 Once you received your administrative certification, what were your intentions for pursuing a principalship?
   2.5 What would motivate you to accept a principalship opportunity in the future?

3. Deterrents
   3.1 What aspects of the principalship do you find unappealing?
   3.2 What deterrents have prevented you from pursuing a principalship?
   3.3 How has your opinion of the principalship changed from the time you obtained administrative certification until now?
   3.4 Currently, what continues to keep you from pursuing principalship opportunities?

4. Other
   4.1 Explain how the demands of the principalship have impacted your decision to remain in the classroom?
   4.2 Explain how your current salary and job security have prevented you from pursuing a principalship?
4.3 How has the increase in principal accountability affected your decision to remain in the classroom?

4.4 How have the recent federal guidelines on how principals are evaluated impacted your outlook on the principalship?

4.5 How do you envision the ideal principalship?
Appendix B

Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board Informed Consent Form
1. **Researcher’s Affiliation**
   Jennifer Carne is currently a doctoral student at Seton Hall University, College of Education and Human Services and is completing a doctoral dissertation in K-12 School Administration.

2. **Purpose**
   The purpose of Jennifer Carne’s study is to explore the reasons why teachers who hold administrative certifications are not pursuing the principalship. The interview should take approximately one hour.

3. **Procedures**
   Jennifer Carne will interview the subjects and make notes of the responses as well as tape record the conversation. Interviews will be conducted in each of the subject’s school districts.

4. **Instruments**
   The interview will consist of the researcher asking several background questions and approximately twelve semi-structured questions to gain perspective about the topic of teachers with administrative certification who are not pursuing administrative careers. The interview questions explore areas of motivation and why teachers initially pursued administrative certification and the barriers they associate with entering the principalship. An example of a question is: (1) What factors motivated you to pursue your administrative certification? (2) What in your opinion is the greatest deterrent for not pursuing the principalship?

5. **Voluntary Nature**
   Participation in this study is voluntary and the subjects can withdraw at any time. Refusal to participate or discontinuing participation in the study at any time will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled.

6. **Anonymity**
   Due to the nature that the researcher is conducting face-to-face interviews, there is no anonymity. However, the information that will be gathered through the interview is solely for the purpose of analysis. The confidentiality of the subject and school district will be preserved and to maintain accuracy and confidentiality, each subject will be assigned a number code.

7. **Confidentiality**
   The subject’s confidentiality will be maintained. All notes, records, and data collected from the subjects during the interview will be secured in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s residence.
8. Records
The researcher and her mentor will have access to the raw data (all notes and
recordings from the interview). These records will be secured with lock and key
in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s residence for three years following
termination of the research.

9. Risks or Discomforts
There are no anticipated risks or discomforts to the subject’s participation in this
study.

10. Benefits
The anticipated benefits to the subjects from participating in the study consist of
having a greater understanding of administration and the possible barriers
associated with the principalship. Furthermore, this study may also influence
policy decisions at the administrative level as a result of the knowledge gained
during this study.

11. Remuneration
There is no remuneration to the subjects for participating in this study.

12. Compensation
There is no remuneration to the subjects for participating in this study and there
are no medical treatments involved in this study.

13. Alternative Procedures
There are no alternative procedures or courses of treatment that might be
advantageous for the subjects as a result of this study.

14. Contact Information
Jennifer Carne is the principle researcher in this study. The researcher’s mentor is
Dr. Colella and the Director of Seton Hall University’s IRB is Dr. Ruzicka. The
above may be contacted for answers to pertinent questions about the research and
research subject’s rights.

Dr. Anthony Colella, Mentor
Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
(973) 761-9389

Seton Hall University
Institutional Review Board

College of Education and Human Services
Executive Ed.D. Program
Tel. 973.275.2728
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2685
Dr. Mary Ruzicka, Institutional Review Board Director
Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
(973) 313-6314

15. Audio Tapes
The researcher is asking the subjects for their written permission to audio record the interview. The subject has the right to review all or any portion of the tape. The subjects will be identified on tape using a number code. The researcher and the researcher’s mentor will have access to the tapes. The researcher will transcribe the tapes. All tapes will be secured in a locked file cabinet in the researcher’s residence and all tapes will be deleted after a period of three years following termination of the research.

By signing this Informed Consent Form below, the subject grants the researcher permission to audio tape the conversation during the interview.

________________________________________  ________________
Subject  Date

16. Copy of Informed Consent Form
A copy of the signed and dated Informed Consent Form will be given to the subject.