

Disincentives to Remaining a School Principal: Perspectives of German and U.S. Principals

Dawson R. Hancock

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Ulrich Müller

Pädagogische Hochschule Ludwigsburg

Abstract

The influence of school leadership on a school's performance is undisputed in both Germany and the United States. Despite its importance, recruiting and retaining principals poses significant challenges in both countries. The current study sought to determine factors that influence school principals' decisions to remain in their positions. Whereas previous research focused on the perspectives of aspiring principals enrolled in principal preparation programs in school leadership, the current study sought the perspectives of current school principals in the United States and Germany. Questioned about their levels of current and expected job satisfaction, this study uncovered important findings regarding areas in which principals in both countries were dissatisfied about the principalship. Implications for school leadership are discussed.

Introduction

The competence of a school's primary leader is a critical contributor to a school's success (English, 2005; Feige, 2012; Huber, 2012; Huber & Gordel, 2006; McEwan, 2003; Moos, 2008). Principals have substantial influence on the working climate and quality of teaching and learning within a school (Bonsen, Gathen, Iglhaut, & Pfeiffer, 2002). Significant evidence suggests that, second only to the influence of instruction in the classroom, school leadership strongly affects student learning (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008). Meta-analyses comparing 21 leadership responsibilities with various measures of student performance have discovered significant improvements in student achievement when principals demonstrate competence in all 21 responsibilities (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Other studies indicate that a school leader's abilities to create a vision and establish directions for a school (Billman, 2004; Harris, 2002), understand and develop people (Hallinger & Heck, 2002), and build productive relations with parents and community (Louis & Kruse, 1998; West, Ainscow, & Stanford, 2005) are directly associated with enhanced student outcomes (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Wolfgramm, Lussi, & Huber, 2013) and teacher motivation and commitment (Sammons, Day, Stobart, Kington, & Gu, 2007; Fend, 1998; Leithwood & Mascall, 2008). Indeed, school leaders play vital and multifaceted roles in setting the direction for schools that are vibrant learning environments for students and productive workplaces for teachers (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005; Huber, 2003). Yet many educational environments struggle to attract and retain an adequate supply of highly qualified candidates for leadership roles (Bonsen, Gathen, Iglhaut, & Pfeiffer, 2002; Knapp, Coplan, & Talbert, 2003; Landtag von Baden-Württemberg, 2012). The attrition rates of principals leaving their positions are high in many nations of the world (Battle & Gruber, 2010; Huber, 2010). What can be done to enhance people's motivation to remain in leadership positions in schools?

The current study is part of a series of collaborative efforts between the Institute for Educational Leadership at the PH Ludwigsburg (Germany) and the Department for Educational

Leadership at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (United States). The purpose of these studies has been to determine factors that motivate and inhibit people from becoming school principals and to contribute to potential solutions. Because the U.S. and Germany are developed countries whose school leaders share many similar responsibilities (Brauckmann, 2012; Hancock, Hary & Müller, 2012; Huber, 2004), the current study sought to explore practices leading to the retention of school principals in both countries. Whereas two prior studies (Hancock, Hary & Müller, 2012; Hancock & Müller, 2009) conducted in Germany and in the United States compared the relative influence of possible motivators and inhibitors that impacted teachers' decisions to become school principals in these two countries, the current study investigated the perspectives of principals on these issues. In particular, the current study sought to determine how the characteristics of the role of principal compare to the principals' expectations of the role.

The conceptual framework for this study is grounded in Locke's Range of Affect Theory (1976). This theory suggests that one's satisfaction with a job depends on two factors – the expectations the person has for the job and the person's actual experiences in the job. Specifically, job satisfaction is determined by the extent to which what one wants in a job is actually experienced in the job. When a person values specific components of a job (e.g., salary, autonomy, etcetera), her/his satisfaction with that job is impacted positively when expectations are met and negatively when expectations are not met compared to a person who does not value those job components. Various researchers (Bernstein & Nash, 2008; Judge & Church, 2000; Judge, Hulin & Dalal, 2012) have affirmed the usefulness of this theory toward explaining one's overall job satisfaction as an aggregate across all components of a job weighted by each component's importance to the individual.

Methods

Participants

One-hundred and fifty-nine German principals were selected at random from schools in the region of Stuttgart, Germany and 134 U.S. principals were selected at random from schools in the south central region of the state of North Carolina participated in this study. Although these schools represented a sample of convenience, participants in Germany and the U.S. were similar in gender, educational level, years of service as a Principal, and levels of schools to the populations that they represented in their respective countries. No significant response differences were discovered based on the characteristics of the participants. Table 1 reveals the participants' characteristics by country.

Table 1. Characteristics of U.S. and German Participants

		U.S.	Germany
Gender	Male	47.8%	62.4%
	Female	52.2%	37.6%
Education Level	Bachelor's	4.4%	-
	Master's	69.6%	74.5%
	Specialist	22.0%	22.5%
	Doctorate	4.0%	3.0%
Years of Service as Principal	0-3	33.6%	26.5%
	4-7	32.0%	28.4%
	8-11	19.4%	22.7%
	12-15	7.1%	11.9%
	16-19	4.2%	7.2%
	20-23	3.7%	3.3%
Levels of Schools as Principal	Elementary	58.8%	62.0%
	Middle School	22.6%	20.4%
	High School	18.6%	17.6%

Procedures

Participants from both countries completed a survey (Appendix) based on a questionnaire (Winter, Rinehart, Keedy, & Bjork, 2007) previously administered to all principals of K-12 public schools in the State of Kentucky. The survey in this study examined the extent to which the participants' current job satisfaction as principals compared to the job satisfaction that they had expected to experience as principals. As suggested by Locke's Range of Affect Theory (1976), one's satisfaction with a job is related to one's perceived job satisfaction. Based upon the theory, the rationale for comparing a principal's satisfaction with a specific job component (e.g., salary) in her or his current job with the principal's expected satisfaction with that same job component was the assumption that if the principal was more satisfied with the component in the current position than what she or he had expected to be in the job, then greater current satisfaction with the job component might be an incentive to remain in the job. Conversely, if the principal was less satisfied with the component in the current position than what she or he had expected to be in the job, then lower current satisfaction with the job component might be a disincentive to remain in the job.

Applying this theory, the survey required participants to rate their satisfaction with 20 job components in their current jobs and their expected satisfaction with the same 20 components in the job of a principal. The 20 job components were derived from previous job satisfaction studies (Hulin, 1991; James & James, 1989) involving instruments that allowed ratings of job components that were common across several job classifications (e.g., salary, autonomy, etcetera) and had been examined for reliability and construct validity (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). A coefficient alpha of .87 demonstrated the internal consistency of the survey (Winter et al., 2007).

The survey was divided into two parts. Part I solicited demographic information from the participants such as gender, marital status, educational level, experience as an educator, length of service as a principal, and level of service as a principal. Part II explored the participants' levels of current and expected job satisfaction as principals on components often experienced in principals' work environments. Participants evaluated each component in Part II using a 5-point Likert scale (1 "not at all important" to 5 "extremely important").

When conducting comparative education studies, researchers must obtain accurate translations of instruments (Bracken & Barona, 1991, Lamnek, 2005). In this study, the English language version of the survey had to be translated into a German language version (Friebertshäuser, 1997). To do so, the original English language survey was initially translated by two independent translators (one English native speaker and one native German speaker) who were fluent in both languages. The resulting translated document was reviewed by five principals who were fluent in both English and German. Adjustments to the translated document were made based on the feedback from these five survey respondents. This process resulted in important clarifications in the German language version of the survey. In addition, three questions contained in the English language version of the survey were deleted in the German language version because they did not conform to the German educational system; this change resulted in 20 survey components for the U.S. sample and 17 components for the German sample.

Findings

Applying Locke's Range of Affect Theory (1976), paired sample t-tests were conducted to compare the rating means for current and expected levels of job satisfaction among the U.S. participants and German participants in order to identify possible discrepancies leading principals to be dissatisfied with their positions. Table 2 reveals the results for the U.S. participants.

Table 2. Paired Sample t-tests of U.S. Current and Expected Levels of Satisfaction

Items	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	r ²	Cohen's d
	M	SD	SE	95% CI						
				Lower	Upper					
Opportunity to use my talents	-.42	.95	.09	-.596	-.259	-5.03	123	.000		
My salary	-1.04	.96	.09	-1.219	-.877	-12.14	123	.000	0.55	1.08
Work climate	-.31	.85	.08	-.461	-.157	-4.03	122	.000		
Freedom to make my own decisions	-.40	.85	.08	-.553	-.253	-5.31	123	.000		
Sense of achievement I experience on the job	-.53	.89	.08	-.752	-.435	-7.43	122	.000	0.31	.60
Opportunity to try my own way of doing things	-.44	.86	.08	-.601	-.294	-5.76	122	.000		
The vacation time I have	-.41	.90	.08	-.566	-.247	-5.04	122	.000		
Income I receive from extra-service pay	-1.10	1.17	.11	-1.322	-.878	-9.84	109	.000	0.47	.94
The time I have to spend with my family	-.77	1.05	.09	-.961	-.587	-8.21	123	.000	0.35	.73
My overall job security	-.44	.87	.08	-.590	-.281	-5.59	123	.000		
The hours I work per week	-.68	1.01	.09	-.855	-.494	-7.39	122	.000	0.31	.67
The opportunity to advance my career	-.44	.93	.09	-.605	-.271	-5.18	120	.000		
The hours I work per year	-.58	.95	.09	-.747	-.403	-6.63	119	.000		
The effect my job has on my spouse's career	-.30	.89	.08	-.464	-.141	-3.72	118	.000		
The opportunity to experience varied activities on the job	-.59	4.56	.41	-1.407	.220	-1.44	122	.151		
The opportunity to serve others	-.11	.590	.05	-.213	-.001	-2.01	120	.047		
The way district policies are implemented	-.53	.94	.09	-.701	-.365	-6.28	121	.000	0.25	.56
The opportunity to give direction to others	-.12	.52	.05	-.215	-.029	-2.59	122	.011		
The recognition I receive for doing a good job	-.870	1.06	.10	-1.059	-.679	-9.06	121	.000	0.40	.82
Extra income I can earn in the summer	-.74	1.11	.10	-.948	-.534	-7.10	111	.000	0.31	.67

¹Effect size calculated using η^2 ($r^2 = t^2 / t^2 + df$) where $\geq .01$ indicated a small ES, $\geq .09$ indicated a medium ES and $\geq .25$ indicated a large effect. Alternately, applying *Cohen's d*² ($Cohen's\ d = \Delta M / \Delta SD$) where 0.2 indicated small ES, 0.5 indicated medium ES and 0.8 indicated large ES.

Statistically significant differences with large effect sizes were discovered on seven components among the U.S. participants.

My salary ($M = 1.04, SD=.96$), $t(123) = 12.14, p < .001$. The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings was 1.048 with a 95% *CI* ranging from -1.219 to -.877. The eta squared statistic (.55) indicated a large effect size.

Sense of achievement I experience on the job ($M = .53, SD=.89$), $t(122) = 7.43, p < .001$. The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings was .53 with a 95% *CI* ranging from -.75 to -.44. The eta squared statistic (.31) indicated a large effect size.

Extra income I receive from extra-service pay ($M = 1.10, SD=1.17$), $t(109) = 9.84, p < .001$. The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings was 1.10 with

a 95% *CI* ranging from -1.32 to .878. The eta squared statistic (.47) indicated a large effect size.

The hours I work per week ($M = .68, SD=1.01, t(122) = 7.39, p < .001$). The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings was .68 with a 95% *CI* ranging from -.86 to -.49. The eta squared statistic (.31) indicated a large effect size.

Recognition for doing a good job ($M = .87, SD=1.06, t(121) = 9.06, p < .001$). The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings was .87 with a 95% *CI* ranging from -1.06 to -.68. The eta squared statistic (.40) indicated a large effect size.

Extra income I can earn during the summer ($M = .74, SD=1.11, t(111) = 7.10, p < .001$). The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings was .74 with a 95% *CI* ranging from -.95 to -.53. The eta squared statistic (.31) indicated a large effect size.

Time with family ($M = .77, SD=1.05, t(123) = 8.21, p < .001$). The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings for *time with family* was .77 with a 95% *CI* ranging from .96 to .59. The eta squared statistic (.35) indicated a large effect size.

These results suggest that U.S. participants' expectations of job satisfaction prior to becoming principals differed substantially in at least seven areas from what they subsequently experienced in the role of principal.

Paired sample t-tests were conducted to compare the rating means for current and expected levels of job satisfaction among the German participants (Table 3). Because of differences in the German educational system, German participants were asked to rate their current and expected levels of satisfaction for only 17 of the 20 components related to the position of principal.

Table 3. Paired Sample t-tests of German Current and Expected Levels of Satisfaction

Items	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	r ²	Cohen's d
	M	SD	SE	95% CI						
				Lower	Upper					
Opportunity to use my talents	-.19	1.22	.097	-.379	.002	-1.95	158	.053		
My salary	-1.01	1.58	.125	-1.259	-.766	-8.11	158	.000	.29	.64
Work climate	.12	1.20	.095	-.068	.307	1.26	158	.210		
Freedom to make my own decisions	-.38	1.35	.107	-.589	-.165	-3.52	158	.001		
Sense of achievement I experience on the job	-.37	1.29	.102	-.572	-.170	-3.64	158	.000	.07	.29
Opportunity to try my own way of doing things	-.13	1.32	.105	-.339	.075	-1.26	158	.210		
The vacation time I have	-.28	1.19	.094	-.462	-.091	-2.95	158	.004		
The time I have to spend with my family	-.72	1.44	.114	-.942	-.492	-6.29	158	.000	.20	.50
My overall job security	.17	1.15	.092	-.011	.351	1.86	158	.065		
The hours I work per week	-.77	1.40	.111	-.993	-.554	-6.97	158	.000	.24	.50
The opportunity to advance my career	-.65	1.34	.106	-.858	-.438	-6.09	158	.000	.19	.49
The hours I work per year	-.77	1.35	.107	-.978	-.556	-7.19	158	.000	.25	.57
The opportunity to experience varied activities on the job	.13	1.23	.098	-.061	.325	1.35	158	.179		
The opportunity to serve others	.07	1.35	.107	-.142	.280	.65	158	.518		
The way district policies are implemented	-.94	1.55	.123	-1.179	-.695	-7.65	158	.000	.27	.61
The opportunity to give direction to others	-.23	1.17	.093	-.416	-.049	-2.51	158	.013		
The recognition I receive for doing a good job	-.70	1.61	.127	-.956	-.453	-5.53	158	.000	.16	.43

¹Effect size calculated using $\eta^2 (r^2 = t^2 / t^2 + df)$ where $\geq .01$ indicated a small ES, $\geq .09$ indicated a medium ES and $\geq .25$ indicated a large effect. Alternately, applying $Cohen's d^2 (Cohen's d = \Delta M / \Delta SD)$ where 0.2 indicated small ES, 0.5 indicated medium ES and 0.8 indicated large ES.

Statistically significant differences with large effect sizes were discovered on seven components among the German participants.

My salary ($M = 1.01$, $SD = 1.58$), $t(158) = 8.11$, $p < .001$. The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings was 1.01 with a 95% *CI* ranging from -1.26 to .77. The eta squared statistic (.29) indicated a large effect size.

The way district policies are implemented ($M = .94$, $SD = 1.55$), $t(158) = 7.65$, $P < .001$. The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings was .94 with a 95% *CI* ranging from 1.18 to .70. The eta squared statistic (.27) indicated a large effect size.

The hours I work per year ($M = .77$, $SD = 1.35$), $t(158) = 7.19$, $p < .001$. The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings was .77 with a 95% *CI* ranging from .98 to .56. The eta squared statistic (.25) indicated a large effect size.

Opportunity to advance my career ($M = .65$, $SD = 1.34$), $t(158) = 6.09$, $p < .001$. The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings was .65 with a 95% *CI* ranging from -.86 to -.44. The eta squared statistic (.19) indicated a medium effect size.

The hours I work per week ($M = .77$, $SD = 1.40$), $t(158) = 6.97$, $p < .001$. The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings was .77 with a 95% *CI* ranging from .99 to .55. The eta squared statistic (.24) indicated a large effect size.

Time with family ($M = .72$, $SD = 1.44$), $t(158) = 6.29$, $p < .001$. The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings for *time with family* was .72 with a 95% *CI* ranging from .94 to .49. The eta squared statistic (.20) indicated a medium effect size.

Recognition for doing a good job ($M = .70$, $SD = 1.61$), $t(158) = 5.33$, $p < .001$. The mean decrease between expected and current satisfaction level ratings was .70 with a 95% *CI* ranging from -.96 to -.45. The eta squared statistic (.16) indicated a medium effect size.

These results suggest that German participants' expectations of job satisfaction prior to becoming principals differed substantially in at least seven areas from what they subsequently experienced in the role of principal.

Summary and Implications

The U.S. and German principals of this study experienced a substantial difference between their current job satisfaction and what they had expected to experience in the role of principal. Of the 17 items evaluated by the participants in both samples, four items demonstrated statistically significant differences between the level of current job satisfaction and expected job satisfaction for both the U.S. and German principals—*my salary*, *hours I work per week*, *time I have to spend with my family*, and *recognition I receive for doing a good job*.

My Salary

Whereas the average salary of a U.S. principal is approximately thirty percent higher than the average salary of a U.S. teacher, German teachers who become principals rarely receive a significant pay raise. Although Hancock, Hary, and Müller (2012) found that the lack of increased salary sometimes serves as a disincentive for German teachers to pursue the principalship, the current study extends that finding by noting that despite the higher pay experienced by U.S. principals, in both countries principals become displeased with their salary levels after having gained some experience in the role of principal. In other words, in both the U.S. and Germany, principals believe that their salaries are not high enough once they experience the demands of the position. One implication of this finding is that regardless of how much one is paid as a principal, the demands of the position in both countries may cause principals to lose motivation to perform in that role. This finding suggests that incentives other than salary may need to be provided in order to enhance a principal's willingness to remain in that position.

Hours I Work Per Week

In both the U.S. and Germany, the responsibilities of principals have increased significantly in recent years. Historically, German principals were responsible for overseeing the centralized and bureaucratic administration of their schools. However, these days, the leadership of German schools is much more de-centralized with principals expected to accomplish a host of new tasks such as establishing a vision for their schools, recruiting teachers, selecting curriculum, and supervising instruction. In the U.S., principals historically focused on management issues such as planning, organizing, supervising, and scheduling. However, these days, U.S. principals are also expected to be instructional leaders, transformational leaders, community leaders, budget experts, and effective mediators between students, parents, and staff. This rapid increase in responsibilities of principals in both countries in the past few years has resulted in expressions of concern by many experienced principals that the demands of the position are too great and serve as a disincentive to be a principal. Many administrators are reporting that the job is simply no longer “doable” (DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Harris, Arnold, Carr, Lowery, & Worsham, 2004). One implication of this finding is that more support personnel and services may need to be provided to principals in order to entice them to remain principals.

Time I Have to Spend With My Family

Related to the significant number of hours needed to perform the responsibilities of a principal in both Germany and the U.S. is the issue of how little time school leaders have to spend with their families when serving as a principal. The quantity of paperwork and number of commitments in schools has increased significantly commensurate to the escalation in complexity of responsibilities assigned to principals. The amount of time needed to address all of the externally mandated accountability issues alone has increased dramatically the amount of time that principals must forfeit with their loved ones. Although most teachers who pursue the role of principal understand that sacrifices in family time will be expected in their new role, experienced principals in both Germany and the U.S. express displeasure regarding the amount of time that they must spend away from their families. Hancock, Hary, and Müller (2012) noted one teacher’s expression of the sentiment of many others when she wrote, “As more and more demands involving paperwork and accountability have been placed on teachers, it is obvious that similar demands on principals have increased also... who would want *that* job?!” One implication of this finding is that school districts may want to help principals achieve greater balance between work demands and home life by relieving them of some of the more mundane responsibilities of their positions.

Recognition I Receive For Doing a Good Job

In both Germany and the U.S., new principals expect to receive moderately high amounts of recognition for their performance as principals. Specifically, in the U.S., novice principals report anticipating appreciation for their efforts from the parents of the children in their schools and accolades from their supervisors and colleagues in the school districts in which they serve. In Germany, new principals report an expectation that their new role will result in heightened status among colleagues, many of whom are teachers with whom they served as a teacher. Unfortunately, in both countries, experienced principals report that the amount of recognition that they receive is far less than the amount that they expected when they became principals. In the current study, the difference between expected and current level of satisfaction with the recognition received for doing a good job was a full standard deviation in both countries. As reported by Hancock and Müller (2009), the motivation of teachers to pursue the principalship and of serving principals to remain in their positions is significantly influenced by factors that enhance satisfaction with the role of principal. Failure to be appropriately recognized for one’s good efforts can serve as a disincentive for a principal to continue to serve in that position. This

finding suggests that persons responsible for hiring school principals may need to find ways to recognize principals more overtly and aggressively in order to attract and retain qualified principals in the profession.

In summary, this study contributed to ongoing research efforts to identify factors that motivate and inhibit individuals from choosing to remain school principals in the U.S. and in Germany. Whereas previous research focused on the perspectives of teachers to become principals, this study explored the views of serving principals regarding their levels of current and expected job satisfaction with the role. As suggested by Locke's Range of Affect Theory (1976), the clear implication of this study is that in order to entice principals to remain in their positions, the gap between principals' current job satisfaction and the expectations that they have for the position of principal must be narrowed in at least four areas—*salary*, *hours worked per week*, *time spent with family*, and *recognition received for doing a good job*. In addition, other areas valued by both U.S. and German principals (e.g., *opportunities to serve others* and *opportunities to experience varied activities in their jobs*) should be maximized. Additional empirical research is needed to identify other specific factors that influence school principals' motivation to remain in their positions in each country.

References

- Battle, D., & Gruber, K. J. (2010). *Principal attrition and mobility: Results from the 2008-2009 principal follow-up survey*. Institute of Education Science, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Bernstein, D. A., & Nash, P. W. (2008). *Essentials of psychology* (4th ed.). Boston: Cengage Learning. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=4Do-bFrt9tUC>
- Billman, P. S. (2004). *Mission possible: Achieving and improving academic achievement*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University.
- Bonsen, M., von der Gathen, J., Iglhaut, C., & Pfeiffer, H. (2002). Die Wirksamkeit von Schulleitung: Empirische Annäherungen an ein Gesamtmodell schulischen Leistungshandelns. Weinheim, München: Juventa.
- Bracken, B. A., & Barona, A. (1991). State-of-the-art Procedures for Translating, Validating, and Using Psychoeducational Tests for Cross-Cultural Assessment. *School Psychology International*, 12, pp. 119–132.
- Brauckmann, S. (2012). Schulleitungshandeln zwischen deconcentration, devolution und delegation. *Empirische Pädagogik*, 26 (1), pp. 78–102.
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. R. (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M.A., and Meyerson, D. (2005). *School Leadership Study: Preparing Successful Principals. Review of Research*. Retrieved from http://www.stanford.edu/dept/seli/research/documents/SELI_sls_research_review.pdf
- DiPaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The principalship at a crossroads: A study of the conditions and concerns of principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 87(634), pp. 43–62.
- English, F. W. (2005). *Handbook of educational leadership: Advances in theory, research, and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Feige, C. (2012). Effektives Management von Bildungseinrichtungen. Eine empirische Vergleichsstudie zur Identifikation erfolgsrelevanter Handlungsdimensionen des Managements für die pädagogische Wirksamkeit von Schulen und Erwachsenenbildungseinrichtungen. Uelvesbüll: Der Andere Verlag
- Fend, H. (1998). Qualität im Bildungswesen. Schulforschung zu Systembedingungen, Schulprofilen und Lehrerleistung. Weinheim, München: Juventa.
- Friebertshäuser, B. (1997). Interviewtechniken – ein Überblick. In: Friebertshäuser, B.; Prengel, A.; Langer, A.: *Handbuch Qualitative Forschungsmethoden in der Erziehungswissenschaft*. Weinheim, München: Juventa.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2002). What do you call people with visions? The role of vision, mission, and goals in school leadership and improvement. In K. Leithwood and P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Handbook of research in educational leadership and administration* (pp. 9–40). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Hancock, D. R., & Müller, U. (2009). Different systems: Similar challenges? Factors impacting the motivation of German and U.S. teachers to become school leaders. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 48(5), pp. 299–306.

- Hancock, D., Hary, C., & Müller, U. (2012). An investigation of factors impacting the motivation of German and US Teachers to become school principals. *Research in Comparative & International Education*, 7, pp. 353–364.
- Harris, A. (2002). Effective leadership in schools facing challenging contexts. *School Leadership and Management*, 22(1), pp. 15–26.
- Harris, S., Arnold, M., Carr, C. S., Lowery, S., & Worsham, S. E. (2004). Motivating and inhibiting factors of the principalship in three states. In C. S. Carr and C. L. Fulmer (Eds.), *Educational leadership: Knowing the way, showing the way, and going the way* (pp. 307–317). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.
- Huber, S. G. (2010). *School leadership: International perspectives*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Huber, S. G. (2003). School leader development: Current trends from a global perspective. In P. Hallinger (Ed.), *Reshaping the landscape of school leadership development: A global perspective* (pp. 273–288). Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Huber, S. G. (2004). *Preparing school leaders for the 21st century: An international comparison of development programs in 15 countries*. Lisse, Netherlands: Taylor & Francis.
- Huber, S. G. (2012). Qualität und Entwicklung von Schule: Die Rolle von schulischen Führungskräften. In Huber, St. G., *Führungskräfteentwicklung. Grundlagen und Handreichungen zur Qualifizierung und Personalentwicklung im Schulsystem* (pp. 5–11) Köln: Carl Link.
- Huber, S. G., & Gordel, B. (2006). Quality assurance in the German school system. *European Educational Research Journal*, 5(3/4), pp. 196–209.
- Hulin, C. L. (1991). Adaptation, persistence, and commitment in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed.) (pp. 445–505). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- James, L. A., & Lawrence, R. J. (1989). Integrating work environment perceptions: Explorations into the measurement of meaning. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, pp. 739–751.
- Judge, T. A., & Church, A. H. (2000). Job Satisfaction: Research and practice. In C. L. Cooper & E. A. Locke (Eds.), *Industrial and organizational psychology: Linking theory with practice* (pp. 166–198). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Judge, T. A., Hulin, C. L., & Dalal, R. S. (2012). Job satisfaction and job affect. In S. J. W. Kozlowski (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of organizational psychology, volume 1* (pp. 496–525). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Knapp, M. S., Copland & M. A., Talbert, J. E. (2003, February). *Leading for learning: Reflective tools for school and district leaders* (research report). Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Lamnek, S. (2005). *Qualitative sozialforschung: Lehrbuch*. Weinheim, München: Beltz PVU.
- Landtag von Baden-Württemberg. (2012). Wie begegnet die Landesregierung systematisch dem Mangel an Bewerbungen zur Besetzung frei werdender Schulleiterstellen? Antrag der Abg. G. Wacker u.a., CDU und Stellungnahme des Ministeriums für Kultus, Jugend und Sport; Drucksache 15 /2209, http://www9.landtag-bw.de/WP15/Drucksachen/2000/15_2209_d.pdf
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), pp. 496–528.

- Leithwood, K. & Mascall, B. (2008). Collective leadership effects on student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), pp. 529–561.
- Louis, K. S., & Kruse, S. D. (1998). Creating community in reform: Images of organizational learning in inner-city schools. In K. Leithwood and K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Organizational learning in schools* (pp. 17–46). Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Müller, U., Hary, C., & Hancock, D. R. (in progress). Why become a principal? A closer look at principals' view of their job.
- McEwan, E. K. (2003). *10 traits of highly effective principals: From good to great performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Moos, L. (2008). School leadership for “Democratic Bildung”: Fundamentalist beliefs of critical reflection? *School Leadership and Management*, 28(3), pp. 229–246.
- Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the different effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), pp. 635–674.
- Sammons, P., Day, C. Stobart, G., Kington, A., & Gu, Q. (2007). Exploring variations in teachers' work, lives and their effects on pupils: Key findings and implications from a longitudinal mixed-method study. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(5), 681-701.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Denver: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.
- West, M., Ainscow, M., & Stanford, J. (2005). Sustaining improvement in schools in challenging circumstances: A study of successful practice. *School Leadership and Management*, 25(1), pp. 77–93.
- Winter, P. A., Rinehart, J. S., Keedy, J. L., & Bjork, L. G. (2007). Principal recruitment: Assessing job pursuit intentions among educators enrolled in principal certification programs. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17, pp. 28–53.

Appendix

PRINCIPAL SURVEY

We invite you to complete this survey because you are a Principal and your opinions about the Principalship are valuable for improving school leadership. Your completion of this survey is voluntary. There are no risks or benefits to you for participating.

The survey should take approximately 1 minutes to complete. Your completed survey will be held in strict confidence. Responses to the survey will be aggregated for reports or publications; thus, your identity will never be disclosed.

Directions:

1. Please provide a response to every question. If none of the alternatives provided for a question corresponds exactly to your position or opinion, select the alternative that is closest to your position or opinion.
2. Follow the directions for each section. If you change a response, be sure that the change is legible.

Thank you for your participation in this survey!

PART I: DEMOGRAPHICS

Gender (check one): Female Male

Marital Status (check one): Married Single

Educational Level (check all degrees that apply):

* Bachelor's Master's Specialist Doctorate

Degrees you are currently pursuing (check all that apply):

* Second Master's Specialist Doctorate

What year did you earn your highest degree? _____

Experience as an Educator

Since becoming an educator, what positions have you held and for how long? Please list chronologically beginning with your most recent position (i.e., teacher, counselor, resource teacher, Assistant Principal, Principal, other?)

<u>Position</u>	<u>Year Began</u>	<u>Year Ended</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

How long have you served as a Principal?

- 0-3 years 12-15 years 23-26 years
 4-7 years 16-19 years 26-29 years
 8-11 years 20-23 years 30 or more years

At what level are you currently serving as a Principal?

- Elementary High School
 Middle School Other (specify _____)

PART II: CURRENT AND EXPECTED JOB SATISFACTION

For the job characteristics identified below, there are two sets of rating scales ranging from a low of 1 (not at all satisfied) to a high of 5 (extremely satisfied). The scales to the left relate to your satisfaction with your current job. The scales to the right relate to job satisfaction that you expected to have in your current job. Please circle the one number for each scale that reflects your opinion regarding current and expected job satisfaction.

Job Characteristics	CURRENT JOB SATISFACTION					EXPECTED PRINCIPAL JOB SATISFACTION									
	In my current job, I rate my satisfaction with the below job characteristics as...					As Principal, I would expect to rate my satisfaction with the below job characteristics as...									
	Not at All Satisfied			Extremely Satisfied		Not at All Satisfied			Extremely Satisfied						
1. The opportunity to use my talents	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5
2. My salary	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5
3. The work climate	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5
4. The freedom to make my own decisions	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5
5. The sense of achievement I experience on the job	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5
6. The opportunity to try my own way of doing things	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5
7. The vacation time I have	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5
*8. Income I receive from extra-service pay	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5
9. The time I have to spend with my family	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5
10. My overall job security	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5
11. The hours I work per week	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5
12. The opportunity to advance my career	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5
13. The hours I work per year	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5
*14. The effect my job has on my spouse's career	1	2	3	4	5						1	2	3	4	5

15. The opportunity to experience varied activities on the job		1	2	3	4	5				1	2	3	4	5
16. The opportunity to serve others		1	2	3	4	5				1	2	3	4	5
17. The way district policies are implemented		1	2	3	4	5				1	2	3	4	5
18. The opportunity to give direction to others		1	2	3	4	5				1	2	3	4	5
19. The recognition I receive for doing a good job		1	2	3	4	5				1	2	3	4	5
*20. Extra income I can earn in the summer		1	2	3	4	5				1	2	3	4	5

* Denotes items omitted on German survey