4-2014

A Comparison of Charter Public and Traditional Public School Principals: Who They Are and How They Function

Jared R. Vickers
Western Michigan University, jaredvickers@hotmail.com

Recommended Citation

Vickers, Jared R., "A Comparison of Charter Public and Traditional Public School Principals: Who They Are and How They Function" (2014). *Dissertations*. 264.
https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/264

A COMPARISON OF CHARTER PUBLIC AND TRADITIONAL
PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS: WHO THEY ARE
AND HOW THEY FUNCTION

by

Jared R. Vickers

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Educational Leadership, Research and Technology
Western Michigan University
April 2014

Doctoral Committee

Jianping Shen, Ph.D., Chair
Louann Bierlein Palmer, Ed.D.
Mark Rainey, Ph.D.

A COMPARISON OF CHARTER PUBLIC AND TRADITIONAL
PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS: WHO THEY ARE
AND HOW THEY FUNCTION

Jared R. Vickers, Ph.D.

Western Michigan University, 2014

In the context of the charter school movement in the last 25 years, this author analyzed the 2007-2008 Schools and Staff Survey (SASS) data to answer two research questions: (a) after controlling for school level and school size what are the differences between traditional and charter public school principals when examining their personal and professional backgrounds in terms of demographics, experience, and education and (b) after controlling for school level and school size what are the differences between traditional and charter public school principals in decision-making, working conditions, and perceptions of the position?

Analyses for research question 1 revealed that the most significant differences between traditional and charter public school principals were in the areas of race, age, gender, and professional background and preparation. Charter school principals were more likely to be non-White, female, young, and have management experience outside of education. Analyses for research question 2 revealed that the most significant differences between traditional and charter public school principals were in the areas of establishing curriculum at their schools, determining the content of professional development programs for teachers, total number of days required to work, perception of leaving education if they could get a higher paying job, and the perception of transferring to

another school. Charter school principals tended to feel that they had more power, worked more days, and had a more positive perception of their positions.

Overall, this study supported previous literature pertaining to charter public school principals regarding who they are and how they function. It also identified significant differences in the demographics, professional background, decision-making responsibilities, working conditions, and principal perceptions between traditional and charter public school principals. After identifying the significant differences between these principals, implications of the findings were discussed and future research recommended.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very thankful for the people that have supported me on this journey. First, I am thankful for my three committee members who have provided guidance and encouragement throughout the various aspects of the dissertation process. A special thanks goes to Dr. Jianping Shen, who became the chair of my committee midway through my dissertation writing process. He enthusiastically provided guidance, continuously encouraged me to keep developing my dissertation, and provided insightful feedback through numerous drafts. I also greatly appreciated the guidance of my committee members, Dr. Louann Bierlein Palmer and Dr. Mark Rainey. Each member of my committee enriched my dissertation with his or her unique educational perspective.

Secondly, I want to thank my wife, Betsy Vickers, for her love and support through the entire process. From beginning to end our family has changed and grown; we welcomed our daughter, Ava Vickers, and our son, Derek Vickers, into the world. However, as our family faced the demands of two young children, demanding careers, and working to fulfill my goal of achieving a Ph.D., my wife always understood, supported, and encouraged me during the endeavor. Several times during the dissertation process, it would have been easy to quit and concentrate more on being a father and a husband. However, my wife always subtly reminded me of my goal and refocused my attention on my goal of earning a Ph.

Acknowledgements – Continued

Next, a special thank you goes to my family, my parents, Don and Judy Vickers, my brother, Darin Vickers, my sister, Darcie Dunsmore, and Coach Bob VanDyke for challenging me on a bus ride home from a high school basketball game in 1994 to dream big, believe in yourself, and achieve your goals. All of these individuals taught me that success in comes through hard work, determination, and going the extra mile.

In addition, I would like to thank Dan Evans, Jackson Public School Superintendent, for his mentorship during this process. Throughout our numerous discussions about education, relationship was a common thread was woven into each conversation. Mr. Evans taught me that in education the foundation of every interaction is grounded in the relationship between the individuals and groups involved. By developing and strengthening relationships at every level of the educational organization we are able to create systems that support the academic and social emotional growth of our students.

During this process, I also experienced the sorrow of losing two important people in my life. My brother-in-law, Scott Dunsmore, lost a battle against cancer in January of 2013. Scott was more than a brother-in-law to my wife, my children, and me. He taught me from a young age that family always comes first and the value of helping those in need. Scott was a man of character and an exemplary model of what every father, husband, and son should strive to become.

In addition, the initial chair of my committee, Dr. Van Cooley, passed away suddenly during the summer of 2012. Dr. Cooley had a unique way of motivating

people, and I will never forget his straightforwardness in making his point clear. For example, Dr. Cooley told me numerous times, "Vickers, write and write some more. If it is wrong, don't worry, I will just have you rewrite it. How will you know if it is right until you write it?" Both of these individuals meant a lot to me, and I will always remember the many invaluable lessons they taught me.

Jared R. Vickers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents – Continued

Table of Contents - Continued

Table of Contents - Continued

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Over the past 20 years, the organization of K-12 public education systems across the United States has changed immensely. This transformation is in part due to the movement at various levels of government to empower parents to choose when determining their child's educational path, which has resulted in the charter school movement. A foundational event of the charter school movement in Michigan took place on Tuesday, October 5, 1993, when then Michigan Governor John Engler stood in front of an assembly of state legislators with a 20-gauge sawed-off shotgun and voiced his support for school choice (Miron & Nelson, 2002). The gun Governor Engler held had been confiscated from a student, and he used it to dramatize school violence and promote his plan for parents to have the freedom to choose a school in which their children could attend. Governor Engler's profound statement about giving parents the right to choose where their children should be educated led to the formation of charter school legislation in Michigan, just a year after the first charter school in the nation opened in October of 1992 in Minnesota.

In addition to parental choice, the charter school movement also encompasses various ideologies ranging from educational innovation to increased accountability. The current and past presidents have highlighted the importance of these ideologies. In the United States, at the national level, three consecutive presidents – Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama – have actively supported charters. During the Obama administration, charter schools have been highlighted under the Race to the Top fund

of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and the regulations for the

School Improvement Grant program (Bulkley, 2011, p. 111).

President Barack Obama stated in a Presidential Proclamation:

> These institutions give educators the freedom to cultivate new teaching models
> and develop creative methods to meet students' needs. This unique flexibility is
> matched by strong accountability and high standards, so under-performing charter
> schools can be closed, while those that consistently help students succeed can
> serve as models of reform for other public schools. (Proclamation No. 8815,
> 2012)

In addition, former President George W. Bush stated in a Presidential Proclamation:

> Charter schools are educational alternatives that empower families with additional
> choices for their children. By providing flexibility to educators while insisting on
> results, charter schools are helping foster a culture of educational innovation,
> accountability, and excellence. Charter schools also encourage parental
> involvement and help contribute to the national effort to close the achievement
> gap. (Proclamation No. 8251, 2008)

> To frame the political landscape surrounding the charter school movement and

how it has encompassed both political parties, Hassel (1999) stated:

> In politics, charter schools have pressed both Republican and Democratic buttons.
> Republicans find them appealing because they provide public schools with a
> limited amount of competition, operate without some of the onerous burdens or
> regulation, and must produce acceptable educational results as a condition for
> continued funding. For their part, Democrats like the fact that

charter schools create new options while adhering to the core values of public

schooling (they are nonselective in their admissions, tuition-free, and

nonreligious). (p. 2)

Even though both political parties support various aspects of the charter school

movement according to their philosophical views, the role of the principal remains

consistent within charter and traditional schools. Research has shown that second only to

the quality of teachers within a school, the role of principal can determine the success of

a school (The Wallace Foundation, 2013). As the charter school movement took shape, it

expanded the platform of how educational systems were structured. However, even with

the expanded platform, one variable remained consistent across the spectrum of

educational systems; this variable is the role of the principal. For years, research has

provided evidence that the principal vitally impacts the positive or negative results of a

school (The Wallace Foundation, 2013). This research has been primarily drawn from

traditional public schools due to the longevity of the traditional public school system

throughout the United States. However, recent research has demonstrated some

generalizations about the key roles and responsibilities of charter school and traditional

public school principals. Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, and Meyerson (2005)

stated that:

> More than ever, in today's climate of heightened expectations, principals are in
>
> the hot seat to improve teaching and learning. They need to be educational
>
> visionaries, instructional and curriculum leaders, assessment experts,
>
> disciplinarians, community builders, public relations experts, budget analysts,
>
> facility managers, special programs administrators, and expert overseers of legal,

contractual, and policy mandates and initiatives. They are expected to broker the often-conflicting interests of parents, teachers, students, district office officials, unions, and state and federal agencies, and they need to be sensitive to the widening range of student needs. (p. 5)

In addition, Campbell and Gross (2008) stated that charter school and traditional public school leaders must shape a school's vision, foster trust among both adults and children, manage resources efficiently, and balance internal and external pressures.

Over the past several years, various studies have examined leadership duties and responsibilities unique to charter school principals. Finn and Petrilli (2002) found that charter school administrators feel that they have greater autonomy with regard to key school functions that do not exist with district-operated public school administrators. Campbell and Gross (2008) found that charter schools amplify the common tasks of school leadership, but add other challenges, such as managing business operations, that are unique to the charter sector because they occur at the school level.

As the charter school movement prepares to enter its third decade, it is imperative to study the similarities and differences that exist between the duties and responsibilities of charter school and traditional public school principals. This insight will contribute to the refinement of the definition of effective school leadership and, in turn, produce more effective schools and school systems.

Background of the Study

An Overview of the Charter School Movement

In 1991, Minnesota became the first state to enact charter school legislation, with the first school, St. Paul's City Academy High School, opening in 1992. The Minnesota

law allowed school restructuring controlled by school boards and for charter applicants to be from outside the current public school sector (Grady, 2012). Since the passing of the legislation in Minnesota, 42 total states and the District of Columbia have followed by passing similar legislation to create publicly funded charter schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). The National Alliance for Charter Public Schools (2011) reported that, during the 2011-2012 school year, there were approximately 5,600 public charter schools enrolling over 2 million students across the United States. Between the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years, charter schools experienced a 7% growth in number of schools and a 13% growth in students (National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, 2011). Table 1 represents the growth of charter schools since 1999 by identifying the number of charter schools, percent of charter schools out of all public schools (traditional public and charter schools), and the year charter schools first operated with the year states passed charter school legislation.

Table 1.1

Growth of Public Charter Schools 1999-2000 through 2012-2013

Year	Number of Schools	% of Schools	Number of States	States in which Charter School operated (year legislation was passed)
1999-2000	1,542	1.7%	31	Alaska (1995), Arizona (1994), California (1992), Colorado (1993), Connecticut (1996), Delaware (1995), District of Columbia (1996), Florida (1996), Georgia (1998), Hawaii (1994), Idaho (1998), Illinois (1996), Louisiana (1995), Massachusetts (1993), Michigan (1993), Minnesota (1991), Mississippi (1997), Missouri (1998), Nevada (1997), New Jersey (1996), New Mexico (1993), New York (1998), North Carolina (1996), Ohio (1997), Oregon (1999), Pennsylvania (1997), Rhode Island (1995), South Carolina (1996), Texas (1995), Utah (1998), Wisconsin (1993)
2000-2001	1,941	2.1%	35	Arkansas (1995), Kansas (1994), Oklahoma (1999), Virginia (1998)
2001-2002	2,313	2.5%	35	
2002-2003	2,559	2.7%	37	Indiana (2001), Wyoming (1995)
2003-2004	2,959	3.1%	39	Maryland (2003), Tennessee (1997)
2004-2005	3,383	3.6%	41	Iowa (2002), New Hampshire (1995)
2005-2006	3,689	3.9%	41	
2006-2007	3,999	4.2%	41	
2007-2008	4,299	4.4%	41	
2008-2009	4,640	4.8%	41	
2009-2010	4,913	5.0%	41	
2010-2011	5,259	5.4%	41	
2011-2012	5,618	5.8%	42	Maine (2011)
2012-2013	6,002	NA	43	Washington (2013)

Note. Data retrieved from the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools (2013).

States that currently do not have legislation regarding charter public schools are Alabama, Kentucky, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont and West Virginia.

This steady growth in charter schools has been fueled by parents' demand for high quality educational options for their children. Meeting these demands through public charter schools has created an educational reform movement based on the principles of reducing burdensome bureaucratic procedures, increasing time on task, and raising academic achievement of all students (Dressler, 2001). The advancement of charter public schools over the past 21 years makes it evident that the charter public school and educational reform movement is growing stronger year after year and has and will continue to impact how traditional public school systems operate.

Policy Development for Charter Schools

The guiding principle of the charter school movement is to create new institutions that receive public revenues but function outside the existing structure of school districts (Kelly & Loveless, 2012). This movement is established independently by each state developing and implementing legislation pertaining to the development, governance, and operation of charter schools. Due to the vast difference in the motivating factors throughout state legislation, it is nearly impossible to develop one concrete definition of charter school legislation. Simply defined, charter school legislation and structure are "a charter school [as] a public educational entity operating under a charter, or contract, that has been negotiated between organizers who design and run the schools (e.g., teachers, parents, or others from the public or private sector), and a sponsor who oversees the provisions of the charter (e.g., local school board, state board of education)" (Bierlein, 1995, p. 12). The National Alliance for Public Charter Schools outlines five primary ingredients of a successful charter public school environment in a state: 1) supportive laws and regulations, 2) quality authorizers, 3) effective charter support organizations, 4)

outstanding school leaders and teachers, and 5) engaged parents and community members (National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, 2009). Legislation in each state varies according to the definition and/or structure of the three key components: the authorizer, the charter contract, and the operator. Depending on the legislation in each state, the charter school authorizer may be state or local boards of education, higher education institutions, local or intermediate school districts, or special-purpose boards (Berman, 2008). In many states, legislation is written to allow higher education institutions, colleges or universities, to oversee charter schools through chartering agreements between the university and the charter school's local board of education.

The charter contract is ultimately the rulebook by which every charter in the state must abide to continue to operate and the guidelines by which the authorizer must hold the operator accountable and vice versa. The National Association of Charter School Authorizers (2012) stated that "a quality charter school authorizer negotiates contracts with charter schools that clearly articulate the rights and responsibilities of each party regarding school autonomy, expected outcomes, measures for evaluating success or failure, performance consequences and other material terms" (p. 5). Legislation pertaining to charter contracts often outlines various structures that the operator and authorizer must establish to achieve compliance. These structures often consist of outlining administrative structure, organizational and guiding principles that pertain to the local board of directors, and generalized academic programming.

The definition of operators varies from state to state and most often includes the organizations that are allowed to be authorizers. However, in many states, operators can consist of groups of parents or community organizations that may apply for a charter

contract, which is a blueprint of the educational institution that the organization will create with the approval of the authorizer. In addition to approved authorizers, parents, and community groups, an Educational Management Organization (EMO) may partner with charter school operators and/or boards of directors to assist in providing educational and/or financial support (Berman, 2008). In most states, EMOs are often for-profit organizations that support and/or operate charter schools.

Even though charter school legislation and structural definitions of charter schools can be simplified, Bierlein (1995, pp. 15-16) outlined four key areas that differ greatly from state to state:

1. Organizer options – Many want to exclude private individuals or schools from obtaining charters.

2. Sponsorship options – Many want only the local boards to sponsor them, not state boards or universities.

3. Legal and fiscal autonomy – Many want charter schools to remain part of the district and not become autonomous entities.

4. Employee requirements/protections – Many want to require certification and maintain district-level bargaining and tenure provisions.

Since legislation is developed individually within each state, charter school laws vary in strength from state to state. To monitor the strength and weakness of charter school legislation, the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools (2013a) analyzes and ranks each state's charter school laws yearly by examining 20 essential components of the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools model law. By examining these rankings, officials can determine the weaknesses in their legislation and make appropriate

legislative changes to increase the effectiveness of the charter school legislation and ultimately improve the performance of charter schools. An example of a state making appropriate changes to charter school legislation occurred in Louisiana where the state legislature implemented significant enhancements to its charter school law by strengthening the authorizing environment and increasing charter school autonomy to increase the state's ranking from thirteenth in 2012 to sixth in 2013 (National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, 2013).

Operational Environment of Charter Schools

One of the most distinct differences between traditional public schools and charter public schools is in the operational and administrative structure of the organizations. In traditional public schools, the building principal reports to the superintendent and the superintendent reports to the local school board, while charter public school principals report to the charter school authorizer, local board of education, and in some cases an educational management organization. In addition, the accountability for the school's academic performance and operations falls on the charter public school principal. Ultimately, the educational leader of the school, the principal, is also the person who coordinates communication and ensures compliance with each of the partnering organizations and the local school board.

However, the operational and governance structure of each charter public school is unique both between traditional public schools and between themselves. For instance, Fryer (2012) stated that publicly funded but privately run public charter schools come in many shapes and sizes. In fact, they are nothing if not diverse, with some in the inner city and others, in rural areas, some that are a member of large networks and others that

are stand-alone institutions. In addition, Bierlein (1995a) stated that, unlike the one-size-fits-all traditional public school, many charter schools provide the best of what alternative education has to offer – smaller school size, experimental learning, teachers who want to work with students in nontraditional settings – with the added features of true site control, limited regulations, and a contract that demands results.

Statement of the Problem

Prevailing knowledge suggests school principals face enormous challenges that range from balancing budgets, student discipline, and teacher leadership. Although there is literature pertaining to the effective administrative structures of traditional public schools and charter public schools, there is a gap in the literature that compares in depth the differences and similarities of the principalship within these entities. The gap in the literature about charter public school leadership is most likely attributed to the fact that charter school legislation across the nation is roughly 20 years old. At this point in the charter public school movement, a comparison between traditional public school and charter public school leadership is imperative to gain an in-depth understanding of the parallels between the backgrounds and leadership roles of principals in both settings. When examining the roles of school principals, it is important that the demographics, professional backgrounds, decision-making responsibilities, working conditions, and principal perceptions be examined to accurately reveal the parallels between the two positions.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the core knowledge on the principalship within both traditional and charter public schools by examining the

demographics, professional background, decision-making responsibilities, working conditions and principal perceptions as defined by the survey questions in the 2007-2008 Schools and Staff Survey (SASS). In this study, I first examined the demographics, professional experience, and professional training of charter public school and traditional public school principals. Next, I examined the decision-making responsibilities, working conditions, and principal perceptions of charter public school and traditional public school principals. The study is guided by the following research questions.

1. After controlling for school level and school size, what are the differences between traditional public school and charter public school principals when examining their personal and professional backgrounds in reference to: (a) demographic variables, and (b) principal experience and training variables?

2. After controlling for school level and school size, what are the differences between charter public school and traditional public school principals when examining the following areas: (a) decision making variables, (b) working condition variables, and (c) principal perception variables?

Significance of the Study

This study is significant because it occurs during a new era of accountability in public education throughout the United States. Since the passing of the No Child Left Behind legislation in 2001, accountability within the school is placed on the shoulders of the building level principal. The Institute for Educational Leadership (2002) highlights the increase of accountability on principals by stating:

Even as communities shine a public spotlight on principals when their schools' test scores are released and prescribe stiff penalties for many when their schools

perform below expectations, current principals find very little in their professional preparation or ongoing professional development that equip them for this new role. Nor are they supported in this leadership role by their school districts, which for decades have expected principals to do little more than follow orders, oversee school staff and contain conflict. So instead, principals mainly stick with what they know, struggling to juggle the multiplying demands of running a school in a sea of rising expectations, complex student needs, enhanced accountability, expanding diversity, record enrollments and staff shortfalls. In short, the demands placed on principals have changed, but the profession has not changed to meet those needs. (pp. 2-3)

With the understanding that principals play a key role in accountability, the study of the similarities and differences between traditional public school and charter public school principals is vital. First, with the charter school movement entering its third decade, and each year gaining more momentum, there is sufficient data to begin to draw comparisons between traditional public school and public charter school principals. The data from this era in education will provide insight into principals' roles and responsibilities during a time when charter public schools were being marketed by results driven data and traditional public schools were in the early stages of the No Child Left Behind legislation. Using the 2007-2008 Schools and Staffing Survey national data set, this study provides valuable insight pertaining to the national picture of the demographics, professional backgrounds, and current roles and responsibilities both principals faced at that time.

This study examines a set of variables to create an in-depth analysis of characteristics found between traditional public school and charter public school principals. To achieve this, an analysis of the demographics, professional background, decision-making, working conditions and principal perceptions data presents a better understanding of the two positions and contributes to the core knowledge of school leadership.

The findings and conclusions of this study provide information that is essential to understand elements of effective school leadership to the stakeholders on various levels ranging from K-12 systems, higher education (principal preparation programs), and policy development at the local, state, and federal levels as the field of educational leadership continues to transform.

Definitions

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions will be used:

Charter Public Schools

A charter school is a public school that, in accordance with an enabling state statute, has been granted a charter exempting it from select state or local rules and regulations. A charter school may be a newly created school, or it may previously have been a regular or private school (Tourkin et al., 2010).

Traditional Public Schools

A regular school has an assigned principal, receives public funding as its primary support, provides free public elementary and/or secondary schooling, and is operated by a local education agency or a contracted education program (Tourkin et al., 2010).

Demographic Information

Demographic information includes data referring to gender, race, and age in the 2007-2008 SASS Principal Questionnaire.

Principal Experience and Training

Principal experience and training within the 2007-2008 SASS database refers to survey questions 0025 (i.e., Prior to this year, how many years did you serve as the principal of this or any other school?), 0026 (i.e., Prior to this year, how many years did you serve as the principal of this school?), 0027 (i.e., Before you became a principal, how many years of elementary or secondary teaching experience did you have?), 0028 (i.e., Since becoming a principal, how many years of elementary or secondary teaching experience have you had?), 0029 (i.e., In addition to serving as principal, are you currently teaching in this school?), 0030 (i.e., Before you became a principal, did you participate in any district or school training or development program for aspiring school principals?), 0031 (i.e., Before you became a principal, did you have any management experience outside of the field of education?), 0032 (i.e., What is the highest degree you have earned?), 0033 (i.e., Do you have a master's degree or higher in education administration?), and 0034 (i.e., In the past 12 months, have you participated in any professional development activities related to your role as a principal?).

Decision Making Power

Decision making power within the 2007-2008 SASS database refers to survey questions 0046 (i.e., How much influence do you have as principal pertaining to setting performance standards for students of this school?), 0053 (i.e., How much influence do you have as principal pertaining to the establishment of curriculum at this school?), 0060

(i.e., How much influence do you have as principal pertaining to determining the content of in-service professional development programs for teachers of this school?), 0068 (i.e., How much influence do you have as principal pertaining to evaluating teachers of this school?), 0075 (i.e., How much influence do you have as principal pertaining to hiring new full-time teachers of this school?), 0082 (i.e., How much influence do you have as principal pertaining to setting discipline policy at this school?), and 0089 (i.e., How much influence do you have as principal pertaining to deciding how your school budget will be spent?).

Working Conditions

Working conditions within the 2007-2008 SASS database refers to survey questions 0225 (i.e., Including hours spent during the school day, before and after school, and on the weekends, how many hours do you spend on all school-related activities during a typical full week at this school?), 0226 (i.e., How many total hours do you spend interacting with students during a typical full week at this school?), and 0227 (i.e., How many days per year are you required to work under your current contract?).

Principal Perceptions

Principal perceptions within the 2007-2008 SASS database, refers to survey questions 0229 (i.e., To what extent do you agree or disagree that the stress and disappointment involved in serving as principal at this school aren't really worth it?), 0230 (i.e., To what extent do you agree or disagree that the faculty and staff at this school like being here; I would describe them as a satisfied group?), 0231 (i.e., To what extent do you agree or disagree that I like the way things are run in this district?), 0232 (i.e., To what extent do you agree or disagree that if I could get a higher paying job I'd leave

education as soon as possible?), 0233 (i.e., To what extent do you agree or disagree that I think about transferring to another school?), 0234 (i.e., To what extent do you agree or disagree that I don't seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began my career as a principal?), and 0235 (i.e., To what extent do you agree or disagree that I think about staying home from school because I'm just too tired to go?).

Strengths and Limitations of the Study

The use of the 2007-2008 SASS dataset provides a national representation of traditional public school and charter public school principals as they existed at that time. Using a national dataset is a considerable strength of the study. This data is used to produce national estimates regarding the background and role of principals across the United States.

However, there are several limitations of the study. First, the variables used to measure the background and responsibilities of the principals in this study are limited to the 2007-2008 SASS dataset, which is an inherent weakness associated with using an existing dataset. Second, the data was collected before the study was conceptualized, and research questions were formed and placed some limits on this study. Finally, the most recent version of the School and Staffing Survey is the 2007-2008 dataset and is not as recent as preferred.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter I is the introduction to the study, which includes the introduction, background of the study, policy development for charter schools, operational environment of charter schools, statement of the problem,

purpose of the study, significance of the study, definitions, strengths and limitations of the study, and organization of the study.

Chapter II consists of a review of the related literature focusing on the definition of charter public schools, defining characteristics of the charter public school movement, examine the similarities and differences between traditional public schools and charter public schools, identifying the responsibilities and characteristics of traditional public school and charter public school principals, examining differences between the principalship in traditional public schools and charter public schools, exploring in depth the reason for the study, and understanding the conceptual framework.

Chapter III describes the methodology for the study, which includes the research design, participants and settings, instrumentation, data analysis, and compliance with ethical guidelines.

Chapter IV includes the restating of the research questions, presentation of the data, and a summary of the results.

Chapter V includes a discussion of the conclusions drawn from the data and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this dissertation was to compare the principalship of traditional

public schools and charter public schools. Contained in the following section is a review

of the existing literature pertaining to the following areas: (a) The definition of charter

public schools; (b) The similarities between traditional public schools and charter public

schools; (c) The differences between traditional public schools and charter public

schools; (d) The responsibilities of traditional public school and charter public school

principals; (e) The characteristics of traditional public school and charter public school

principals; (f) Differences between traditional public school and charter public school

principals; (g) reason for the study; (h) and the conceptual framework.

Definition of Charter Public Schools

The literature pertaining to the definition of charter public schools varies from

technical language contained in state and federal legislation to critical observations made

by opponents and supporters of charter public schools. Varying definitions highlight the

vast differences found in charter public schools. Toma and Zimmer (2012) stated that the

advent of charter schools is among the most controversial educational reforms debated in

educational circles. These schools, which are publicly funded schools of choice, form a

contract, or "charter" with a public entity and are given autonomy from state and local

regulations in exchange for accountability for results. Bulkley (2011) stated, "A charter

school is not a kind of school and not a kind of learning program or method. The

opportunity the law provides is an empty institutional structure, as a building is an empty physical structure. Students learn from what the organizers put into it" (p. 111). In addition, Manno, Finn, Bierlein, and Vanourek (1998) stated:

> The charter school concept is simple but powerful: sound school choices can be provided to families under the umbrella of public education without micromanagement by government bureaucracies. Independent schools that are open to all, paid for by tax dollars, accountable to public authorities for student learning and other results, and subject to basic health, safety, and nondiscrimination requirements are legitimate public schools even if they are managed by a committee of parents, a team of teachers, the local Boys' & Girls' Club, or a profit-making firm. (p. 490)

Meanwhile, the federal definition of charter schools provides a concise definition of what must be included in the organizational structure of a charter school institution. According to the No Child Left Behind – Charter Schools Program Title V, Part B Non-Regulatory Guidance (U.S. Department of Education, 2005, pp. 9-10) the term charter school means a public school that:

- In accordance with a specific state statute authorizing the granting of charters to schools, is exempt from significant State or local rules that inhibit the flexible operation and management of public schools, but not from any rules relating to the other requirements of this paragraph [the paragraph that sets forth the Federal definition]

- Is created by a developer as a public school, or is adapted by a developer from an existing public school, and is operated under the public supervision and direction.

- Operates in pursuit of a specific set of educational objectives determined by the school's developer and agreed to by the authorized public chartering agency.

- Provides a program of elementary or secondary education, or both.

- Is nonsectarian in its programs, admissions policies, employment practices, and all other operations, and is not affiliated with a sectarian school or religious institution.

- Does not charge tuition.

- Complies with the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1973, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Act.

- Is a school to which parents choose to send their children, and that admits students on the basis of a lottery, if more students apply for admission than can be accommodated?

- Agrees to comply with the same Federal and State audit requirements, as do other elementary schools and secondary schools in the State unless such requirements are specifically waived for the purpose of this program [the PSCP].

- Meets all applicable Federal, State, and local health and safety requirements.

- Operates in accordance with State law.

- Has a written performance contract with the authorized public chartering agency in the State that included a description of how student performance will be measured in charter schools pursuant to State assessments that are required of other schools and pursuant to any other assessments mutually agreeable to the authorized public chartering agency and the charter schools.

The federal legislation provides a framework from which all state charter public school policies must adhere to be in compliance at the federal level if they want access to federal charter school funds.

Defining Characteristics of the Charter Public School Movement

The roots of the charter public school concept can be traced back to the free market theories of Milton Friedman. In 1955, Friedman wrote an article entitled "The Role of Government in Education" which proposed supplementing public education with privately run but publicly funded schools in the form of a voucher system. Friedman's premise was that significant improvement in the school system would result from providing parents with a choice in schools (Grady, 2012). The next documented attempt to create a charter public school model was in 1988 when Ray Budde, a retired school teacher, and Albert Shanker, a past president of the American Federation of Teachers, used the word "charter" to describe a contract between a group of teachers and local school board to allow the teachers to explore innovations in education. The same year, Albert Shanker also published a report titled *Education by Charter: Restructuring School Districts*, which outlined several important needs of American schools that ranged from flexibility of organizational structure to increased accountability. The following year in

1989, Philadelphia started several schools-within-schools and referred to them as "charters." However, it took another decade before major federal legislation brought the charter school concept to a national level.

The characteristics of the charter school movement are intensely driven by a passion for improving public education and improving the achievement and preparation of all students. Fryer (2012) stated that when originally conceived, charter schools offered two distinct promises. First, they were to serve as an escape hatch for students in failing schools. Second, they were to use their legal and financial freedoms to create and incubate new educational practices (p. 7). In addition, when the charter movement began, the leaders included many "renegade public school principals" and other educators who wanted to start schools that operated outside the traditional school structures (Campbell, 2007, p. 29). In addition, Gronberg, Jansen and Taylor (2012) stated:

> Charters represent an expansion of public school choice, offering free, publicly funded educational alternatives to traditional public schools. Charters are allowed to operate free from many of the rules and regulations that apply to traditional public schools, although they remain subject to academic and fiscal accountability to state governments. In principle, charters are also held tightly accountable by parents who are evaluating their charter choice relative to their guaranteed outside option, a seat in a traditional public school. (p. 302)

Meanwhile, Grady (2012) stated "charter schools are independent schools that contract with the state, universities, or local school district to provide education for area students" (p. 514).

The charter school movement is often fueled by the belief that the practices found in traditional public schools are outdated and that the new innovations seeded in the charter school movement provide tremendous promise for the future of our educational systems. Fryer (2012) stated that "some believe that any top-down approach is futile, arguing that increasing market forces through choice, vouchers, parental triggers, and reduced barriers to entry and exit will allow the cream to rise to the top and force underperforming schools out of the education market" (p. 5). In addition, Manno, Finn, and Vanourek (2000) stated:

Charter schools are today's most prominent expression of education's movement away from the world of homogeneity and uniformity. They switch the emphasis from inputs to results by focusing on high standards of student achievement. They flip the structure from rule-bound hierarchy to decentralized flexibility by putting committed educators in charge. They reaffirm the old American principle of local control but do so at the individual school level where they welcome a wide array of instructional designs. They constitute education's version of civil society, a hybrid that draws on the best public and private sectors. They introduce enterprise, competition, choice, and accountability into the current public education system. (pp. 474-475)

It is evident that one of the driving forces of the charter public school movement is the belief that the traditional system is outdated, and that the implementation of charter public schools can revive the education system through innovation.

Over the last 18 years, the number of charter schools in the United States has risen dramatically. This increase has been the result of an effort to hold schools more

accountable for increasing academic achievement. In a recent study, Gawlik (2012) interviewed teachers and administrators at four public school academies in the Detroit metropolitan area and found that charter school principals stated:

> One of the most consistently cited benefits of charter school reform is that charter
> schools are held accountable for student outcomes in ways that traditional public
> schools are not because a chartering agency can, in theory (and sometimes in
> practice), close a charter school that fails to either attract students or does not
> meet specified performance outcomes. (p. 210)

Under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, Race to the Top, and the proposed reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), charter schools are set to become a major piece of education reform in the United States. To support this, Grady (2012) stated:

> The number of charter schools in operation will continue to increase, as the
> United States Department of Education has made the expansion of school choice
> and charter schools a main piece of the Race to The Top program and ESEA
> reauthorization. (p. 524)

From the passion driving the charter school movement, a body of literature has developed that examines the systematic processes unique to charter schools. One example of an examination of charter school processes and systems is an in-depth study through the Michigan Public School Academy Initiative, which outlines eight characteristics of exemplary programs and practices found in charter public schools across Michigan (Horn & Miron, 1999). The eight exemplary programs and practices include:

- Desire and intent of involving parents in the school.

- Increase student enrollment in individual buildings.

- Ability to accept students from across geographic lines.

- Identified theme or focus of the school.

- Decision to construct less costly but functional buildings.

- Reduced student/teacher ratio and use of teaching assistants/volunteers.

- Increased emphasis on the facilitation role of the building administrator.

- Involvement of teachers in decision-making processes that have direct

    effect on instruction.

To summarize the charter public school movement, Manno, Finn, Bierlein, and

Vanourek (1998) stated:

> Whatever else the movement to develop 'New American Schools' has
>
> accomplished since its beginning in 1991, it has certainly spurred the imagination
>
> of individuals and organizations that have made these schools genuine centers of
>
> innovation. Policy makers, professionals, taxpayers, parents, and others
>
> committed to revitalizing public education in America. Charter schools are
>
> creating a new kind of American public schools, and much more can be learned
>
> from them. (p. 490)

The defining characteristics of the charter public school movement collectively

combine to form a new type of school and school system where innovative practices can

be implemented, and high performing schools can be established.

Similarities between Traditional Public Schools and Charter Public Schools

As the charter school movement took shape and began to spread across the nation, the similarities between traditional public and charter public schools were most evident in four areas: interactions between organizations, systematic principles, institutional leadership, and accountability requirements.

The interactions between the two systems in the early years of the charter public school movement were deeply rooted in how much each organization despised each other; Lake (2011) stated:

> Nearly all (traditional) school districts refused to even recognize that charter schools had a right to exist. Districts were known to call the local fire marshal to make sure new charter schools could not get their fire permits approved in time to open or to delay the release of state funds so that charter schools could not pay salaries. Charter school leaders were just as antagonistic – waging aggressive legal, public relations, and political battles to win as many new charters as possible in historically low-performing districts such as Dayton, Milwaukee, and Los Angeles. (p. 1)

However, as the charter school movement has continued to expand, school districts and charter schools are increasingly choosing to abandon negative competition in favor of collaborative partnership (Baxter & Nelson, 2012).

Similarities between the two organizations can also be drawn from recent research that focuses on the systematic principles. At the systematic level, Phillips (2011) outlines five common principles that nine cities (Baltimore, Denver, Hartford, Conn., Los Angeles, New York City, and Rochester, N.Y.) committed to a compact that states that

all charter schools and traditional public schools should adopt and commit to the

following points in the pursuit of achieving success:

    a.   Districts and public charter schools have a collective obligation to all

        students;

    b.   Charter schools need to support the success of district schools and vice

        versa;

    c.   Students should have access to equitable resources;

    d.   District schools and public charter schools must be equally accountable for

        student performance; and

    e.   Leaders will expand or replicate high-performing schools.

These five points exemplify best practices in education and create a community of

schools rather than individual school communities. The two most important points that

each organization must strive to achieve are that all students should have access to

equitable resources and schools must be accountable for student performance.

 Speaking at the institutional leadership level, Spillane and Kenney (2012) stated:

    Even in the face of tremendous change in the institutional environment of

    America's schools, school leaders still have to deal with the dual organizational

    imperatives of legitimacy and integrity. First, there is organizational legitimacy

    as school leaders strive to gain support of diverse stakeholders by demonstrating

    to those stakeholders their school's 'cultural fitness.' As policy makers work

    increasingly to define this cultural fitness in terms of student learning in a few

    core school subjects and as measured by state mandated standardized achievement

    tests, it shifts the metric for legitimacy. Indeed, the core work of schools, long

buffered from external scrutiny by school administrators, is now exposed to such

scrutiny. Second, school leaders must achieve organizational integrity by knitting

together the expectation of diverse stakeholders in order to create an

'organizational self' that is minimally coherent, integrated, and self-consistent. In

addition, addressing organizational functions such as setting direction for the

school and developing short and long-term goals to realize this direction are

critical when it comes to organizational integrity. With the charter school

movement, the implications of organizational legitimacy and integrity have an

increased impact on charter school and traditional public school leaders in that

they have to build and maintain 'cultural fitness' and create 'organizational self'

through the magnifying critical lens that is based heavily on student achievement.

(pp. 547-548)

The cultural fitness and organizational self, outlined above is one example of the

increased public relations aspect that the creation of charter public schools brought to

education. In the past, traditional public schools enrolled students from a defined district.

With the implementation of charter public schools, parents were given the opportunity to

enroll their children in the traditional public school or charter public school. Due to the

increase in parent choice over the past 20 years, both traditional public and charter public

schools have increased public relations to attract students and sustain enrollment.

In addition, May (2006) stated, "Our public schools are solid institutions that

simply need to recognize that a customer-driven organization requires continuous

attention and genuine change to effectively meet the needs of the public they serve" (p.

42). These two statements regarding institutional leadership represent that both

organizations, traditional public schools and charter public schools, should continuously monitor and adapt to the needs of their customers, the community, students, and parents.

The accountability requirements of charter public schools and traditional public schools also have numerous similarities. Gawlik (2012) stated that "just as in traditional public schools, charter schools report to the intermediate school district, which then moves up the chain of command to the superintendent of instruction, the state board of education, and finally the state and federal legislature" (pp. 217-219). These accountability requirements at the state and federal level have directly impacted the role of the principalship in both charter schools and traditional public schools. This is supported by Ylimaki and Jacobson's (2013) statement:

> Since the early 2000s, schools in the USA have operated under similar accountability pressures because of the required and publicly reported annual testing as per No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and Race to the Top (RttT) mandates. Under this test–driven regime, schools that persistently fail to make adequate yearly progress face consequences including reconstitution and administration/teacher loss of employment. (p. 7)

Lytle (2012) elaborates on the former statement by stating "No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and Race to the Top (RttT) call for interventions of low performing schools to change school leadership driven by corporate-style leadership models of which there is little precedence for this approach in educational leadership and little evidence that it produces results different from more traditional approaches to schooling" (p. 54). With the implementation of NCLB and, most recently, RttT, the accountability in public education is increasing, and politicians, media outlets, and parents are constantly

scrutinizing the results. By more closely examining the results of each school, the general public may clearly observe the differences between high performing and low performing traditional public and charter public schools.

In conclusion, Fullan (2010,) stated, "developing individual school leaders is just a start. Meaningful gains in student achievement will require whole system reform. For school leaders to fulfill this role, leadership development needs to be job-embedded, organizational-embedded, and system-embedded" (p. 46). In addition, Mendels (2012) stated "educators and policymakers at all levels would do well to remember that the crux of the principal's job today is not, as it was in the recent past, to sit at the apex and attend to administrative tasks, but to work collaboratively and unleash potential" (p. 58). The role of the school leader has expanded greatly over the past 20 years and as it evolves, the shift away from the manager to collaborator and facilitator will continue to emerge. In a larger sense, as the landscape of education changes so too will the role of principal, moving from a task-oriented position toward a position of collaboration and innovation.

Differences between Traditional Public Schools and Charter Public Schools

Recent research has clearly outlined the distinct differences between traditional public schools and charter public schools. Examining the free market philosophy and reviewing the literature pertaining to the arguments outlined by supporters and opponents of the charter school movement best define the differences between the two systems.

A reoccurring theme in the literature of differences between the two systems is found within the market system that is created when competition is introduced. Grady (2012) stated that the charter school system creates "structural change" and creates a

market for school choice that is lacking in the public school sector. Carpenter and

Medina (2011) stated:

> Traditional public schools in the United States operate in a relatively monopolistic
>
> market, they have little incentive to improve the quality of education they provide
>
> their students to increase the efficiency of the resource use. According to this
>
> view, the introduction of school choice challenges the educational monopoly,
>
> creating market incentives that induce traditional public schools to become more
>
> effective and efficient. (p. 34)

In addition, Grady (2012) stated that "advocates of 'school choice' systems have relied

on Milton Friedman's theory to suggest that a competitive education market will be more

innovative, responsive, and efficient than government-run education 'monopolies'" (p.

521). In any industry, competition drives the market. For years, the field of education

was immune to this competition due to the structure of the traditional school systems.

With the creation of charter public schools, consumers received the opportunity to

explore various educational options and ultimately select the form of school that best

meets the needs of the student and family.

Recent literature also defines distinct differences between the two systems that are

outlined in the research that supports the charter public school movement. Baxter and

Nelson (2012) stated that the promise of charter schools as a model for broad public

education reform, precisely from their ability to operate with autonomy, free of the

constraints of bureaucratic hierarchy that have hamstrung American school districts for

more than a century (p. 27). To support this, Preston et al. (2012) stated, "Proponents of

choice argue that providing this freedom not only diversifies educational opportunities,

but also creates incentives for the improvement of traditional public schooling through increased market competition for services" (p. 319). The diversification of educational opportunities is outlined in greater detail in a report by The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (1998), which stated:

> Charter schools are not simply another type of "school choice" or another in a long line of reform measures. Charter schools not only hold promise, yet unrealized, of allowing parents and children the opportunity to choose the school they attend, but they also grant teachers and parents two additional opportunities, or choices. First, parents and teachers have the opportunity to actively create and develop new innovative schools and curricula. Second, parents and teachers have the ability to transform an existing school into the school they envision. (p. 3)

In a review of recent studies, Preston et al. (2012) found evidence of diversification by discovering the practices that differed most from those of traditional public schools were specialized programs of study, small school size, and the basic institutional structure of charter schools, providing autonomy outside the purview of local school boards. In another review of literature supporting charter public schools, Bulkley (2011, p. 112) cited several reasons in favor of charter public schools:

- Serve children that are not well served by traditional public schools, especially low-income students of color in urban areas.

- Enable schools to engage in distinctive administrative, instructional, and fiscal practices.

- Operate under a higher level of scrutiny and public accountability, because their contracts will not be renewed if they do not demonstrate that they are providing high-quality educations.

- Based on the combination of innovation, public accountability through contracting, and the market pressures inherent in being schools of choice, result in a higher quality of education.

Another study by Manno, Finn, and Vanourek (2000, p. 474), defined the differences between traditional public schools and public charters schools by outlining the following four features:

- Public charter schools can be created by almost anyone (e.g., educators, parents, and community groups).

- Public charter schools are exempt from most state and local regulations, essentially autonomous and self-governing in its operations.

- Public charter schools are attended by youngsters whose families choose it and by educators who are also there by choice.

- Public charter schools risk being closed for not producing satisfactory results.

However, recent reports have outlined various arguments that charter public schools are harmful to the American public school system, ultimately taking funds from traditional education systems and creating inequality in K-12 educational systems. The majority of the literature opposing charter public schools claims that public resources used to fund charter public schools are being unfairly taken from traditional public schools and causing hardship. Tienken (2011) stated:

As charter schools multiply, public school teachers and administrators need to understand the policy landscape in which charters are skimming money from their traditional local public schools, making scarce resources even scarcer. More than 250,000 students currently attend for-profit charter schools that are funded with taxpayer money. They operate outside the public domain, although they take our tax dollars; and their job is to make money. Enter the proverbial dual system dragon. (p. 107)

In addition, Turnamian (2011) stated:

The charter school movement must shrink, not expand. Failing and mediocre charter schools need to be closed and their resources returned to the traditional public school system – preferably with higher levels of autonomy to create innovation, such as zones of excellence and pilot systems, within the existing system. (p. 10)

When examining the differences between traditional public and charter public schools, the issue of funding tends to become the focus of supporters or opponents of the charter school movement. The opponents of charter public schools strongly feel that public funds invested into charter public schools ultimately take funds away from traditional public schools. Meanwhile, the supporters of charter public schools feel the charter public school movement is entitled to public funds just as a traditional public school is entitled to the same funds.

Demographics of Traditional Public School and Charter Public School Principals

This study examined the similarities and differences between traditional public school and charter public school principals' demographics. Over the past one hundred

years, several studies have examined the demographic variables of traditional public

principals and have tracked how these variables have changed over the years. Recently,

in 2008, the National Association of Elementary School Principals stated that "according

to the data collected in a 2008 study of elementary school principals, the typical principal

is female, White, and 50 years old" (p. 1). With the growth of the charter public school

movement over the past decade, several studies have begun examining the correlation of

demographic data between traditional public school and charter public school principals.

Race

Recent studies have demonstrated a significant difference in the race of traditional

public and charter public school principals. In a study of 1999-2000 data, Gates, Ringel,

Santibanez, Ross, and Chung, (2003) found that, in 1999-2000, 18% of public school

principals were members of a racial/ethnic minority compared to 29% of charter school

principals (p. 19).

In a 2003-2004 study, The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) found

that about twice as many charter schools as traditional public schools are led by

minorities (32.4% vs. 17.2%) (p. 66). In addition, 2003-2004 data made available by The

National Center for Education Statistics showed that 75.8% of charter school principals

in Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin were White compared to 24.2% that were Black or Other

(Gross & Pochop, 2007, p. 3).

In 2008, Campbell and Gross stated that the principal of a traditional public

school is more likely to be White (63% vs. 57%) (p. 6). In addition, traditional public

schools are less likely to be led by a minority with African Americans, Hispanics, Asians,

Native Americans, and Others comprising 37% of principals and Whites comprising 41%

(p. 6).

Most recently, The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2009)

stated that, in 2008, 90.3% of elementary principals classified themselves as White (p.

142).

Gender

Over the past 10 years, three studies have identified a significant difference

between the gender of traditional public school and charter public school principals. In

2003, Gates, Ringel, Santibanez, Ross, and Chung, stated that, in 1999-2000, 44% of all

public school principals were female compared to 54% of charter school principals (p

19). Furthermore, 2003-2004 data from The National Center for Education Statistics

demonstrated that in the Midwest states of Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin, 59.8% of

charter school principals were female compared to 39.9% who were males (Gross &

Pochop, 2007, p. 3). Most recently, The National Association of Elementary School

Principals (2009) indicated that the percent of female elementary school principals

increased from 42.0% in 1998 to 61.0% in 2008 (p. 141).

Age

Over the past twenty years, the average age of the principal has increased, and

data has identified a significant difference between the age of principals in traditional

public and public charter school principals. In 2003, Gates, Ringel, Santibanez, Ross,

and Chung stated the age of the nation's principals is growing older as a group. From

1987-1988 to 1999-2000, the average age of principals increased from 47.8 to 49.3 years

old in the public sector (p. xiv). In addition, Gates, Ringel, Santibanez, Ross, and Chung

(2003) also stated that the average age of charter school principals in 1999-2000 was one year younger than principals of traditional public schools, 48.3 versus 49.3 years old (p. 13).

Experience and Training of Traditional and Charter Public School Principals

The experience and training of traditional public school and charter public school principals have been the focus of studies over the past ten years. Campbell and Gross (2008) stated that the professional "greenness," coupled with the expanded organizational demands of the charter school leadership job, is raising important concerns for charter school leaders (p. 28).

Educational Experience

The following studies identified significant differences between traditional public and charter public school principals when examining the years of experience as a principal. In 2008, Campbell and Gross discovered that almost 30% of charter school leaders have led the school for two years or less compared to 16% of traditional public school principals (p. 6). Moreover, Gross and Pochop (2008) stated that according to the 2003-2004 SASS survey, 24% of charter public school principals and 18% of traditional public school principals had 2 to 3 years of experience, while 48% of charter public school principals and 66% of traditional public school principals had 4 or more years of experience.

In addition, a recent study in 2008 by The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2009) stated that between 1998 and 2008, the percentage of principals with 4 or fewer years rose from 7.1% to 20.8% (p. 58). In addition to data on the years of experience traditional public and charter school principals hold, studies have also

presented data on the involvement of principals in the classroom. The National Alliance for Public Charter Schools (2008) discovered:

> According to federal data, a mere 2% of principals in traditional public schools also teach. In charter schools, the figure is about 19%. So in addition to juggling an array of leadership responsibilities, a substantial portion of charter school leaders are balancing classroom teaching as well – and we don't have a good handle on how this affects the rest of their job. (p. 13)

Professional Training

Another significant variable that has been examined over the past ten years is the type of professional training traditional public and charter public school principals have achieved. The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2009) stated that an average of 61.4% of elementary school principals held at least a Master's degree in 2008 (p. 66). In addition, The National Center for Education Statistics, using data from 2003-2004, found that 79.5% of charter school principals in Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin held at least a Master's degree or greater (Gross & Pochop, 2007, p. 4).

In addition to the level of education, some studies have begun to examine the skills acquired by principals during educational leadership programs. For instance, Campbell and Gross (2008) stated that charter school leaders with education degrees more commonly reported that they were "very confident" in instructional issues, such as engaging staff toward a common vision, attracting teachers, developing leadership in the school, facilitating staff toward whole school initiatives, implementing long-range plans, and establishing high expectations for students (p. 25). Campbell and Gross (2008) also stated, "The NCSRP's research findings show that leaders who have gone through

traditional principal training programs lack confidence in financial management, while those who have backgrounds in financial management lack confidence in core educational leadership" (p. 29).

Another variable that has been examined by a recent study identified forms of professional development of current principals. The National Association for Elementary School Principals (2009) stated that the top three approaches principals prefer are participating in district-provided opportunities (49.8%), face-to-face networking with fellow professionals (49.8%), and reading journals, books, and other literature (47.7%) (p. 81).

Responsibilities of Traditional Public School and Charter Public School Principals

Over the past decade, the field of education has transformed from an administrative structure where principals were managers of buses, boilers, and books to a structure concentrating on accountability and educational leadership. This transformation from managerial responsibilities to educational leadership responsibilities has been the focus of several studies in recent years. In 2012, MetLife surveyed 500 principals throughout the United States and found that 69% of principals believe that their responsibilities today have changed compared to five years ago and that the job has increased in complexity (MetLife, Inc., p. 23). In addition, the same study found that 75% of principals agree that the job of principal has become too complex, a view shared by principals regardless of school demographic characteristics (MetLife, Inc., 2012, p. 23). The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2008) stated:

> The role of principal continues to become more complex and challenging.
>
> Traditional leaders may have considered their jobs to be solely the managers of

schools. But the current social and educational context – which combines high-stakes accountability with the high ideals of supporting social, physical and emotional needs of children – demands that principals demonstrate the vision, courage and skill to lead and advocate for effective learning communities in which all students – and adults – reach their highest potential. (p. 2)

In addition, Bickmore and Dowell (2011) have illustrated from the work of Camburn et al. (2010); Cooley and Shen (2003); Goldring et al. (2008); and Horng et al. (2009), evidence that supports this shift:

The majority of principals' time was spent on administrative tasks related to students (discipline, administering testing, scheduling, and student activities), personnel issues (hiring, communicating, and problem solving), organizational tasks (financing, scheduling, compliance issues, and building maintenance), and instructional issues (monitoring/observing instruction, supporting teachers' professional development, analyzing student data or work, modeling instructional practices, and teaching a class). (p. 45)

An example from The Wallace Foundation (2013) presented a paralleled view, which has identified five key responsibilities of principals:

1. Shaping a vision of academic success for all students, one based on high standards.

2. Creating a climate hospitable to education in order that safety, a cooperative spirit and other foundations of fruitful interactions prevail.

3. Cultivating leadership in others so that teachers and other adults assume their part in realizing the school vision.

4. Improving instruction to enable teachers to teach at their best and students to learn at their utmost.

5. Managing people, data and processes to foster school improvement.

In addition, the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (1999) identified several areas that would fall into the role of the principal; these areas include legal matters (civil rights and special education), accountability, program evaluation, student assessment, business and financial management, personnel issues, the development of policy, public relations, marketing your school, and moving beyond controversy.

In addition, Muse and Abrams (2011) recently interviewed 25 principals from Virginia and found that principals conceived their roles in ways that were multifaceted which include leading by example, building relationships, creating a vision, understanding the community, being a manager and instructional leader, and possessing child-centered leadership (pp. 53-54). The shift in responsibilities of the principal over the past 20 years includes an increase in the educational leadership responsibilities that are ultimately magnified for the general public through an increase of accountability systems at the state and national level.

Specific items in the following two frameworks provide items that were directly aligned to the variables that were used in this study.

First, at a national level, 43 states have adopted the Educational Leadership Policy Standards (The Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008), which outlines 6 standards and 30 functions of essential aspects of the various responsibilities of principals:

Standard 1: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.

A. Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission

B. Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning

C. Create and implement plans to achieve goals

D. Promote continuous and sustainable improvement

E. Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans

Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

A. Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations

B. Create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program

C. Create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students

D. Supervise instruction

E. Develop assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress

F. Develop the instructional and leadership capacity of staff

G. Maximize time spent on quality instruction

H. Promote the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning

I. Monitor and evaluate the impact of the instructional program

Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

A. Monitor and evaluate the management and operational systems

B. Obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources

C. Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff

D. Develop the capacity for distributed leadership

E. Ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning

Standard 4: An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

A. Collect and analyze data and information pertinent to the educational environment

B. Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources

C. Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers

D. Build and sustain productive relationships with community partners

Standard 5: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

A. Ensure a system of accountability for every student's academic and social success

B. Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior

C. Safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity

D. Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making

E. Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling

Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

A. Advocate for children, families, and caregivers

B. Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning

C. Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies

Second, Shen and Cooley (2013) outline seven important dimensions of the principalship that encompass the multitude of responsibilities principals experience and ultimately lead to student achievement. The seven dimensions consist of 1) data-informed decision-making, 2) safe and orderly school operations, 3) high, cohesive, and culturally relevant expectations for students, 4) distributive and empowering leadership, 5) coherent curricular programs, 6) real-time and embedded instructional assessment, and 7) passion for and commitment to school renewal (p. 1). These two frameworks served

as a baseline for the data analysis of this study. In Chapter 5, conclusions are drawn

between the frameworks and the data outcomes of the variables outlined in Chapter 3.

Characteristics of Traditional Public School and Charter Public School Principals

The qualities of traditional public school and charter public school principals are

often defined by internal characteristics that are typically derived from caring and

compassionate traits. The literature outlining the qualities of principals has focused on

internal characteristics for at least the past one hundred years. Darsie (1938) outlined an

example of this:

What are the essential qualities of the educational leader? In part they are

compounded of those personal characteristics without which enduring leadership

in any field is impossible. Absolute intellectual and moral honesty, courage,

genuine concern for human welfare, intellectual capacity, and emotional stability

are of primary importance. (p. 145)

Examining this definition of qualities of principals provides an understanding of

how the literature about qualities of effective principals has evolved, yet remain grounded

in internal characteristics. This is evident in a recent study by DiMarino and Miles which

found that:

First, in framing the vision for their schools, each principal was driven by deeply

rooted care and concern for each of their students. Second, the principals had the

ability to empathize with staff members when sharing the leadership for the

vision; by their willingness and ability to understand the various viewpoints of

others, the principals demonstrated an uncommonly high level of self-confidence.

Third, implementing the strategies required them to become strong salespersons –

initially for their ideas, but eventually for a collaboratively created vision for their school. Fourth, they had strong work ethic and an almost-stubborn determination to succeed while maintaining a sense of calm and order in the face of often-bitter conflict. (2006, p. 47)

These themes exemplify the focus on internal traits such as care and concern, empathy, understanding various viewpoints, and self-confidence. However, the complexity of the internal qualities has increased compared to Darsie's definition of qualities due to the continuously amplified responsibilities of the role of principal.

Although the internal qualities of principals play a vital role in determining the success of a principal, the ability of the principal to lead and manage external aspects is also an imperative factor in determining success. The literature has outlined the qualities of effective leaders and managers of individuals fulfilling the role of principal. A recent report released by the National Conference of State Legislatures stated:

The role of the school leader has changed from building manager to instructional leader. Today's school leaders are facing new and greater challenges, including increased accountability for student academic achievement; complex social environments that reflect the nation's ever-changing economic, racial and ethnic diversity; and a constantly changing educational landscape with new technology and limited resources. Effective principals create vision and set high expectations, develop and support teachers and school staff, and strengthen school culture. They also build leadership teams to share or distribute leadership roles among teachers and other school staff to bolster student academic achievement.

Although leadership and management can be defined individually it is imperative

that we examine the literature to discover how each of these impacts the

responsibilities and qualities of leaders to be effective leaders and managers.

(2011, p. 4)

Muse and Abrams found:

Good leadership requires effective management. Effective principals are also

effective managers. They must be excellent communicators and use this strength

to develop relationships with teachers, assistant principals, students, parents,

custodians, secretaries, counselors, media specialist, bus drivers, central office

personnel, and school resource officers. As the school manager, the principal

must display respect for every individual who contributes to the school's success.

(2011, p. 51)

In addition, Eacott stated:

To understand the context in which they work, leaders must have an

understanding of the collective unconscious assumptions of their work, and the

value placed on their work by a diverse range of societal forces and power

relations. This involves leaders using and interpreting multiple sources of

information, evaluating alternative points of view, and developing a reasoned and

defensible argument for practice. This requires a critical reflexivity to distinguish

the persuasive educational assumptions, which inform educational leadership.

(2011, p. 137)

The conclusions drawn from the two studies above highlight the interaction of leadership

and management decisions and reflect personal characteristics, which focus on building

relationships, being excellent communicators, and respecting all individuals. These characteristics can be used universally to outline the characteristics of principals and allow for distinct comparisons to be drawn between charter public school and traditional public school principals.

Differences between Traditional Public School and Charter Public School Principals

Unlike their traditional public school district counterparts, charter principals are not typically supported by a district infrastructure. Ilene Berman, Program Director of the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (2008) stated that unlike most public school districts, where a building principal has day-to-day responsibilities in the school, but the superintendent is the primary conduit to the school board, a charter school director often does both. In addition to serving as instructional leaders of their schools, charter school principals often must find school facilities, develop and monitor budgets and strategic plans, recruit board members, hire and train staff, recruit and orient families, and work with the governing board, local community, and authorizing board.

Conductors of another study interviewed the administration and staff of traditional public, independent schools, and charter public schools of 21 schools in four small to mid-size urban areas and categorized the following areas as functions of the charter school leadership: (a) instructional leadership, (b) cultural leadership, (c) managerial leadership, (d) human resource leadership, (e) strategic leadership, (f) external development leadership, and (g) micro political leadership (Portin, Schneider, DeArmond, & Gundlach, 2003). In addition, Gross and Pochop (2007) used data from the National Center for Education Statistics Schools and Staffing Survey from 2003-2004 to examine the public charter school principal survey results from the Midwest states

(Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin) data to identify challenges faced by charter school principals, namely (a) raising funds or managing finances, (b) engaging parents, (c) acquiring or maintaining facilities, (d) negotiating with district and traditional schools, (e) attracting qualified teachers, (f) attracting students, (g) maintaining a focus on the school's mission, (h) complying/reporting on state and federal law/requirements, and (i) having conflict with the charter boards of trustees. Additionally, Bickmore (2011) conducted a multi-case study of two charter school principals and compiled six themes from the data: (a) accountability, (b) personnel issues, (c) student-related issues, (d) management issues, (e) school promotions, and (f) instructional issues (p. 58).

Charter school principals also face an increased responsibility dealing with compliance and accountability which is often greater than that found in traditional public schools due to the role of reporting to a chartering agency and the local board of directors, management of operations, and various state and federal reporting requirements. In a recent study, Gawlik (2012) interviewed teachers and administrators at four public school academies in the Detroit metropolitan area and found that charter school principals felt pressure related to accountability; however, their version of accountability is twofold. They are held accountable to the state but also to their authorizers, which places an extra burden on the principal as he or she performs administrative tasks (p. 217). However, another study of 853 superintendents and 909 principals found that former public school administrators were frustrated and exasperated by the bureaucracy, red tape, and politics in traditional school systems, and their dissatisfaction caused them to gravitate to charter schools and the freedom found in charter systems (Farkas et al., 2001). The pressure felt by charter public school

principals to meet compliance and accountability standards varies due to the requirements individual states impose on charter public schools. As outlined earlier in Chapter 2, the policies that regulate charter public schools vary from state to state and authorizer to authorizer.

The difference in funding between traditional public schools and charter schools often creates an environment where the charter school principal is forced to do more with less in regards to the funding of the school and its programs. During a national symposium, charter school leaders expressed concerns about receiving less funding per pupil than traditional public school districts, limiting what they could do for their students (Hill, Rainey, & Rotherham, 2006). When state and federal governments require schools to adopt certain policies or establish specific programs without providing the funding needed to meet the requirements, schools are often caught between a rock and a hard place: ignore a federal or state mandate and risk punitive action, or slash other programs to free up funds and meet the unfunded mandates, which ultimately results in increased responsibilities for the principal (Kennedy, 2001). In addition to receiving less funding and meeting unfunded mandates, Campbell and Gross (2008) found that charter school principals must engage in tasks unique to charter school systems. Charter schools operate as market-driven entities and, thus, must attract an adequate number of students to be financially viable. Promoting and marketing the school to attract students often become the most important among the charter school principal's responsibilities. In addition, Campbell and Gross stated, "What sets the job apart from the traditional public school principalship is that charter school leaders operate without a safety net – no local district

supplies teachers or facilities in a pinch, and funding and laws can change abruptly" (p. 28).

Reason for the Study

The key factor for gaining a better understanding of the principalship between traditional public and charter public school systems is to develop insight about the similarities and uniqueness of the two positions. The literature has alluded to the importance of gaining this insight. For instance, Fryer (2012), examined the result of charter-school practices that were implemented in 20 schools within the Houston Independent School District and the 10 schools within the Denver Public Schools and found that:

> By disentangling which factors make charters successful and demonstrating that these factors are able to take root in traditional public schools, we have illuminated a path forward. It is not possible to offer a one-size-fits-all package of reforms; we cannot allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good. By expanding what we know works and conducting more research as we expand those practices, this new approach could benefit millions of students from the nation's struggling schools and neighborhoods. (p. 12)

As the charter school movement continues to evolve at various rates around the country, it is imperative that a critical lens be used to compare the structures found within traditional public schools and charter schools. Spillane and Kenney (2012) researched the shifts in educational leadership over the past 25 years and found that, in reality, school administrators are left in this changing institutional environment to design entirely new formal organizational structures in their schools that support a tighter coupling

between policy, administration, and instruction. By analyzing the similarities and differences of these structures and the outcomes of these structures, we can begin to establish common best practices that are present in both settings.

Conceptual Framework

The structure of the conceptual framework is organized by outlining the general theories of charter public schools and traditional public schools. The listing of the general theories of each of the systems presents a clear understanding of the general organizational and operational environments in which each of the principals operate within each system. The general theories of charter public and traditional public schools have been outlined and supported throughout the literature review. The primary focus of this study was the role of the principal, which determined who they are and how they function. The data from the 2007-2008 SASS determined the similarities and differences between the two positions, charter public school and traditional public school principals. The results of the study correlated with two current leadership frameworks, the seven dimensions of learning-centered leadership (Cooley & Shen, 2013), and the six standards outlined in the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 (The Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008).

For an overview of the conceptual framework, refer to Figure 1.

Comparison of Charter Public School and Traditional Public School Principals prior to RTTT

Charter Public Schools Theory	Difference between Principal Personal and Professional Variables	Traditional Public Schools Theory
- Increased accountability (outcomes against their charter) - Varying difference in law/regulation/policy environment within and among states - Increased freedom - Staff (Make a commitment to work in a unique setting) - Curriculum (Unique to each school) - Free of union contracts - Free from tradition (we have always done it that way) - ***Principal as CEO -- accountable to authorizer and appointed board of education*** - More innovation - Parental choice/more involvement in education - Increased Public Relations (key component to enrollment and sustainability and undefined boundaries)	a) **Demographic Information** b) **Principal Experience & Training** c) **Decision Making** d) **Working Conditions** e) **Principal Perceptions**	- Limited accountability (Increased with NCLB, only some hit hard) - Very little difference in law/regulation/policy environment within and among states - Limited freedoms - District-hired staff - District-set curriculum - Must follow union contracts - Traditions (often entrenched throughout the school and district) - ***Principal as mid-level manager, accountability to superintendent and elected board of education*** - Less innovation - No parent choice/limited involvement in education - Limited Public Relations due to defined district boundaries.

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework comparing charter public school and traditional public school principal.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the differences and similarities between charter public school principals and traditional public school principals using variables from the 2007-2008 SASS data. This study utilized a survey research design, and quantitative approaches were applied to each research question.

1. After controlling for school level and size, what are the differences between traditional public school and charter public school principals when examining their personal and professional backgrounds in reference to (a) various demographic variables and (b) various principal experience and training variables?

2. After controlling for school level and size, what are the differences between traditional public school and charter public school principals when examining the following areas (a) various decision-making variables, (b) various working condition variables, and (c) various principal perception variables?

In this chapter, detailed descriptions are given for the following: the participants and setting, instrumentation, development of SASS, validity of SASS, choice of SASS Public School Principal Questionnaire, research design, data analysis, weighting and relative weight, sample size and power of study, and compliance with ethical guidelines.

Research Design

This quantitative study employed a cross sectional design and a secondary dataset to examine the possible relationships between principals' group membership (traditional public school principals vs. charter public school principals) and their personal and

professional characteristics. A quantitative cross sectional design is appropriate because the purpose of this study was to quantify the similarities and differences between the two groups of principals at one point of time, rather than looking at changes over time in a longitudinal study. The survey research design is suitable for this study because it is based on a large-scale survey that has a representative sample of American principals during the 2007-2008 school year using the 2007-2008 SASS Public Schools Principal Questionnaire sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). This study is a purely quantitative one based on an existing national data set.

Participants and Setting

Participants were drawn from the elementary and secondary principals who participated in the 2007-2008 SASS Public School Principal Survey conducted by NCES. The 2007-2008 SASS Public School Principal Survey used a stratified sample based on clustered probability sampling. The SASS survey used a complex stratified sample design to establish a database that is representative of the public school principals. The structure of the dataset allows for the researcher to identify traditional public school principals and charter public school principals separately so that comparisons can be drawn between the two groups for the various variables. The available sample included traditional public school principals and charter public school principals, creating a sufficient sample size of participants for statistical analysis.

Instrumentation

Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)

The 2007-2008 SASS Public Schools and Staffing Survey national data set was used in this study. This section is an overview of the SASS, administration of the SASS,

validity and reliability of the SASS, and the rationale for the choice of SASS Public

School Principal Questionnaire. This section also provides the codes, scoring, and levels

of measurement for the 2007-2008 SASS variables that are imperative to testing the

hypothesis of the current study.

Overview of the SASS

The data for this study was extracted from the Schools and Staffing Survey

(SASS). The SASS is an integrated survey collected from public, private, and public

charter schools nationwide. Moreover, the SASS is the most comprehensive national

principal survey in the United States (Rand Education, 2004). The Principal Survey

collected data from a representative sample of the nation's principals regarding principal

experience and training, goals and decision making, teacher and aide professional

development, school climate and safety, instructional time, teacher and school

performance, working conditions, and principal perceptions and demographic

information. The data produced through the SASS survey gives a synopsis of the

condition of America's K-12 educational system at that point in time. The SASS survey

is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics

(NCES). The NCES inaugurated surveying schoolteachers, principals, and administrators

in the 1980s with the Teacher Demand and Shortage Questionnaire. During the 1999-

2000 school year, the NCES changed the survey to the SASS, which surveyed public

schools, public charter schools, private schools, and Indian Education/Tribal schools.

This model continued for the 2003-2004, 2007-2008, and 2011-2012 SASS, with the

public charter schools included in the sample as part of the public school questionnaire.

The SASS has six survey components: (1) the School District Survey, (2) the Principal

Survey, (3) the School Survey, (4) the Teacher Survey, (5) the School Library Media

Center Survey, and (6) the Teacher Follow Up Survey. The survey components are such

that the data samples from one survey component can be integrated with another (Shen &

Ma, 2006). For the purpose of this study, the 2007-2008 SASS Public School Principal

survey data set was utilized, since the 2011-2012 dataset was not yet available. In the

data set, public schools were sorted by school type (traditional public or public charter),

the key independent variable used for the study.

Administration of the SASS

The 2007-2008 SASS survey was mailed by NCES to teachers, principals, and

administrators during the 2007-2008 school year. Prior to the surveys being mailed, an

overview of the survey and verification of address letter were mailed to the sampled

schools. Following the overview letter, the NCES mailed the surveys to the sample

schools and used a computer-assisted, telephone-interviewing instrument to verify school

information and to establish a survey coordinator. Throughout the year, schools were

contacted by Census telephone centers to remind the survey coordinator to encourage

participants to complete and return all surveys.

Validity and Reliability of the SASS

There are two technical characteristics of measurement that are used to judge the

overall quality and appropriateness -- validity and reliability (McMillian, 2004). Validity

is a conclusion of the relevance of the measure for a specific understanding. Creswell

(2003) defines validity as the ability to draw meaningful and useful inferences from the

scores on instruments. Reliability in statistics is used to describe the overall consistency

of a measure. McMillian (2004) describes reliability as the consistency or the repeatability of measures.

The SASS questionnaires are systematically developed and administered surveys designed to produce highly reliable data pertaining to K-12 educational statistics. The SASS estimates are based on samples, which may differ somewhat from the values that would be obtained from the universe of respondents using the same questionnaire, instructions, and field representatives. The difference occurs because a sample survey estimate is subject to two types of errors: non-sampling and sampling. Non-sampling errors are attributed to many sources, including definitional difficulties, the inability or unwillingness of respondents to provide correct information, differences in the interpretation of questions, inability to recall information, errors made in collection (e.g., in recording or coding the data), errors made in processing the data, and errors made in estimating values for missing data (NCES, 2009). The 2007-2008 SASS data was reviewed for data errors associated with editing, imputation, and weighting programs. Specific analysis review incorporated univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analysis to examine various aspects of the data. The aspects of the dataset that were reviewed include general data quality, nonresponse, weighting, external data checks, and response variance (Torkin et al., 2010).

Choice of SASS Public School Principal Questionnaire

The 2007-2008 SASS Public School Principal Questionnaire dataset was selected because the present study requires measures of principal data including demographics, experience and training, decision making responsibilities, working conditions, and principal perceptions. This data set was used because the SASS dataset includes the

principal background and responsibility data of interest for the proposed study, SASS data is stratified proportionately to be representative of the national population of American principals, which allows for generalizing of the findings, and the SASS data is (a) systematically planned and executed as well as detailed; (b) reflective of the population; (c) quantifiable because the data is expressed numerically; (d) comprehensive in range of measurements and (e) large in sample size; and (f) a reliable description of schools, teachers, and principals nationwide (U.S. Department of Education, 2000).

Data Variables

Research Question 1 examined personal and professional background variables, which include gender, race, age, and various professional background preparation and experiences. Table 2 outlined each associated SASS variable, label, level, code/scoring, and SASS survey item.

Table 3.1

Variable Codes, Scoring, and Levels of Measurement for 2007-2008 SASS Data

pertaining to Research Question #1

SASS Variable	Label	Level	Code/Scoring	SASS Survey Item
Gender	Gender	Nominal	Gender Male = 1, Female = 0	Q39
Race	Race	Nominal	Race White =1, All others = 0	Q41a
Age	Age	Interval/Ratio	Principal Age	Q42
Years of principalship experience	YAP	Interval/Ratio	Years of Experience	Q1
Years of experience in current position	YATS	Interval/Ratio	Years in current position	Q2
Years of teaching experience before becoming a principal	YTBP	Interval/Ratio	Years of teaching	Q3
Years of teaching experience while being a principal	YTAP	Interval/Ratio	Years of teaching and being a principal	Q4
Principals that teach while fulfilling the role of principal	TAP	Nominal	Yes = 1, No = 0	Q5
Principals that participated in a program for aspiring principals	ASPIRE	Nominal	Yes = 1, No = 0	Q6
Principals with prior management experience outside education	MANAGE	Nominal	Yes = 1, No = 0	Q7
Highest degree earned by principal	DEGREE	Nominal	Bachelor's or less = 1, Master's or higher = 0	Q8
Principals who earned at least a Master's degree	EDLD	Nominal	Yes = 1, No = 0	Q9
Principals who have participated in professional development activities focused on the role of the principal	PD	Nominal	Yes = 1, No = 0	Q10

Research Question 2 examined professional variables, which include various

decision-making variables, working condition variables, and various principal perception

variables. Table 3 outlined each associated SASS variable, label, level, code/scoring, and

SASS survey item.

Table 3.2

Variable Codes, Scoring, and Levels of Measurement for 2007-2008 SASS Data Pertaining to Research Question #2

SASS Variable	Label	Level	Code/Scoring	SASS Survey Item
Setting performance standards for students of this school	A46	Interval	Scale 1-4 (No Influence, Minor Influence, Moderate Influence, Major Influence)	Q12a(4)
Establishing curriculum at this school	A53	Interval	Scale 1-4 (No Influence, Minor Influence, Moderate Influence, Major Influence)	Q12b(4)
Determining the content of professional development programs for teachers	A60	Interval	Scale 1-4 (No Influence, Minor Influence, Moderate Influence, Major Influence)	Q12c(4)
Evaluates teachers	A68	Interval	Scale 1-4 (No Influence, Minor Influence, Moderate Influence, Major Influence)	Q12d(4)
Hires new full-time teachers	A75	Interval	Scale 1-4 (No Influence, Minor Influence, Moderate Influence, Major Influence)	Q12e(4)
Determines the discipline policy at this school	A82	Interval	Scale 1-4 (No Influence, Minor Influence, Moderate Influence, Major Influence)	Q12f(4)
Decides how the budget will be spent	A89	Interval	Scale 1-4 (No Influence, Minor Influence, Moderate Influence, Major Influence)	Q12g(4)
Total hours spent on school-related activities per week	A225	Interval	Total Hours	Q34
Total hours interacting with students per week	A226	Interval	Total Hours	Q35
Total number of days required to work each year	A227	Interval	Total number of days	Q36
The stress and disappointments involved in serving as principal aren't worth it	A229	Interval	Scale 1-4 (Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree)	Q38a

Table 3 – continued

SASS Variable	Label	Level	Code/Scoring	SASS Survey Item
The faculty and staff at this school like being here	A230	Interval	Scale 1-4 (Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree)	Q38b
I like the way things are run in this district	A231	Interval	Scale 1-4 (Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree)	Q38c
If I could get a higher paying job I'd leave education as soon as possible	A232	Interval	Scale 1-4 (Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree)	Q38d
I think about transferring to another school	A233	Interval	Scale 1-4 (Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree)	Q38e
I don't seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began my career as a principal	A234	Interval	Scale 1-4 (Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree)	Q38f
I think about staying home from school because I'm just too tired to go	A235	Interval	Scale 1-4 (Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, Somewhat disagree, Strongly disagree)	Q38g

*These were the original codings in the survey. Data were recoded for these two variables so that a higher number reflected a report of feeling more satisfied. After recoding, variable A229 to A235 all reflect the scale that a higher number equates to feeling more satisfied.

Data Analysis

For the purpose of this study, logistical regression analysis and discriminate function analysis were used to predict the probability of traditional public school and charter public school principal membership based on the variables outlined in each of the research questions.

Logistical regression analysis is a type of regression analysis used for predicting the outcome of a categorical dependent variable based on one or more predictor variables. The prediction describes the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable by converting the dependent variable into a probability score.

Logistical regression can be binomial or multinomial. Binominal logistical regression is used when the observed outcome can only have two possible types. Generally, responses are coded as "0" or "1" to identify the type of outcome. An example binomial logistical regression in this study is the coding of gender. Gender was coded as 1 = male and 2 = female. Multinomial logistical regression is used when the observed outcome can have three or more responses. An example of these responses could include "better," "no change," or "worse." For the purpose of this study, binomial logistical regression was used to analyze the data for Research Question 1, which examined the personal and professional characteristics variables to predict the group membership of traditional public school principals and charter public school principals.

Discriminate function analysis is a statistical analysis to distinguish groups based on a set of variables. This analysis allows the researcher to determine which category (or group) has a greater probability to possess the characteristic described by the variable. For Research Question 2, discriminate function analysis was used to examine if traditional public school principals and charter public school principals can be distinguished by the decision making, principal perceptions, and working conditions variables.

In this study, I inquired into whether traditional public school principals and charter public school principals could be distinguished based on their professional characteristics.

Weighting and Relative Weighting

The 2007-2008 SASS data were weighted to estimate national, regional, and state estimates for public schools, districts, and principals. The weighting procedures used for

the 2007-2008 SASS survey served three distinct purposes: to take account of the probability a school would be selected, to reduce any bias that could result from a nonresponse, and to make use of information available from external sources to improve the ability of the sample to make accurate predictions (National Center for Education Statistics, 2004). For this study, relative weights were used to perform the statistical analyses with the purpose of both (a) approximating the national population and (b) adjusting to the sample size; therefore the test statistics were not inflated for the tests.

Sample Size and Power of the Study

According to the technical report, the characteristics of the 2007-2008 SASS data were weighted to represent 5,250 public school districts, 9,800 public schools, and 9,800 public school principals. The response rate was 87.8% for public school districts, 80.4% for public schools, and 79.4% for public school principals. Weighting was used to account for the principal selection probability, to reduce bias resulting from failure to respond, and to account for the differences in response rates between traditional public school principals and charter public school principals. The size of the survey ensured the power of the analyses.

<div align="center">

Compliance with Ethical Guidelines

</div>

All proper documentation was sent to the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board and approval was received (see Appendix A). The HSIRB is comprised of a committee that exists to protect human subjects and requires students to submit their research proposal for review (Western Michigan, 2011). Because this proposal is based on secondary data, there was no human contact. Confidentiality has been assured

because no names are associated with the data; only research codes were used during all

phases of the study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, the findings of the quantitative analysis of the study are presented. The primary purpose of the study was to contribute to the existing literature on the similarities and differences between traditional public school and charter public school principals. The study used national survey data from the 2007-2008 School and Staffing Survey sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics to conduct an analysis on the similarities and differences between traditional public school and charter public school principals. Research Question 1 was addressed using a binomial logistical regression analysis to predict the group membership of traditional public school and charter public school principals based on the personal and professional characteristics variables. Research Question 2 was addressed using discriminate function analysis to examine if traditional public school and charter public school principals can be distinguished by variables on decision making, principal perceptions, and working conditions. The chapter first presents the descriptive statistics related to the variables used in the study followed by the findings related to Research Questions 1 and 2.

Descriptive Statistics

The following is the descriptive statistics for the variables used in this study. The descriptive statistics provides the reader with a better understanding of the relationship between charter public school and traditional public school principal related to these variables.

School Level Data

Table 4.1

School Level Data as Related to Public Charter and Traditional Public School Principals

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Public Charter School	Elementary	170	56.8	56.8
	Secondary	80	26.6	83.5
	Combined	50	16.5	100.0
	Total	290	100.0	
Traditional Public School	Elementary	4970	69.4	69.4
	Secondary	1700	23.7	93.1
	Combined	490	6.9	100.0
	Total	7170	100.0	

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter schools are less likely to be an elementary school (56.8% vs. 69.4%), slightly more likely to be a secondary school (26.6% vs. 23.7%), and much more likely to be a combined school (elementary and secondary schools combined, 16.6% vs. 6.9%).

Personal Background Data

Table 4.2

Gender Data for Public Charter and Traditional Public School Principals

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Public Charter School	Female	170	58.4	58.4
	Male	120	41.6	100.0
	Total	290	100.0	
Traditional Public School	Female	3580	50.0	50.0
	Male	3580	50.0	100.0
	Total	7170	100.0	

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter schools are more likely to have a female as principal (58.4% vs. 50.0%).

Table 4.3

Race Data for Public Charter and Traditional Public School Principals

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Public Charter School	Other	70	24.8	24.8
	White	220	75.2	100.0
	Total	290	100.0	
Traditional Public School	Other	920	12.8	12.8
	White	6250	87.2	100.0
	Total	7170	100.0	

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter schools are more likely to have a non-White person as a principal (24.8% vs. 12.8%).

Table 4.4

Age Data for Public Charter and Traditional Public School Principals

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Public Charter School	48.68	10.62
Traditional Public School	48.77	8.86

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter schools principals are slightly younger (mean of 48.68 years vs. 48.77 years).

Professional Background Data

Table 4.5

Years of Principalship Experience

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Public Charter School	6.61	6.32
Traditional Public School	7.52	6.78

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter school principals have less principalship experience (mean of 6.61 years vs. 7.52 years).

Table 4.6

Years in Current Position

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Public Charter School	3.49	3.89
Traditional Public School	4.26	4.75

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter school principals have less experience in their current position (mean of 3.49 years vs. 4.26 years).

Table 4.7

Years of Teaching before Becoming Principal

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Public Charter School	10.72	8.93
Traditional Public School	12.73	6.85

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter school principals have fewer years of teaching before becoming a principal (mean of 10.72 vs. 12.73).

Table 4.8

Years of Teaching While Being a Principal

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Public Charter School	.93	2.24
Traditional Public School	.45	2.17

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter school principals have more years of teaching while being a principal (mean of .93 vs. .45).

Table 4.9

Principals Who Teach While Fulfilling the Role of Principal

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Public Charter School	No	260	87.4	87.4
	Yes	30	12.6	100.0
	Total	290	100.0	
Traditional Public School	No	7000	97.7	97.7
	Yes	170	2.3	100.0
	Total	7170	100.0	

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter school principals more often fulfill the role of principal while teaching (12.6% vs. 2.3%).

Table 4.10

Principals that Participated in a Program for Aspiring Principals

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Public Charter School	No	150	52.1	52.1
	Yes	140	47.9	100.0
	Total	290	100.0	
Traditional Public School	No	3130	43.7	43.7
	Yes	4040	56.3	100.0
	Total	7170	100.0	

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter school principals were less likely to participate in programs for aspiring principals (47.9% vs. 56.3%).

Table 4.11

Principals with Prior Management Experience Outside of Education

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Public Charter School	No	120	42.5	42.5
	Yes	170	57.5	100.0
	Total	290	100.0	
Traditional Public School	No	4390	61.3	61.3
	Yes	2780	38.7	100.0
	Total	7170	100.0	

Compared with traditional public schools, more public charter school principals have prior management experience outside of education (57.5% vs. 38.7%).

Table 4.12

Highest Degree Earned by Principal (Master's or below vs. above Master's)

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Public Charter School	Master or below	200	69.0	69.0
	Above Master's	90	31.0	100.0
	Total	290	100.0	
Traditional Public School	Master's or below	4470	62.3	62.3
	Above Master's	2700	37.7	100.0
	Total	7170	100.0	

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter school principals are less likely to have a degree above a Master's (31.0% vs. 37.7%).

Table 4.13

Principals who Earned a Master's Degree in Educational Leadership (EDLD)

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Public Charter School	No	110	37.8	37.8
	Yes	180	62.2	100.0
	Total	290	100.0	
Traditional Public School	No	990	13.7	13.7
	Yes	6180	86.3	100.0
	Total	7170	100.0	

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter school principals are less likely to have a Master's in Educational Leadership (62.2% vs. 86.3%).

Table 4.14

Participation in Professional Development Related to the Role of the Principal

		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Public Charter School	No	20	7.3	7.3
	Yes	270	92.7	100.0
	Total	290	100.0	
Traditional Public School	No	140	2.0	2.0
	Yes	7030	98.0	100.0
	Total	7170	100.0	

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter school principals are less likely to have participated in professional development activities related to the role of principal (92.7% vs. 98.0%).

Table 4.15

Descriptive Statistics for Principals' Actual Influence on Decision-Making Power*

Variables		Charter School		Traditional Public	
		M	SD	M	SD
A1	Setting performance standards for students of this school	3.69	0.59	3.50	0.71
A2	Establishing curriculum at this school	3.71	0.57	3.45	0.71
A3	Determining the content of professional development programs for teachers	3.84	0.37	3.72	0.52
A4	Principal evaluates teachers	3.95	0.21	3.93	0.30
A5	Principal hires new full-time teachers	3.93	0.28	3.88	0.41
A6	Principal determines the discipline policy at this school	3.89	0.34	3.87	0.38
A7	Principal decides how the	3.70	0.61	3.69	0.58

budget will be spent

*Means are based on a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 = No Influence, 2 = Minor Influence, 3 = Moderate Influence, 4 = Major Influence.

Compared with traditional public schools, charter public school principals have a higher level of decision-making influence in the areas of setting performance standards (3.69 vs. 3.50), establishing curriculum (3.71 vs. 3.45), determining content of professional development programs for teachers (3.84 vs. 3.72), and hiring new full-time teachers (3.93 vs. 3.88).

Table 4.16

Descriptive Statistics for Principals' Working Conditions

		Charter School		Traditional Public	
Variables		M	SD	M	SD
B1	Total hours spent on school-related activities per week	58.19	12.68	58.44	12.10
B2	Total hours interacting with students per week	21.41	12.22	20.82	12.82
B3	Total number of days required to work each year	228.00	23.08	224.99	22.06

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter school principals report working more days per year (228.00 vs. 224.99), and spent more time interacting with students per week (21.41 hours vs. 20.82 hours).

Table 4.17

*Descriptive Statistics for Principals' Perceptions**

		Charter School		Traditional Public	
Variables		M	SD	M	SD
C1	The stress and disappointments involved in serving as principal aren't worth it	3.45	0.84	3.41	0.84
C2	The faculty and staff at this school like being here	3.50	0.74	3.54	0.71
C3	I like the way things are run in this district	3.05	0.74	3.06	0.84
C4	If I could get a higher paying job I'd leave education as soon as possible	3.49	0.81	3.29	0.91
C5	I think about transferring to another school	3.55	0.79	3.36	0.91
C6	I don't seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began my career as a principal	3.35	0.91	3.22	0.91
C7	I think about staying home from school because I'm just too tired to go	3.61	0.73	3.61	0.75

* Means based on scale of 1 to 4 with 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Somewhat Disagree, 4 = Strongly Disagree. C2 and C3 were reversely coded for analyses.

Compared with traditional public schools, public charter school principals report that they experience stress and disappointments less (3.45 vs. 3.41), perceive that the faculty and staff like being at this school more (3.50 vs. 3.54), tend to hold higher approval ratings for the way the district is run (3.05 vs. 3.06), would be less likely to leave education for a higher paying job (3.49 vs. 3.29), would be less likely to think about transferring to another school (3.55 vs. 3.36), and are more likely to have as much enthusiasm as when they began their career as principal (3.35 vs. 3.22).

The results presented in the foregoing pages reveal the patterns of similarity and difference between traditional public school and charter public school principals based descriptive statistics. In the following section, inferential statistics are presented to identify the similarities and differences between the two groups of principals.

Results for Research Question 1

Research Question 1: After controlling for school level and size, what were the differences between traditional public school and charter public school principals when examining their personal and professional backgrounds in reference to (a) various demographic variables and (b) various principal experience and training variables?

The results for Research Question 1 are presented through three models, Control Model (Model A), Personal Background Model (Model B), and Personal and Professional Background Model (Model C). All three models – Model A, Model B, and Model C – are statistically significant. The results are presented in table 4.18.

The results in Table 4.18 indicated that the control model A, including "school size," "elementary," and "all others," explains 1.7% of the variance in outcomes. After entering three variables of "race," "age," and "gender" (model B), model B explains 3.7% of the variance of outcome measure, which means that three additional demographic variables explain 2% additional variance than model A, which is statistically significant (chi-square = 41.687, df = 3, p < .001). Model C contains 10 additional variables on professional characteristics and explains a total of 14.2% of the variance in the outcome measures. In comparison to model B, the 10 additional variables on professional characteristics explain 10.5% more variance in the outcome measure, which is statistically significant (chi-square = 228.187, df = 10, p < .001).

Overall, the results in Model C indicated that charter school principals tend to be non-White, younger, female, less likely to have an M.A. in educational administration, have fewer years in current position, have fewer years of teaching experience, are more likely to teach while fulfilling the role of the principal, are less likely to participate in a development program for aspiring principals, are much more likely to have management experience outside of education, and are less likely to participate in professional development activities related to the role of principal. The following provides detailed findings for each variable, based on the findings from the final model (Model C).

- School size (b=.000, p=.890, Exp (B) = 1.000): The variable of school size does not predict whether a given school will have a charter or traditional public school principal.

- Elementary Level (b=-.739, p=.000, Exp (B) = .478): After including personal and professional background variables, the chance of an elementary school to have a public charter school principal is 47.8% as likely as other types of schools. In other words, elementary schools across the nation are less likely to be led by a charter school principal.

- Elementary and secondary vs. combined (b=-.509, p=.012, Exp (B) = .601): The chance of an elementary or secondary school having a public charter school principal is 60.1% as likely as a combined school. In other words, combined schools across the nation are much more likely to have charter school principals.

- Race (with white being the indicator variable) (b=-.956, p=.000, Exp (B) = .384): After controlling for other variables, the probability for a white individual to lead a public charter school is 38.4% as likely as a non-White individual. In other

words, public charter schools across the nation are much more likely to be led by non-White individuals than traditional public schools.

- Age (b=.023, p=.010, Exp (B) = 1.023): After controlling for other variables, findings indicated that being one year older increased the probability of being a charter school principal by 2.3%. In other words, public charter school principals are more likely to be older than traditional public school principals.

- Gender (with male being the indicator variable) (b=-.481, p=.000, Exp (B) = .618): After controlling for other variables, the chance for a male to become a public charter school principal was 61.8% as likely as the female counterpart. Thus, public charter schools across the nation are more likely to be led by females than traditional public schools.

- Highest degree (b=-.189, p=.161, Exp (B) = .828): After controlling for other variables, the variable of highest degree did not predict whether an individual was a charter or traditional public school principal.

- Principals that earned a master's degree in educational administration (having a master's degree in educational administration is the indicator variable) (b=-1.138, p=.000, Exp (B) = .321): After controlling for other variables, a person who has a master's degree in educational administration was 32.1% as likely to be a charter school principal as someone who does not have such a degree. In other words, public charter school principals were much less likely to have a master's degree in educational administration than traditional public school principals.

- Years of principalship experience (b=-.010, p=.487, Exp (B) = .990): After controlling for other variables, the variable of years of principalship experience

did not predict whether an individual was a charter or traditional public school principal.

- Years of experience in current position (b=-.048, p=.013, Exp (B) = .953): After controlling for other variables, with each additional year of experience in current position, the chance of becoming a public charter school principal was 95.3% as likely. Public charter school principals had fewer years of experience in their current position than their public school counterparts, which is unsurprising given the short history of the charter school movement.

- Years of teaching experience (b=-.058, p=.000, Exp (B) = .944): After controlling for other variables, with each additional year of teaching experience, the chance of becoming a public charter school principal was 94.4% as likely. In other words, public charter school principals have fewer years of teaching experience than traditional public school principals.

- Years of teaching experience while being the principal (b=-.004, p=.882, Exp (B) = .996): The variable of years of teaching experience while being the principal did not predict whether an individual was a charter school or traditional public school principal.

- Principals that teach while fulfilling the role of principal (b=1.501, p=.000, Exp (B) = 4.488): After controlling for other variables, for those who teach while fulfilling the role of principals, the chance of being a public charter school principal was 348.4% more likely than someone who did not teach while fulfilling the role of being a principal. In other words, charter school principals were much

more likely to teach while fulfilling the role of principal than their traditional public school counterparts.

- Participation in a school training or development program for aspiring principals (b=-.341, p=.008, Exp (B) = .711): After controlling for other variables, with each additional year of teaching experience, the chance of becoming a public charter school principal was 94.4% as likely. The chance for someone who participates in a school training or development program for aspiring principals to become a public school principal was 71.1% as likely as someone who does not participate in these trainings. In other words, public charter school principals were less likely to participate in a school training or professional development program for aspiring principals than traditional public school principals.

- Prior management experience outside of education (b=.624, p=.000, Exp (B) = 1.866): After controlling for other variables, the chance for those having management experience outside of education to become a public charter school principal was 86.6% more likely than someone who does not have management experience outside of education. In other words, a public charter school principal was more likely to have management experience outside of education than a traditional public school principal.

- Principals who have participated in professional development activities related to the role of the principal (b=-.953, p=.000, Exp (B) = .386): After controlling for other variables, for those who have participated in professional development activities related to the role of the principal, the probability of being a public charter school principal was 38.6% as likely as someone who had not participated.

In other words, public charter school principals were much less likely to participate in professional development activities related to the role of principal than traditional public school principals.

Table 4.18

Comparison of the Three Models That Predict the Outcome of Being a Public Charter School Principal

	Model A			Model B			Model C		
	B	Sig.	Exp (B)	B	Sig.	Exp (B)	B	Sig.	Exp (B)
School Size	.000	.271	1.000	.000	.962	1.000	.000	.890	1.000
Elementary	-1.080	.000	.340	-1.184	.000	.306	-.739	.000	.478
Elementary or Secondary vs. Combined	-.760	.000	.468	-.710	.000	.492	-.509	.012	.601
Race (White as the indicator variable)				-.788	.000	.455	-.956	.000	.384
Age				-.001	.883	.999	.023	.010	1.023
Gender (Male as the indicator variable)				-.443	.001	.642	-.481	.000	.618
Highest Degree							-.189	.161	.828
M.A. in Educational Administration							-1.138	.000	.321
Years of principalship experience							-.010	.487	.990
Years of experience in current position							-.048	.013	.953
Years of teaching experience							-.058	.000	.944
Years of teaching experience while being principal							-.004	.882	.996
Principals who teach while fulfilling the role of principal							1.501	.000	4.488
Participation in a school training or development program for aspiring principals							-.341	.008	.711
Prior management experience outside of education							.624	.000	1.866
Principals who have participated in professional development activities related to the role of principal							-.953	.000	.386
Nagelkerke R Square		0.017			0.037			0.142	
-2 Log likelihood		2432.126			2390.439			2162.252	
Df		3			6			16	
Δ (-2 Log likelihood)					41.687			228.187	
Δdf					3			10	
Model comparison (chi-square test)					P < .001			P < .001	

Results for Research Question 2

Research Question 2: After controlling for school level and school size, what were the differences between charter public school and traditional public school principals when examining the following areas: (a) decision-making power variables, (b) working condition variables, and (c) principal perception variables?

After controlling for school level and school size, discriminate function analysis was conducted to determine whether there were differences between traditional public school and charter public school principals when examining the decision-making responsibilities, working conditions, and principal perceptions through variables in the 2007-2008 SASS data.

In Table 4.19, a description of the variables within the three categories is presented to assist in interpreting the analysis. The results of three discriminate function analyses of principals' actual inference on decision-making power, principals' working conditions, and principals' perceptions are reported in Table 4.20. All three sets of results are statistically significant.

Table 4.19

A Description of Variables

Principals' Actual Influence on Decision-Making Power

A1   Setting performance standards for students of this school – (continuous, 1 = No Influence, 2 = Minor Influence, 3 = Moderate Influence, 4 = Major Influence)

A2   Establishing curriculum at this school – (continuous, 1 = No Influence, 2 = Minor Influence, 3 = Moderate Influence, 4 = Major Influence)

A3   Determining the content of professional development programs for teachers – (continuous, 1 = No Influence, 2 = Minor Influence, 3 = Moderate Influence, 4 = Major Influence)

A4   Principal evaluates teachers (continuous, 1 = No Influence, 2 = Minor Influence, 3 = Moderate Influence, 4 = Major Influence)

A5   Principal hires new full-time teachers (continuous, 1 = No Influence, 2 = Minor Influence, 3 = Moderate Influence, 4 = Major Influence)

A6   Principal determines the discipline policy at this school (continuous, 1 = No Influence, 2 = Minor Influence, 3 = Moderate Influence, 4 = Major Influence)

A7   Principal decides how the budget will be spent (continuous, 1 = No Influence, 2 = Minor Influence, 3 = Moderate Influence, 4 = Major Influence)

Principals' Working Conditions

B1   Total hours spent on school-related activities per week (continuous – total hours)

B2   Total hours interacting with students per week (continuous – total hours)

B3   Total number of days required to work each year (continuous – total number of days)

Principals' Perceptions

C1   The stress and disappointments involved in serving as principal aren't worth it (continuous, 1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Strongly disagree)

C2*   The faculty and staff at this school like being here (continuous, 1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Strongly disagree)

C3*   I like the way things are run in this district (continuous, 1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Strongly disagree)

C4   If I could get a higher paying job I'd leave education as soon as possible (continuous, 1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Strongly disagree)

C5   I think about transferring to another school (continuous, 1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Strongly disagree)

C6   I don't seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began my career as a principal (continuous, 1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Strongly disagree)

C7   I think about staying home from school because I'm just too tired to go (continuous, 1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Somewhat agree, 3 = Somewhat disagree, 4 = Strongly disagree)

---

*C2 and C3 were reversely coded for analyses.

Table 4.20

Discriminant Analysis of Charter School and Traditional Public School Principal

		Charter School		Traditional Public			
Variables		M	SD	M	SD	Univariate F	Item to function correlation

Principals' Actual Influence on Decision-Making Areas

		M	SD	M	SD	Univariate F	Item to function correlation
A1	Setting performance standards for students of this school	3.69	0.59	3.50	0.71	20.42***	-0.19
A2	Establishing curriculum at this school	3.71	0.57	3.45	0.71	39.27***	-0.47
A3	Determining the content of professional development programs for teachers	3.84	0.37	3.72	0.52	17.35***	-0.22
A4	Principal evaluates teachers	3.95	0.21	3.93	0.30	1.40	0.02
A5	Principal hires new full-time teachers	3.93	0.28	3.88	0.41	5.59*	-0.15
A6	Principal determines the discipline policy at this school	3.89	0.34	3.87	0.38	.90	0.10
A7	Principal decides how the budget will be spent	3.70	0.61	3.69	0.58	.10	0.06
	Group centroids						
	Charter School						-0.54
	Traditional Public						0.02

Principals' Working Conditions

		M	SD	M	SD	Univariate F	Item to function correlation
B1	Total hours spent on school-related activities per week	58.19	12.68	58.44	12.10	.12	0.07
B2	Total hours interacting with students per week	21.41	12.22	20.82	12.82	.61	-0.06
B3	Total number of days required to work each year	228.00	23.08	224.99	22.06	5.22*	-0.33
	Group centroids						
	Charter School						-0.41
	Traditional Public						0.02

Principals' Perceptions

		M	SD	M	SD	Univariate F	Item to function correlation
C1	The stress and disappointments involved in serving as principal aren't worth it	3.45	0.84	3.41	0.84	0.78	0.09
C2	The faculty and staff at this school like being here	3.50	0.74	3.54	0.71	0.96	0.13
C3	I like the way things are run in this district	3.05	0.74	3.06	0.84	0.04	0.14
C4	If I could get a higher paying job I'd leave education as soon as possible	3.49	0.81	3.29	0.91	13.71***	-0.37

Table 4.20 – Continued

Variables		Charter School		Traditional Public		Univariate F	Item to function correlation
		M	SD	M	SD		
C5	I think about transferring to another school	3.55	0.79	3.36	0.91	12.62***	-0.41
C6	I don't seem to have as much enthusiasm now as I did when I began my career as a principal	3.35	0.91	3.22	0.91	5.00*	-0.18
C7	I think about staying home from school because I'm just too tired to go	3.61	0.73	3.61	0.75	0.003	0.19
	Group centroids						
	Charter School						-0.50
	Traditional Public						0.02

*** < 0.001, ** < 0.01, * < 0.05

Principals' Actual Influence on Decision Making

Discriminate function distinguished the two groups on principals' actual influence in two decision-making areas. An examination of group centroids and item-to-function correlations indicated that this discriminate function separates charter school principals from traditional public school principals on the variables of establishing curriculum at this school and determining the content of professional development programs for teachers. Charter school principals (M = 3.71) perceived to have more influence in establishing curriculum at their school compared to traditional public school principals (M = 3.45); charter school principals (M = 3.84) perceived to have more influence in determining the content of professional development programs for teachers compared to traditional public school principals (M = 3.72). Using the absolute value of 0.20 as the cut-off point for item-to-function correlation coefficients, the group centroids and the item-to-function correlation coefficients also indicated that charter public school principals perceive more influence pertaining to these two variables than their traditional

public school counterparts. These findings on establishing curriculum and determining the content of professional development programs for teachers support previous findings, due to the common administrative structure of charter public schools that allows decision-making power in these two areas to take place at the building level. The two groups did not differ significantly on influences related to (a) principal evaluates teachers, (b) principal hires new full-time teachers, (c) principal determines the discipline policy at this school, and (d) the principal decides how the budget will be spent.

Principals' Working Conditions

The discriminant function analysis of the two groups on principals' working conditions yielded one significant function that separated charter public school and traditional public school principals. In comparison, charter public school principals' total number of days required to work each year (M = 228.00) is significantly greater than traditional public school principals (M = 224.99). Because the item-to-function correlation coefficient for the total number of days required to work each year (-0.33) is in the same direction of the charter school principal's group centroid (-0.41), this also indicated that charter public school principals work more days per year than traditional public school principals. This was consistent with previous findings, and a result of the increased administrative duties that charter public school principals often oversee in comparison to traditional public school principals. The two groups did not differ on the total hours spent on school-related activities per week and total hours interacting with students per week.

Principals' Perceptions

Two significant discriminate functions distinguished the two groups on principals' perceptions. Based on the absolute value of 0.20 as the cut-off point, an examination of group centroids and item-to-function correlations indicated that this discriminate function separates charter school principals from traditional public school principals on the variables of "if I could get a higher paying job I'd leave education as soon as possible" and "I think about transferring to another school." Charter school principals (M = 3.49) reported being more satisfied with their salaries in their current position compared to traditional public school principals (M = 3.29); charter school principals (M = 3.55) reported thinking less about transferring to another building compared to traditional public school principals (M = 3.36). While the item-to-function correlation coefficients for these variables -- if I could get a higher paying job I'd leave education as soon as possible (-0.37) and I think about transferring to another building (-0.41) -- are in the same direction as the charter school principal group centroid (-0.50), this result also indicated that charter public school principals are more satisfied with their salaries in the current position and think less about transferring to another school. The findings of charter public school principals considering leaving their positions less than traditional public school principals supports previous findings due to the increased job satisfaction that charter school principals often experience compared to traditional public school principals. The two groups did not significantly differ on "the stress and disappointments involved in serving as principal aren't worth it," "the faculty and staff at this school like being here," "I like the way things are run in this district," and "I think about staying home from school because I'm just too tired to go."

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The principal plays a pivotal role in increasing the achievement of the students and impacting the success of the school in general. Recent legislation has placed greater emphasis on the accountability of the principal to increase the achievement of all students within their schools. This emphasis on accountability, along with the implementation of charter public schools, has increased the necessity to examine the role of the principal in both charter public and traditional public schools. In this study, the author examined the similarities and differences between traditional public and charter public school principals in the areas of demographics, professional backgrounds, decision-making, working conditions, and principals' perceptions.

The present study was designed to answer two questions: (a) after controlling for school level and school size, what are the differences between traditional public school and charter public school principals when examining their personal and professional backgrounds in terms of demographics, experience, and education? and (b) after controlling for school level and school size, what are the differences between traditional public school and charter public school principals in decision-making, working condition, and perceptions of the position? This chapter presents an introduction, summary of results, discussion of findings, limitations, recommendations for future research, and conclusions that are drawn from the data analysis and results of the study.

Introduction

The structure of the K-12 educational organization has drastically changed over the past 25 years. This change has primarily been the result of the introduction of charter public schools in several states across the nation. Various state legislatures have passed laws guiding the creation and structure of charter public schools within each state. Even though the structure of charter public schools varies from state to state, the principle of empowering parents and families to determine the educational path of their children remains consistent across the United States. In addition, the structure and size of charter public schools varies greatly, much like that of traditional public schools. Although the structure, size, and philosophy of charter public and traditional public schools vary greatly, the leadership and management of each organization is defined by the role of the principal or a similar position. A principal plays an important role in working with and through other people to achieve organizational goals (Shen & Cooley, 2013). With the understanding that an individual known as the principal leads all K-12 educational organizations, examining the variations of this role between charter public schools and traditional public schools is imperative.

The principalship is a dynamic position that can be examined and analyzed from various angles. The purpose of this study was to examine the similarities and differences between charter public and traditional public school principals in the areas of demographics, experience and training, decision-making, working conditions, and perceptions. To begin to understand the similarities and differences between these two positions, understanding the implementation and development of the charter school movement is imperative. The charter public school movement began in Minnesota in

1992 and since has spread across the United States. Since the opening of the first charter

public school, St. Paul's City Academy High School in Minnesota in 1992, 42 states and

the District of Columbia have followed by implementing various forms of charter public

school legislation. The movement has grown to include over 5,600 charter public schools

and more than 2 million students. As the public charter school movement has spread

across the country, charter schools have become diverse in size, location, specializations,

and organization.

The primary purpose of this study was to quantifiably assess the similarities and

differences between charter public and traditional public school principals. Two major

research questions guided this dissertation: (a) what are the differences between charter

public and traditional public school principals when examining their personal and

professional backgrounds in reference to demographics, professional experience, and

professional training, and (b) what are the differences between charter public and

traditional public school principals when examining principals' actual inference on

decision-making power, principals' working condition, and principals' perception?

The findings from this study are significant to this topic because few studies have

used quantitative methodology to examine the similarities and differences between

traditional public and charter public school principals. The national data set of SASS

2007-2008 used for this dissertation allows for the examination of the similarities and

differences. The findings from the analysis contribute to the existing literature on

traditional public school and charter public school leadership on a national level.

This chapter provides summaries, discussions, and conclusions that come from

the data analysis and results of the study. Moreover, recommendations for future

research are provided for educational researchers, educators, and policy makers based on the results of this study.

<div align="center">

Summary of Results

</div>

Research Question 1

As described in Chapter IV, the findings related to Research Question 1 identified various differences between the personal and professional backgrounds of traditional public and charter public school principals. Descriptive and logistical regression analysis revealed that the most significant differences between traditional public and charter public school principals emerge in the areas of race, age, gender, and professional background and preparation.

Ethnicity. Descriptive statistics indicated that the charter public school principal demographic is more likely to be a non-White person (24.8% vs. 12.8%). Logistic regression found that after controlling for other variables, the probability for a White person to lead a public charter school was 38.4% as likely as a non-White person. This conclusion supports recent literature when examining the race of the principal in both charter public and traditional public schools. For example, in a study of 1999-2000 data, Gates, Ringel, Santibanez, Ross, and Chung (2003) found that 18% of public school principals were members of a racial/ethnic minority compared to 29% of charter school principals (p. 19). In a 2003-2004 study, The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) found that minorities (32.4% vs. 17.2%) lead twice as many charter schools as traditional schools (p. 66).   In addition, Campbell and Gross (2008) stated that a principal of a traditional public school is more likely to be White (63% vs. 57%) and a

traditional public school is less likely to be led by a minority (African American, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, and Other) (37% vs. 41%) (p. 6).

Age. Descriptive statistics indicated that there was a small difference in age between charter public school principals and traditional public school principals (mean of 48.68 years vs. 48.77 years). Logistic regression found that after controlling for other variables, being one year older increased the probability of being a charter school principal by 2.3%. This finding supported recent literature examining the age of the principal in both charter public and traditional public schools. In one instance, Gates, Ringel, Santibanez, Ross, and Chung (2003) discovered that the average age of charter school principals in 1999-2000 was one year younger than principals of traditional public schools, 48.3 vs. 49.3 (p. 13).

Gender. Descriptive statistics indicated that charter public schools appear to be more likely to have a female principal (58.4% vs. 50.0%) than traditional public schools. Logistic regression found that after controlling for other variables, the chance of a male becoming a charter public school principal is only 61.8% as likely as the female counterpart. This finding is consistent with recent literature when examining the gender of the principal in both charter public and traditional public schools. For example, Gates, Ringel, Santibanez, Ross, and Chung (2003) found that in 1999-2000, 44% of all public school principals were female compared to 54% of all charter school principals (p. 19).

Level of Degree. Descriptive statistics analysis indicated charter public school principals appear to be less likely to have a master's degree in educational administration (31.0% vs. 37.7%). Logistic regression found that after controlling for other variables, the probability of a person who has a master's degree in educational administration to be

a charter school principal is 32.1% as likely as someone who does not have a master's degree in educational administration. After reviewing the existing literature, no literature was found that compares the level of education between charter public school principals and traditional public school principals. However, it appears that traditional public school principals are more likely to have a master's degree in educational administration according to the data results of the current study.

Years of Experience. Descriptive statistics analysis indicated that charter public school principals appear to have less experience in their current position than their traditional public equivalents (mean of 4.26 years vs. 3.49 years). Logistic regression found that after controlling for other variables, with each additional year of experience in current position, the chance of becoming a public charter school principal is 95.3% as likely. Public charter school principals have fewer years of experience in their current position than their public school counterparts. This finding supports recent literature when examining the number of years principals of charter public and traditional public schools have served in their current position. In 2008, Campbell and Gross discovered that almost 30% of charter school leaders have led a school for two years or less compared to 16% of traditional public school principals (p. 6). In addition, Gross and Pochop (2008) stated that in the 2003-2004 SASS dataset 24% charter school principals had 2-3 years of principalship experience, while the corresponding figure was 18% for traditional public school principals, and that 48% of charter school principals had 4 or more years of principalship while the corresponding figure was 66% for traditional public school principals.

Teaching Experience . Descriptive statistic analysis indicated charter public school principals are more likely to have taught fewer years than traditional public school principals (mean of 10.72 years vs. 12.73 years). Logistic regression found that after controlling for other variables, with each additional year of teaching experience, the chance of becoming a public charter school principal was 94.4% as likely. After reviewing the existing literature, no literature was found that compares the number of years taught before becoming a principal between charter public school principals and traditional public school principals. However, it appears that traditional public school principals are more likely to have taught more years before becoming a principal as indicated by the result from the current study.

Teaching while Fulfilling the Role of Principal. Descriptive statistic analysis indicated charter public school principals are more likely to teach while fulfilling the role of principal (12.6% vs. 2.3%). Logistic regression found that after controlling for other variables, for those who teach while fulfilling the role of principals, the chance of being a charter public school principal was 348.4% more likely than someone who does not teach while fulfilling the role of principal. Put simply, charter school principals were much more likely to teach while fulfilling the role of principal than their traditional public school counterparts. After reviewing the existing literature, no literature was found that compares if the principal teaches while fulfilling the role of principal between charter public school principals and traditional public school principals. However, results from this study indicated that charter public school principals are more likely to teach while fulfilling the role of principal.

Professional Development Participation. Descriptive statistic analysis indicated charter public school principals are less likely to participate in programs for aspiring principals (47.9% vs. 56.3%). Logistic regression found that after controlling for other variables, the probability for those who participate in a principal training or development program for aspiring principals to become a public school principal was 71.1% as likely as those who do not participate in these trainings. After reviewing the existing literature, no literature was found that compares participation in programs for aspiring principals between charter public school principals and traditional public school principals. However, according to these results, it appears that traditional public school principals are more likely to participate in programs for aspiring principals.

Prior Management Experience. Descriptive statistic analysis indicated charter public school principals are more likely to have prior management experience outside of education than traditional public school counterparts (57.5% vs. 38.7%). Logistic regression found that after controlling for other variables, the probability for those having management experience outside of education to become a public charter school principal was 86.6% more likely than those who do not have management experience outside of education. After reviewing the existing literature, no literature was found that compares prior management experience outside of education between charter public school principals and traditional public school principals. However, it appears that charter public school principals are more likely to have prior management experience outside of education as indicated by the results of the current study.

Professional Development Activities Related to the Role of Principal.
Descriptive statistic analysis indicated charter public school principals are less likely to

participate in professional development activities related to the role of the principal (92.7% vs. 98.0%). Logistic regression found that after controlling for other variables, the probability for a principal to participate in professional development activities related to the role of the principal, the chance of being a public charter school principal was 38.6% as likely as someone who has not participated. After reviewing the existing literature, no literature was found that compares the participation of principals in professional development activities between charter public school principals and traditional public school principals. However, it appears that traditional public school principals are more likely to participate in professional development activities related to the role of principal as indicated by the results from the current study.

Non-Statistically Significant Variables. In the current study, based on the logistic regression results for Model C, after controlling for other variables, there were no statistically significant differences between charter public and traditional public school principals for the following variables: (a) school size, (b) highest degree obtained (above a Master's), (c) number of years of principalship experience, and (d) years of teaching experience while being principal.

Research Question 2

As described in Chapter IV, the findings related to Research Question 2 identified that there are various differences between the two groups of principals' decision-making power, principals' working conditions, and principals' perceptions.

Descriptive analysis revealed that the most significant differences between traditional public and charter public school principals was in the area of establishing curriculum at their school, determining the content of professional development programs

for teachers, total number of days required to work, perception of leaving education if they could get a higher paying job, and the perception of transferring to another school. These differences revealed in the descriptive statistics were confirmed by discriminate function analyses.

Establishing Curriculum. The discriminate function analysis indicated charter public school principals (M = 3.71) perceived to have more influence on establishing curriculum within the school when compared to traditional public school principals (M = 3.45). After reviewing the existing literature, no literature was found that compares charter public school principals and traditional public school principals specifically examining the power of a principal to establish curriculum at their school. However, the finding appears to be consistent with the overall argument for empowering principals in public charter schools.

Determining the Content of Professional Development. The discriminate function analysis indicated charter public school principals (M = 3.84) perceived to have more influence in determining the content of professional development programs for teachers within the school when compared to traditional public school principals (M = 3.72). After reviewing the existing literature, no literature was found that compares charter public school principals and traditional public school principals specifically examining the power of a principal to establish the content of professional development. However, the finding appears to be consistent with the overall argument for empowering principals in public charter schools.

Days Required to Work. The discriminate function analysis indicated charter public school principals (M = 228.00) work more days per year when compared to

traditional public school principals (M = 224.99). This finding supported a recent study

by Gawlik (2012), in which the author interviewed teachers and administrators from four

public schools in the Detroit metropolitan area and found that charter school principals

felt pressure related to accountability; however, their version of accountability is twofold.

They are held accountable to the state, but also to their authorizers, which places an extra

burden on the principal and administrative tasks (p. 217). This increased pressure of

accountability could directly impact the number of days a principal works per year.

Perception on Leaving Education. Discriminate function analysis indicated

charter public school principals (M = 3.49) are perceived to be more satisfied with their

jobs and salaries when compared to traditional public school principals (M = 3.29). In

addition, discriminate function analysis indicated charter public school principals (M =

3.55) are perceived to be less likely to transfer to another school when compared to

traditional public school principals (M = 3.36). The finding that charter public school

principals are less likely to leave education for a higher paying job and less likely to think

about transferring to another school supports recent research by Farkas et al. (2001), in

which the author interviewed 853 superintendents and 909 principals and found that

former public school administrators were frustrated and exasperated by the bureaucracy,

red tape, and politics in traditional school systems which caused them to gravitate to

charter schools and the freedom found in charter systems. This study identified that

traditional public school administrators tend to gravitate to the freedom found in charter

schools. This could be due to the burdens outlined above that are often placed on

traditional public school principals. The impact of these burdens can be related to the

findings of this study that identify a dissatisfaction among traditional public school

principals and a greater commitment of charter public school principals to the principal

position. Table 5.1 outlines the 30 variables used in this study and identifies previous

research pertaining to each variable.

Table 5.1

Significant Findings from the Study Compared to Previous Research Findings

Findings (Vickers, 2014)	Previous Research
Compared with traditional public schools, *public charter schools* are statistically significantly:	
- more likely to have a female as principal (58.4% vs. 50.0%).	Aligns with findings by Gates, Ringel, Santibanez, Ross, and Chung (2003), and Gross and Pochop (2007) that public charter school principals are more likely to be female.
- more likely to have a non-White person as a principal (24.8% vs. 12.8%).	Aligns with findings by Gates, Ringel, Santibanez, Ross, and Chung (2003), Campbell and Gross (2008) and the National Center for Education Statistics (2004) that public charter school principals are more likely to be minorities.
- more likely to be slightly younger (mean of 48.68 years vs. 48.77 years).	Aligns with findings by Gates, Ringel, Santibanez, Ross, and Chung (2003) that public charter school principals are slightly younger than traditional public school principals.

Findings (Vickers, 2014)	Previous Research
Compared with traditional public schools, *public charter school principals* are statistically significantly:	
- more likely to work more days per year (228.00 vs. 224.99).	Aligns with Gawlik (2012) that due to increased accountability placed on public charter school principal, it can result in working more days per year.
- more often fulfill the role of principal while teaching (12.6% vs. 2.3%).	Align with the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools (2008) found that charter public school principals fulfill the role of principals more often than that of traditional public school principals.

Table 5.1 – Continued

- have less experience in their current position (mean of 3.49 years vs. 4.26 years).	Aligns with findings by Campbell and Gross (2008), Gross and Pochop (2008) that public charter school principals are more likely to have less experience in their current position.
- less likely to participate in programs for aspiring principals (47.9% vs. 56.3%).	No previous research found.
- more likely to have prior management experience outside of education (57.5% vs. 38.7%).	No previous research found.
- less likely to have a Master's in Educational Leadership (62.2% vs. 86.3%).	No previous research found.
- less likely to have participated in professional development activities related to the role of principal (92.7% vs. 98.0%).	No previous research found.
- more likely to have influence establishing curriculum (mean of 3.71 vs. 3.45, on 1-4 scale)	No previous research found
- more likely influence determining content of professional development programs for teachers (mean of 3.84 vs. 3.72, on 1-4 scale)	No previous research found.
- less likely to leave education for a higher paying job (mean of 3.49 vs. 3.29, on 1-4 scale)	Aligns with Farkas et al. (2001) that found that traditional public school principals often become frustrated with the bureaucracy, red tape, and politics found in a traditional public school district.
- less likely to think about transferring to another school (mean of 3.55 vs. 3.36, on 1-4 scale)	No previous research found.

Discussion of Findings and Implications

The results of this study highlight key differences between charter public and traditional public school principals that have implications on charter public school policy and practice. The five key implications from this study that impact charter public school principals include race and gender, leadership from outside of education, perceived power of the principal, working conditions, and commitment to the principal position.

Diversity of Charter Public School Principals

The results from this study clearly indicated that charter public school principals are more likely to be female and a minority. This diversity in gender and race of charter public schools mirrors the diversity of students that often comprise the student population of charter public schools.

Leadership from Outside of Education

The results of this study clearly identified charter public school principals are more likely to have management experience outside of education compared to traditional public school principals. Other findings that supported the theme of leadership experience outside of education include that public charter school principals have had fewer years of teaching before becoming principals and are less likely to have a master's degree in educational administration. The results from this study support one of the charter public school's founding premises - delivering innovation to education through pioneering leadership. This is also outlined in the Conceptual Framework in which Charter Public School Theory includes more innovation as a key component of the theory.

Perceived Power of the Principal

The results from this study identified specific areas in which charter public school principals report more influence when compared to traditional public school principals. Charter public school principals perceived to have more influence in the areas of establishing curriculum and providing professional development. This perceived power in the area of curriculum and professional development is likely to be the result of the high level of autonomy that charter public school principals often possess at the building

level. In addition, a high level of autonomy at the classroom and building level is a foundational principle of the charter school movement. This is also outlined in the Conceptual Framework in which Charter Public School Theory includes increased freedom as a key component of the theory.

Working Conditions

The data from this study identified a difference in working conditions between charter public and traditional public school principals in the area of the number of days worked per year. This difference in the number of working days may be directly related to the increased duties and responsibilities that charter public school principals face compared to traditional public school principals. Public charter school principals are also much more likely to teach while fulfilling the role of principalship. This combination of teaching and leadership found in charter public schools is contributed to the multiple roles and responsibilities that charter public school principals often fulfill due to the administrative structure implemented within the charter school.

Commitment to the Principal Position

The results from this study appeared to indicate that public charter school principals are more committed to their school than their traditional public counterparts. The results indicated that charter school principals are less likely to leave education and transfer to another building, which demonstrates an increased commitment to the role of principalship. Previous studies have shown that increased autonomy and promise of implementing innovative educational practices attract principals to charter public schools. This is also outlined in the Conceptual Framework in which Charter Public School

Theory includes staff making a commitment to work in a unique setting as a key component of the theory.

Principals with Diverse Backgrounds

The results of this study identified that public charter schools principals are more likely to be non-White when compared to traditional public schools. This finding suggests that charter public schools have an increased chance of being led by a principal similar to the racial background of the students who attend the school.

Personnel with Experience Outside of Education

The results of this study identified that charter public schools on average have a greater chance of being led by a principal with management experience outside of education. The implication of this finding is that charter public school principals with experience outside of education could have experience and knowledge of various management models. The implementation of various non-educational management models could increase or decrease the success of the school. This is also outlined in the Conceptual Framework in which Charter Public School Theory includes more innovation and being free from tradition as a key component of the theory. This allows for charter public schools to be more open to attracting leaders from industries other than education.

More Committed Personnel

The results of this study identified that traditional public school principals are more likely to think about transferring to another school when compared to charter public school principals. The implication of this can have two outcomes. First, charter public school principals are more content and committed to their current positions. Second, due to the structure of many charter public schools, the schools often consist of only one

building. If the charter public school district only consists of one building, the principal would not have the option to transfer to another building. This is also outlined in the Conceptual Framework in which Charter Public School Theory includes staff making a commitment to work in a unique setting as a key component of the theory.

Professional Preparation and Experience

The results from the study identified that traditional public school principals are more likely to have a master's degree in educational administration, participate in programs for aspiring principals, and participate in professional development pertaining to the role of the principal. Additionally, results from the study identified that traditional public school principals tend to have more experience in the role of teacher and as a principal. In addition, this is outlined in the Conceptual Framework in which Charter Public School Theory includes varying difference in law, regulation, and policy environment as a key component of the theory. This could attribute to alternative pathway to certification for principals of charter public schools.

Increased Responsibility

The results of this study identified that charter public school principals teach while fulfilling the role of principal at an increased rate when compared to traditional public school principals. The implication of this could suggest an increased burden on charter public school principals and possibly burnout. This is also supported in the Conceptual Framework in which Charter Public School Theory includes increased accountability as a key component of the theory. The increased accountability could result in additional burdens for charter public school principals.

Increased Number of Work Days per Year

The results of this study identified that charter public school principals work more days per year when compared to traditional public school principals. The implication for this could stem from the increased burdens that are often placed on charter public school principals to fulfill more roles and responsibilities than that of traditional public school principals. However, the descriptive data from the study identified that traditional public school principals work more hours per week, potentially due to the increased extra-curricular activities in traditional public schools. The area of work days per year was not included in the conceptual framework due to that fact that the theory of charter public and traditional public theory concentrated on specific characteristics of each organization instead of individual descriptors of the principals.

Limitations

This study provided an in-depth look at the differences between traditional public and charter public school principals. This study was based on the 2007-2008 School and Staffing Survey sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics. It was a quantitative look at the similarities and differences of principals based on the respondents' answers.

There were several limitations that impacted this study. First, the variables used to measure the background and responsibilities of the principals in this study were limited to the 2007-2008 SASS dataset, which is an inherent weakness associated with using an existing dataset. Second, the study and research questions were conceptualized after the data was collected, placing some limits on this study. Third, the most recent version of the School and Staffing Survey is the 2007-2008 dataset and is not as recent as preferred.

Recommendations for Future Research

Recommendations for future research pertaining to this line of study potentially consist of both quantitative longitudinal studies and qualitative studies based on the current data. Both suggestions would continue to increase the knowledge base pertaining to the similarities and differences between charter public and traditional public school principals.

Future Quantitative Longitudinal Study

Performing a quantitative longitudinal study on the variables outlined in this study over a period of 10-20 years would allow researchers to identify trends across the variables between charter public and traditional public school principals. The current study could serve as a baseline for the similarities and differences between charter public and traditional public school principals because the charter school movement is in its infancy when compared to the length of existence of traditional public schools. A quantitative study would also allow researchers to examine the charter school movement over an extended period of time. These observations could identify whether the charter public school movement continues to evolve according to the movement's founding principles or according to the model of traditional public schools.

Future Qualitative Study

Performing qualitative studies that examine the variables outlined in this study using questionnaires, interviews, and focus groups would allow researchers to possibly draw more in-depth comparisons between charter public and traditional public school principals. By using qualitative methodologies, researchers could contextualize various factors that are not possible to contextualize in a national dataset. In addition, this study

could make comparisons focused on specific geographical regions and draw conclusions based on school size and location.

While prior research has outlined effective administrative practices for charter public and traditional public schools, the achievement of this study went beyond the structures and examined the individuals leading each of these organizations. The results of this study identified that there are various differences between charter public and traditional public school principals. The differences identified involve a wide variety of variables ranging from demographics to the perceptions of the principal. By examining these variables in practical significant terms, a charter public school principal tends to be a minority, female, have less teaching and principals experience, less likely to have a M.Ed. in Educational Leadership, have management experience outside of education, perceive to have more influence on curriculum and teacher professional develop, work more days per year, and less likely to think about transferring to another school. In contrast, a traditional public school principal tends to be white, male, older, have less teaching and principalship experience, more likely to have a M.Ed. in Educational Leadership, not have management experience outside of education, perceive to have less influence on curriculum and teacher professional development, work fewer days per year, and more likely to think about transferring to another school. The identification of these differences will support future researchers as they examine the differences in various areas of charter public and traditional public school organizations.

Conclusion

Conclusions drawn from this study can be best understood by examining the practical significant difference between the two groups—charter public and traditional

public school principals. When examining the practical significant findings from the study across the various variables, a profile of charter and traditional public school principals can be established. The profile of charter public school principals in the areas of demographics, professional preparation, and professional experience includes principals that are more likely to be minorities, younger, female, less likely to have an M.A. in educational administration, fewer years in current position, fewer years of teaching experience, more likely to teach while fulfilling the role of principal, less likely to participate in a program for aspiring principals, more likely to have management experience outside of education, and less likely to participate in professional development activities related to the role of principal. In contrast, the profile of a traditional public school principal tends to be White, older, male, more likely to have an M.A. in educational administration, more years in current position, more years of teaching experience, less likely to teach while fulfilling the role of principal, more likely to participate in a program for aspiring principals, less likely to have management experience outside of education, and more likely to participate in professional development activities related to the role of principal.

The profile of charter public school principals in the areas of decision-making power, principals' working conditions, and principals' perception identifies more influence in establishing curriculum at their school, more influence in determining the content of professional development programs for teachers, more workdays per year, less likely to leave education for a higher paying job, and less likely to think about transferring to another school. In contrast, a traditional public school principal identifies less influence in establishing curriculum at their school, less influence in determining the

content of professional development programs for teachers, fewer workdays per year,
more likely to leave education for a higher paying job, and more likely to think about
transferring to another school. Table 5.2 identifies the profiles of charter public and
traditional public school principals according to the statistically significant findings from
this study.

Table 5.2

Practical Significant Findings from the Study

Descriptors	Charter Public School	Traditional Public School
Demographic, Professional Preparation, and Professional Experience Variables		
Race	Minority	White
Age	Younger	Older
Gender	Female	Male
M.A. in education administration	Less likely to have an M.A. in education administration	More likely to have an M.A. in education administration
Years in current position	Fewer years in current position	More years in current position

Table 5.2 – Continued

Practical Significant Findings from the Study

Descriptors	Charter Public School	Traditional Public School
Years of teaching experience	Fewer years of teaching experience	More years of teaching experience
Teach while fulfilling the role of principal	More likely to teach while fulfilling the role of principal	Less likely to teach while fulfilling the role of principal
Participation in program for aspiring principals	Less likely to participate in program for aspiring principals	More likely to participate in program for aspiring principals
Prior management experience outside of education	More likely to have management experience outside of education	Less likely to have management experience outside of education
Principals who have participated in professional development activities related to the role of principal	Less likely to participate in professional development activities related to the role of	More likely to participate in professional development activities related to the role of

the principal	the principal

Decision-Making Power, Principals' Working Conditions, and Principals' Perception Variables

Establishing curriculum at their school	Perceive to have more influence on establishing curriculum	Perceive to have less influence on establishing curriculum
Determining the content of professional development programs for teachers	Perceive to have more influence on determining the content of professional development for teachers	Perceive to have less influence on determining the content of professional development for teachers
Total number of days required to work each year	Work more days per year	Work fewer days per year
If I could get a higher paying job, I'd leave education as soon as possible	Less likely to leave education for a higher paying job	More likely to leave education for a higher paying job
I think about transferring to another school	Less likely to think about transferring to another school	More likely to think about transferring to another school

The findings from this study support the charter school theory that principals typically have more decision-making power, more principals will have management experience outside of education, and that charter school principals will be more committed to their work. In addition, charter school principals have less professional experience and professional preparation pertaining to the role of the principalship. The findings also suggest that the principalship has been diversified as a result of the charter school movement with more females, minorities, and younger leaders. Overall, this research has given a viable glimpse into who charter public and traditional public principals are and how they function. In turn, this research resulted in findings that have revealed significant differences between the principals as well as the potential for future research.

REFERENCES

Baxter, P., & Nelson, E. (2012). Mastering change: When charter schools and school districts embrace strategic partnership. In R. Lake & B. Gross, *Hopes, Fears, & Reality* (pp. 23-31). National Charter School Resource Center. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED528667.pdf

Berman, I. (2008). Improving charter school leadership. *NGA Center for Best Practices.* Retrieved from http://www.nyccharterschools.org/sites/default/files/resources/Improving_ Charter_School_Leadership.pdf

Bickmore, D., & Dowell, M. (2011). Concerns, use of time, and the intersection of leadership: Case study of two charter school principals. *Research in Schools*, *18*(1), 44-61.

Bierlein, L. (1995a). Catching on but the jury's still out. *Educational Leadership*, *53*(4), 90-91.

Bierlein, L. (1995). Charter schools: A new approach to public education. *NASSP Bulletin*, *79*(12), 12-20.

Bulkley, K. E. (2011). Charter schools, taking a closer look. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, *47*(3), 110-115.

Camburn, E., Spillane, J., & Sebastian, J. (2010). Assessing the utility of a daily log for measuring principal leadership practices. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46, 707-737.

Campbell, C. (2007). Building a pipeline of new school leaders. *National Charter School Research Project, Center on Reinventing Public Education*, Retrieved from http://www.crpe.org/publications/ch-3-building-pipeline-new-school-leaders-hfr-07

Campbell, C., & Gross, B. (2008). Working without a safety net: How charter school leaders can best survive on the high wire. *National Charter School Research Project, Center on Reinventing Public Education*, Retrieved from http://www.secstate.wa.gov/library/docs/uw/pub_ncsrp_icshighwire_sep08_2008_007814.pdf

Carpenter, D., & Medina, P. (2011). Exploring the competitive effects of charter schools. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, *20*(1), 33-56.

Cooley, V., & Shen, J. (2003). School accountability and professional job responsibilities: A perspective from secondary principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, *87*(634), 10-25.

Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Darsie, M. (1938). What is educational leadership? *Phi Delta Kappan*, *20*(5), 145-147.

Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). School leadership study: Developing successful principals, *Stanford Educational Leadership Institute*, Stanford University.

DiMartino, J., & Miles, S. (2006). Leadership at school: How to get the job done. *Principal Leadership Magazine*, *10*, 47-50, Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Dressler, B. (2001). Charter school leadership. *Education and Urban Society*, *33*, 170-185.

Eacott, S. (2011). New look leaders or a new look at leadership. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *25*(2), 134-143.

Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffett, A., Folano, T., & Foley, P., (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership.* New York, NY: Public Agenda.

Finn, C., & Kanstoroom, M. (2002). Do charter schools do it differently? *The Phi Delta Kappan*, *84*(1), 59-62.

Fryer, R. G. (2012). Learning from the successes and failures of charter schools. *The Hamiliton Project*, Washington, DC: Author.

Fullan, M. (2009). Leadership development: The larger context. *Educational Leadership*, *67*(2), 45-49.

Gates, S., Ringel, J., Santibanez, L., Ross, K., and Chung, C. (2003). *Who is leading our schools?: An overview of school administrators and their careers.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Education.

Gawlik, M. (2012). Moving beyond the rhetoric: Charter school reform and accountability. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *105*(3), 210-219.

Goldring, E., Huff, J., May, H., & Camburn, E. (2008). School context and individual characteristics: What influences principal practice? *Journal of Educational Administration*, *46*, 332-352.

Grady, D. (2012). Charter school revocation: A method for efficiency, accountability, and success. *Journal of Law and Education*, *41*(3), 513-554.

Gronberg, T., Jansen, D., & Taylor, L. (2012). The relative efficiency of charter schools: A
cost frontier approach. *Economics of Education Review*, *31*, 302-317.

Gross, B., & Pochop, K. (2007). *Leadership to date, leadership tomorrow: A review of data
on charter school directors* (Working Paper No. 2007-2). Retrieved from
http://www.digitalarchives.wa.gov/ViewRecordMedia.aspx?RID=501CF60E78E25F
76B5D13280E157CB0A

Hassell, B. (1999). *The charter school challenge: Avoiding the pitfalls, fulfilling the promise*.
Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press.

Hill, P. T., Rainey, L., & Rotherham, A. J. (2006). *The future of charter schools and
teachers unions: Results of a symposium*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington
Center on Reinventing Public Education. Retrieved from
http://www.crpe.org/cs/crpe/download/csr_files/pub_ncsrp_unions_oct06.pdf

Horn, J., & Miron, G. (1999). *Evaluation of the Michigan public school academy
initiative*. Kalamazoo, MI: Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University.

Horng, E., Klasik, D., & Loeb, S., (2009). *Principal time-use and school effectiveness*
(School Leadership Research Report No. 99-3). Stanford, CA: Institute for Research
on Education Policy & Practice.

Institute for Educational Leadership. (2002). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing
the principalship.* Retrieved from www.iel.org.

Kelly, A., & Loveless, T. (2012). Comparing new school effects in charter and traditional
public schools. *American Journal of Education*, *118*(4), 427-453.

Kennedy, K. (2001). The top ten issues impacting school administrators. *American
School & University, 63*(5), 18-22.

Lake, R. (2011). Consorting with the enemy: When charter schools and school districts work together. In R. Lake & B. Gross, *Hopes, Fears, & Reality* (pp. 1-9). National Charter School Resource Center. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED528667.pdf

Lytle, J. (2012). Where is leadership heading? Research shows that the school improvement remedies promoted by policy makers and reformers often are in stark contrast to what actually has been proven to work in schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *93*(8), 54.

Manno, B., Finn, C., Bierlein, L., & Vanourek, G. (1998). How charter schools are different: Lessons and implications from a national study. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *79*(7), 488-498.

Manno, B., Finn, C., & Vanourek, G. (2000). Charter school accountability: Problems and prospects. *Educational Policy*, *14*(4), 473-493.

May, J. (2006). The charter school allure: Can traditional schools measure up? *Education and Urban Society*, *39*(19), 19-45.

McMillian, J. (2004). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (4th ed). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Mendels, P. (2012). The effective principal: 5 pivotal practices that shape instructional leadership. *The Learning Forward Journal*, *33*(1). 54-58.

MetLife, Inc. (2012). *The MetLife survey of the American teacher: Challenges for school leadership.* New York, NY: Author.

Miron, G., & Nelson, C., (2002). *What's public about charter schools: Lessons learned about choice and accountability.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Muse, M., & Abrams, L. (2011). An investigation of school leadership priorities. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*. Summer 2011.

National Alliance For Public Charter Schools. (2008). Charter school executives: Toward a new generation of leadership.

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2009). *A new model law for supporting the growth of high-quality public charter schools*. Retrieved from http://www.publiccharters.org/data/files/Publication_docs/ModelLaw_P7-wCVR_20110402T222341.pdf

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2011). *Back to school tallies: Estimated number of public charter schools & students, 2011-2012*. Retrieved from http://www.publiccharters.org/data/files/Publication_docs/NAPCS%202011-12%20New%20and%20Closed%20Charter%20Schools_20111206T125251.pdf

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2013). *Table 1: Growth of public charter schools 1999-2000 through 2012-2013*. Retrieved from http://dashboard.publiccharters.org/dashboard/reports

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2013a). Measuring up to the model: A ranking of state charter school laws. Retrieved from http://www.publiccharters.org/data/files/Publication_docs/NAPCS_2013%20Model%20Law%20Rankings_20130211T204454.pdf

National Association of Charter School Authorizers. (2012). *Principals and standards for charter school authorizing*. Retrieved from http://www.qualitycharters.org/images/stories/publications/Principles.Standards.2012_pub.pdf

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2009). The K-8 principal in 2008: A 10-year study. Alexandria, VA: Author.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2008). *Leading learning communities: Standards for what principals should know and be able to do*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *Schools and staffing survey*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/das.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). Characteristics of schools, districts, teachers, principals, and school libraries in the United States: 2003-2004 schools and staffing survey.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Characteristics of public, private, and bureau of Indian education elementary and secondary schools in the United States: Results from the 2007-2008 schools and staffing survey*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009321.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Fast facts: Charter schools.* Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=30

National Conference of State Legislatures. (2011). *Strong leaders strong schools: 2010 school leadership laws*. Washington, DC: Author.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (1998). *Choice matters: Policy alternatives and implications for charter schools*. Portland, OR: Author.

Phillips, V. (2011). Learning from each other. *The School Administrator*, *68*(7), 10–14. Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=19602

Portin, B., Schneider, P., DeArmond, M., & Gundlach, L. (2003). *Making sense of leading schools: A study of the school principalship*. Seattle, WA: Washington University, Center on Reinventing School Principalship.

Preston, C., Goldring, E., Berends, M., & Cannata, M. (2012). School innovation in district context: Comparing traditional public schools and charter schools. *Economics of Education Review*, *31*, 318-330.

Proclamation. No. 8815, May 7 (2012), http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/DCPD-201200347/pdf/DCPD-201200347.pdf

Proclamation. No. 8251, May 2, (2008), http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2009-title3-vol1/pdf/CFR-2009-title3-vol1-proc8251.pdf

Rand Education. (2004). *The careers of public school administrators: Policy implications from an analysis of state-level data*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Education.

Shen, J. & Cooley, V.E. (Eds.) (2013). *A resource book for improving principals' learning-centered leadership*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Shen, J., & Ma, X. (2006). Does systemic change work? Curricular and instructional practice in the context of systemic change. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *5*(3), 231-256.

Spillane, J., & Kenney, A. (2012). School administration in a changing education sector: The US experience. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *50*(5), 541-561.

The Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC2008. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2008/Educational_Leadership_Policy_Standards_2008.pdf

The Wallace Foundation. (2013). *The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning*. Retrieved from www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/effective-principal-leadership/Pages/The-School-Principal-as-Leader-Guiding-Schools-to-Better-Teaching-and-Learning.aspx.

Tienken, C. (2011). Charter schools: Education reform or business? *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, *47*(3), 107-109.

Toma, E., & Zimmer, R. (2012). Two decades of charter schools: Expectations, reality, and the future. *Economics of Education Review*, *31*, 209-212.

Tourkin, S., Thomas, T., Swaim, N., Cox, S., Parmer, R., Jackson, B., Cole, C., & Zhang, B. (2010). *Documentation for the 2007–08 schools and staffing survey* (NCES 2010-332).

Turnamian, P. (2011). What I've learned about charter schools: After 10 years on the front lines. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 10-15.

U.S. Department of Education. (2000)*. Let's fix NCLB*. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/

U.S. Department of Education. (2005). *No Child Left Behind Legislation: Part B – Charter Public Schools*. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg62.html.

Ylimaki, R., & Jacobson, S. (2013). School leadership practice and preparation. *Journal of Educational Administration, 51*(1), 6-23.

Appendix A

Human Subjects Institution Review Board Letter of Approval

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board

Date: October 15, 2012

To: Jianping Shen, Principal Investigator
Jared Vickers, Student Investigator for dissertation
Jiangang Xia, Student Investigator

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair *Amy Naug*

Re: HSIRB Project Number 12-10-46

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled "A Comparison of Charter School and Traditional Public School Leadership: Evidence from SASS 2007-2008" has been **approved** under the **exempt** category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note: This research may **only** be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project (e.g., *you must request a post approval change to enroll subjects beyond the number stated in your application under "Number of subjects you want to complete the study*)." Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

Reapproval of the project is required if it extends beyond the termination date stated below.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: October 15, 2013