

2002

Perceptions of New Jersey Elementary, Middle and Secondary School Administrators Regarding NASSP Assessment Center Skill Dimensions and Job Behaviors

Dorian L. Skeete
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Skeete, Dorian L., "Perceptions of New Jersey Elementary, Middle and Secondary School Administrators Regarding NASSP Assessment Center Skill Dimensions and Job Behaviors" (2002). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 1359.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/1359>

PERCEPTIONS OF NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE AND SECONDARY
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS REGARDING NASSP ASSESSMENT CENTER
SKILL DIMENSIONS AND JOB BEHAVIORS

BY

DORIAN L. SKEETE



Dissertation Committee

Daniel Gutmore, Ph.D., Mentor
Rev. Dr. Chris Hynes, Ed.D
Ronald Batistoni, Ed.D
Elaine McGhee, Ed.D

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of the Degree of Doctor of Education
Seton Hall University

2002

ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS OF NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE AND SECONDARY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS REGARDING NASSP ASSESSMENT CENTER SKILL DIMENSIONS AND JOB BEHAVIORS

This study was designed to determine the perceptions of New Jersey elementary, Middle and secondary school administrators toward their NASSP Assessment Center experiences and their job behaviors.

The data collected for analysis was collected by use of the Administrator Assessment Program Survey, an original instrument developed by the researcher. The survey was administered to 500 NASSP Assessment Center participants who had been assessed between 1994 and 2002. Responses were received from 141 respondents. This represents 30% of the total sample.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was completed on the independent research variables of Level of Administration and Year of Participation in the NASSP Assessment Center. The AAPS reliability alpha for the 73-question instrument was .95.

The findings reveal that differences were found to exist by level of administration and year of participation in 36% of the survey questions. Qualitative information was also collected and presented in narrative form.

It may be interpreted from the data that the level of administration and year of participation in the NASSP Assessment Center have the most significant impact on the perceptions of New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators.

© Copyright by Dorian L. Skeete, Ed.D, 2002
All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

“There must always be the continuing struggle to make the increasing knowledge of the world bear some fruit in increasing understanding and in the production of human happiness.” Charles R. Drew

“Whoever wants to reach a distant goal must take many small steps.” Helmut Schmidt

I wish to take this opportunity to acknowledge the continuing support that I received from my family, friends, colleagues and a wide circle of well-wishers. To my mentor, Dr. Daniel Gutmore, I say thank you for seeing me through this endeavor. Because of your generous support, guidance and constant urgings to keep going, I have arrived. I appreciate your saying those things that I did not want to hear as well as those that I did. To Rev. Dr. Chris Hynes, thank you for your invaluable assistance.

To my dissertation committee members, Dr. Ronald Batistoni and Dr. Elaine McGhee, thank you for patiently wading through several rewrites and graciously accepting all of them with smiles of encouragement. Your assurances that all would come together in the end provided comfort and helped me over the rougher spots in this process. Dr. Batistoni, your great sense of humor did much to alleviate some of the more stressful moments.

To Dr. James Caulfield, Executive Director, thank you for your unwavering belief that one day I would achieve this goal.

I have enjoyed this journey of growth and self-discovery, moving one more step toward a destination that is yet unknown.

DEDICATION

“Our destinies are tied together; none of us can make it alone.”

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

It is with a deep sense of gratitude and appreciation that I dedicate this
dissertation to the loving memory of my parents,

Maxine R. Wilson and

Festus O. Wilson

who steadfastly encouraged me to be and do the best I possibly could
in all circumstances.

I also dedicate this dissertation to my husband, Tyrone
whose love and support continue to make the profoundest of difference in

my life and my sons

Sean and Darius for their

unabashed confidence in my ability to

be successful in this endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	14
Definition of Terms.....	14
Assessment of Performance.....	14
Assessment Center.....	15
Educational Assessment Center.....	17
Assessor.....	17
Participant.....	17
Skill Dimensions.....	18
The Research Questions.....	21
Subsidiary Questions.....	21
Significance of the Research.....	22
Limitations of the Research.....	23
Hypothesis.....	24
Organization of the Research.....	24
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
Short History of Assessment Centers.....	26
Historical Perspective and Design of the NASSP Assessment Centers.....	33
Background of Other Public School Assessment Centers.....	45
Recent Research of Educational Assessment Processes.....	48
Summary.....	67
III. METHODOLOGY	
Research Questions.....	70
Subsidiary Questions.....	71
Population of the Study.....	72
Data Collection.....	73
Data Analysis.....	74
Method of Analysis.....	74

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction.....	76
Response Rate.....	76
Background Information.....	77
Gender.....	77
Level of Administrator.....	77
Years of Experience in Education.....	78
Years in Current Position.....	78
School District.....	79
Ethnic Background.....	79
Year of Participation in the NASSP Assessment Center.....	79
ANOVAS and Tukey HSDs.....	81
Frequencies of Behaviors.....	118
Analysis of Qualitative Data.....	127
Qualitative Data Comments.....	127
Reliability Analysis.....	139

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study.....	155
Statement of the Research Questions.....	157
Statement of the Subsidiary Questions.....	158
Conclusions.....	159
Recommendations for Future Research.....	165

REFERENCES.....	172
-----------------	-----

APPENDICES.....	181
-----------------	-----

Appendix A. Administrator Assessment Program Survey.....	182
Appendix B. Letters of Solicitation.....	191
Appendix C. Approval Letter from IRB (Institutional Review Board).....	194
Appendix D. Qualitative Data Comments by NASSP Skill Dimensions....	196
Appendix E. Exhibited Frequencies of Gender, Years in Current Position, Years in Education, School District and Ethnic Background..	202

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Exhibited Frequencies for Level of Administrator.....	78
Table 2	Exhibited Frequencies for Year of Participation.....	80
Table 3	ANOVA for Level of Administration.....	81
Table 4	Levels of Significance for Administrative Level.....	88
Table 5	Levels of Significance Indicative of Trends for Administrative Level.....	88
Table 6	Tukey HSD (Q9).....	89
Table 7	Tukey HSD (Q17).....	90
Table 8	Tukey HSD (Q24).....	91
Table 9	Tukey HSD (Q43).....	92
Table 10	Tukey HSD (Q52).....	93
Table 11	Tukey HSD (Q60).....	94
Table 12	Tukey HSD (Q64).....	95
Table 13	ANOVA for Year of Participation in the Assessment Center.....	97
Table 14	Levels of Significance for Year of Participation in the Assessment Center.....	104
Table 15	Levels of Significance Indicative of Trends for Year of Participation in the Assessment Center.....	104
Table 16	Tukey HSD (Q31).....	105
Table 17	Tukey HSD (Q54).....	106
Table 18	Tukey HSD (Q55).....	107
Table 19	Tukey HSD ((Q56).....	108

Table 20	Tukey HSD (Q 57).....	109
Table 21	Levels of Significance for Gender.....	110
Table 22	Levels of Significance Indicative of Trends for Gender.....	111
Table 23	ANOVA for Gender.....	112
Table 24	Professional Development in Problem Analysis.....	119
Table 25	Professional Development in Judgment.....	120
Table 26	Professional Development in Organizational Ability.....	120
Table 27	Professional Development in Decisiveness.....	121
Table 28	Professional Development in Leadership.....	122
Table 29	Professional Development in Sensitivity.....	122
Table 30	Professional Development in Stress Tolerance.....	123
Table 31	Professional Development in Oral Communication.....	124
Table 32	Professional Development in Written Communication.....	124
Table 33	Professional Development in Range of Interest.....	125
Table 34	Professional Development in Personal Motivation.....	126
Table 35	Professional Development in Educational Values.....	126
Table 36	Reliability Coefficients.....	140

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

More than half of all school administrators in the United States will retire during the 1990s. The need to replace them is generating renewed interest in administrator preparation programs and affording a unique opportunity for upgrading current preparation practices. (Klauke, 1990, p. 1)

In the recent history of education, schools have had to adjust to several challenges (Helquist, 1988, p. 1). Although issues of curriculum, negotiations with bargaining groups and personnel adjustments are being closely scrutinized, by far the greatest challenge lies in the replacement of qualified, professional staff at all levels. Of particular concern is the recruitment and hiring of qualified candidates to fill school leadership positions. The National Association of Elementary School Principals conducted a study in 1998 and found that the 42 percent turnover that has existed during the last ten years indicates a trend for the next decade (Doud & Keller, 1998).

In the next ten years, school boards will find it increasingly difficult to secure school administrators. There will be no shortage of candidates clamoring to sit

behind desks with titles after their names; individuals who possess the leadership characteristics essential to making schools effective centers of teaching and learning, however, will be scarce (Steller, 1984, p. 1).

The challenge of replacing professional staff at all levels, including administration, is in direct contrast to some of the most recent educational challenges (Helquist, 1988, p. 1). Schools, who for years have not hired many administrators, will quickly need to develop processes for the identification of potential administrators (Helquist, 1988, p. 1). There is renewed interest in the preparation programs for principals and in upgrading current preparation practices. At the same time, issues that relate to racially and sexually balanced placement of new administrators, the need for experiential, self-directed and broadly based training are now in the forefront of new trends in the training of school administrators (Klauke, 1990). The question now is what skills and methods should be emphasized in the training of school administrators?

The problems of today are much more complex than when many of the current school administrators began their educational careers. The principal who acts as the all-knowing patriarch of the school and who wisely solves all problems no longer exists (Clark, 1995). The new basic skills that principals need today are radically different from those of just a couple of decades ago, but these new skills are what will make or break our new school administrators in this continuously changing society (Clark, 1995).

The American Association of School Administrators (Hoyle et al, 1985) submit the development of skills in the following areas: designing, implementing, and evaluating school climate; building support for schools; developing school curriculum; instructional management; staff evaluation; staff development; allocating resources; and educational research, evaluation and planning (Klauke, 1990, p. 1).

According to AASA, administrators must also possess a thorough understanding of the learning process, as well as the ability to communicate and cooperate with people of diverse cultures, positions, and perspectives within the school and community (Klauke, 1990, p. 1).

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) sees the role of future principals as more collegial as they work to facilitate, support and assist teachers by having a positive, wholesome self-concept that enables them to develop the potential of others without fear and without concern for personal benefit (Klauke, 1990, p. 1).

Principals must be team builders (Clark, 1995, p. 9). In the fluid educational organizations that characterize today's schools, knowledge and skills are valuable resources that all teachers and administrators must bring to the table in a spirit of collaboration and cooperation. The smart administrator knows that to tap into that collective wisdom, a team must be forged (Clark, 1995, p. 9).

Principals must understand human nature. In successful organizations, teams don't just casually come together. They must be built carefully, with training,

practice, and thought (Clark, 1995, p. 9). The principal must be the catalyst to manage the diversity of human nature and individual personalities.

Principals need vision to meet today's challenges (Clark, 1995, p. 10). This issue has been discussed often but many principals have no vision for their schools. They simply come to school each day and engage in crisis management (Clark, 1995, p. 10). According to Dr. Larry Leverett (2001), superintendent of the Plainfield District in Plainfield, New Jersey, "Principals have the right to have a vision. They are often subject to the visionary statements of all the school stakeholders and central office staff." Vision comes about when principals are able to step back and think about all of the possibilities. Principals can be encouraged in the practice of engaging in creative dreaming by looking at the work people such as futurist Joel Barker.

Steven Covey, in The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People (1989, p. 99), says that everything is created twice, once in the mind and then again in reality. If we can see it in great detail in our mind's eye, we take the first step toward achieving it in reality. Reading such authors as Norman Vincent Peale, Tony Robbins, Tom Peters, Joel Barker and others can provide principals with a foundation for a new way of thinking and dreaming about the future.

In looking at the necessary skills of school administrators in the next millennium, it is clear that hiring good leaders is becoming a challenge that will have a significant effect on the quality of education for decades to come. The processes that districts use are important, not only to assure that quality principals are hired, but

also can, "...be a powerful determinant of people's understanding not only of the principalship, but of the goals and aims of the district as well." (Council for Basic Education, 1984, p. 4).

In the past, school districts have taken the filling of administrative vacancies for granted. It seemed to be only a matter of selecting the best of the candidates who showed up. Within the past year, however, reports of shortages have circulated in the educational leadership community, suggesting that both the quantity and quality of leadership aspirants is declining (Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 2001).

It is likely that school districts will have to find better ways of attracting qualified leadership candidates. The changing nature of the job suggests that school districts must deliberately seek out the right kind of person and provide encouragement and support.

Effective school administration is more than a matter of behavioral competence. Effective administration also is a matter of "fit." (Duke & Iwanicki, 1992, p. 26). Although various theories have been developed to help explain leadership (Bass, 1981; Rost, 1991), there has been no definitive explanation of its attributes. Behaviorists suggest that specific behaviors or competencies define leadership. Leaders then are distinguished from non-leaders by these differing and important behaviors. These leaders are assessed on the visible manifestation of these behaviors. Principals in many school districts are evaluated annually with checklists of these behaviors (Duke & Stiggins, 1985).

Another way to think about leadership focuses on aesthetics (Duke, 1986). If leadership is best understood as a perception or attribution, it reveals as much about the person who uses it to describe someone else as the person who is described. Conceptions of leadership can be characterized, like art, by certain properties and Duke identifies four such properties: direction, engagement, originality, and fit. Fit derives from the continuing interaction that takes place between a leader, followers and the culture in which they exist:

As the leader attempts to give directions to his followers and engage their attention, so too do his followers strive to influence him and attract his commitment. For leadership to exist under such circumstances, general agreement must exist on the meanings attributed to various aspects of the culture, including its guiding values. (Duke, 1986, pp. 17-18).

What is important here is congruence of the leadership behavior with the context in which it is manifested (Duke & Iwanicki, 1992). The decisiveness of American leadership, for example, would be out of place with the respect for ambiguity that the Japanese apply under certain circumstances. The Japanese perceive the right conditions in which to make a decision as more important than the decision itself.

A small-scale exploratory study conducted by Hambrick and Fukutomi (1991) suggests that principal assessment cannot be understood solely in terms of skill-based or goal-based evaluations. Perceptions of fit also can play a role in the

assessment process (Duke & Iwanicki, 1992, p. 34). The notion of fit recognizes that successful leadership is as much a function of careful placement as it is a product of special traits or thorough training.

There is some evidence that the assessment of principals cannot be understood fully without taking into account perceptions of fit, that is, the extent to which they are perceived to be appropriately matched to a given context.

In hiring principals, many superintendents look for a “good fit”—that is, a candidate’s apparent ability to mesh with the personalities, culture and needs of a particular site.

However, those perceptions may be based on unexamined and unproven assumptions about school leadership. For example, the belief that minority schools in certain neighborhoods require principals who have strict discipline policies or minority principals cannot be successful leaders in suburban school districts.

The challenge of finding competent and caring administrators will affect the quality of education for decades.

Until recently, not much was known about how school administrators were chosen. In 1977, Jeswald concluded that:

...candidates are seldom observed or evaluated with respect to their administrative performance...decisions typically are made with little more than an educated guess about potential administrative abilities. (p. 86)

A 1985 study by Pokorny found that 99% of school districts utilized the traditional interview as the primary technique to select principals (Helquist, 1988, p.2). One of her conclusions was that selection techniques such as the interview do not reflect what the literature recommends, and that scientifically developed instruments have not been widely implemented by a majority of districts (Helquist, 1988, p. 2).

Baltzell and Dentler (1983) described the assessment center method as one of five methods that is more suitable than the traditional reliance on an interview as the primary process in the selection of school principals (Helquist, 1988, p. 2). One of these is the assessment center method, which has gained wide use in the selection of managers in industry (Helquist, 1988, p. 2). According to the authors it is the most effective method of managerial selection in use anywhere (Helquist, 1988, p. 2).

After an initial screening of applicants' resumes and cover letters, most districts rely on the personal interview to make their final choice. Unfortunately, interviews are highly subjective and easily influenced by appearance, mannerisms, and conversational skills (Anderson, 1991).

Although most school districts still rely on the personal interview as the primary tool for selection, there are many formal assessment instruments that could add breadth and objectivity to the selection process. Kenneth and Miriam Clark (1996) cite evidence that using a carefully chosen battery of tests along with other

information provides better prediction of success than using professional judgment alone.

Another alternative is the well-established assessment-center approach offered by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), which takes candidates through two days of simulated leadership tasks, with evaluation by experienced practitioners. A brand-new option is the School Leaders Licensure Assessment that has been developed based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards (Tirozzi, 2001).

The development of, and widespread implementation of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Assessment Center program has created a unique situation in education (Helquist, 1988, pp. 2-3). The Center uses commonly agreed upon criteria in a standardized process to obtain extensive objective skill development information on a large number of potential principals (Helquist, 1988). This process effectively identifies the strengths and weaknesses, as well as the overall rating, of those educators who will be entering into a position whose role has changed drastically over time, and whose influence as a leader is considered vital for an effective school (Helquist, 1988, p. 3).

For years principals and other school personnel asked the National Association of Secondary School Principals for assistance in identifying and developing potentially strong building administrators (Hersey, 1982, p. 370). With technical help from various experts, including a committee of the American

Psychological Association's Division of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, NASSP began its Assessment Center program in 1975 (Hersey, 1982).

Based on extensive interviews with teachers and administrators in pilot school districts, the Assessment Center was designed with three basic components (Hersey, 1982):

1. Twelve skill dimensions with specific definitions were found to relate to the most important characteristics of successful assistant principals and principals. The skills to be assessed were problem analysis, judgment, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, stress tolerance, oral communication, written communication, range of interests, personal motivation and educational values.
2. Simulation techniques and exercises were written into the Center design to provide information for evaluating the twelve skills. Many of these techniques simulate activities that an assistant principal and principal experience each day, including leaderless group activities, fact-finding and stress tests, administrative in-baskets, a structured personal interview and a participant feedback session.
3. A comprehensive and rigorous training program was developed to produce well-trained assessors who could administer the assessment process appropriately so that observed behaviors were properly interpreted.

The assessor staff appears to be the most important component in a successful Assessment Center (Hersey, 1982). As a result, much time has been spent in refining

the training module so that potentially superior assessors can be (a) initially screened more effectively, (b) taught and evaluated comprehensively within fairly tight time constraints, (c) approved and certified by NASSP as official assessors to begin functioning in projects, and (d) monitored in an actual Center acting as a school district assessor (Hersey, 1982, p. 370).

Initially the project was seen as useful to principals in making better administrative personnel selections by evaluating the management skills of potential assistant principals and the process as an effective career counseling technique with all participants. However, after several districts successfully assessed a number of young administrative candidates, the potential of the approach became evident (Hersey, 1982, p. 371). Not only could the Assessment Center be used to identify good candidates for "threshold" administrative jobs, but also developmental suggestions for each participant were becoming an integral part of the process (Hersey, 1982, p. 371).

While the NASSP Assessment Center Project was developed to provide a better process to select administrators, the method has potential uses that go beyond that of selection (Wendel & Uerling, 1989a, p. 74).

The assessment center method, a valid and reliable process for measuring generic skills related to job requirements, could have major implications for graduate preparation programs for principals. The method could be used to:

Diagnose students' developmental needs

Broaden the scope of preparation program activities

Measure the effectiveness of an institution's preparation program

(Wendel & Uerling, 1989b, p. 74)

Further, the incorporation of assessment center concepts into the training of administrators would be an effective response to those concerned with the relevance of current academic preparation (Wendel & Uerling, 1989c, p. 74).

The assessment requirement in the state of New Jersey was originated under the aegis of the State Education Department and former Commissioner Saul Cooperman. In 1986-87, the Department of Education (DOE) strongly advocated the assessment requirement during the debate over the principals' certification process. The New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association (NJPSA) actively supported the assessment requirement during that debate. Though enacted by the State Board of Education in 1988, the assessment requirement was suspended from November 1990 to May 1995.

According to the New Jersey State Department of Education's Update on Performance Assessment (1997), all individuals who are entering employment as school principals must undergo an assessment of performance, conducted by a state-approved assessor. This requirement applies to both individuals who are seeking provisional certification and those individuals who acquired a standard principal endorsement prior to September 1, 1990 but have not yet served in a position requiring the principal endorsement. The only individuals waived from the

assessment requirement are those who are experienced principals from another state or from nonpublic schools.

The performance assessment process involves an evaluation of an individual's management and leadership skills through a variety of exercises that simulate the actual job functions of a school principal. The purpose of the assessment process is to evaluate an individual's strengths and weaknesses in these skill areas so that the individual's mentor and school district can plan a training program that meets his or her specific needs.

Second, assessment will assist superintendents, existing principals and local boards of education in their selection decisions of new school administrators. One of the most important decisions of local administrators and boards is the choice of the best possible person as a building administrator.

Educational research and our collective experience clearly show that the performance of the building principal is the key to the success of a school. The effective schools research during the 1970s and 1980s was a driving political force to increase accountability in American schools (Edmonds, 1979; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986). The attainment of improved student outcomes was tied to strong principal leadership. The principal's performance was the barometer by which schools were judged to be academically sound or failing students.

Presently, local boards and administrators have only two tools to evaluate a new principal candidate—the resume, including an application and the interview.

The assessment report can add a new dimension to the district's insight into the potential performance of an as yet untried, new principal. However, every district does not see, or is allowed to see the report. A district can select new hires that most match their local leadership needs. A major challenge facing school systems throughout the United States is the selection of the most competent people to fill key administrative positions. One way of ensuring that is to assess a person's abilities before that individual is promoted.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze the perceptions of school administrators in New Jersey who have participated in the NASSP Assessment Center process in order to determine the effect of New Jersey assessment center experiences and job behaviors. Specifically, this research proposes to identify and evaluate the discrete job performance behaviors of school administrators in New Jersey following their assessment center experiences since becoming a requirement for licensure in 1995.

Definition of Terms

Assessment of Performance

An assessment of performance is a process that evaluates the skills and abilities of a candidate for the principalship. Trained assessors who are active or retired principals, superintendents or university personnel conduct the evaluation process. The assessment process can usually be completed in four days. During the

first two days, the principal candidate participates in a series of exercises designed to measure the qualities and skills that have been identified as critical to success as a school principal. Problem analysis, judgment, sensitivity, educational values, leadership, decisiveness and communications skills are among the areas assessed.

Next, the assessors evaluate the candidate's performance and write an in-depth analysis. The director of the assessment process then develops a written report and meets with the individual candidate to review his/her performance. During this meeting, all aspects of the individual's performance are discussed and recommendations are made concerning the future professional development of the candidate.

The assessment process and report are learning and development tools for aspiring principals.

Assessment Center

The term assessment center refers to a standardized set of procedures used to identify managerial potential. Although no two programs are exactly alike, they all utilize multiple methods of assessing traits and skills, including interviews, projective tests, situational tests, written tests of personality and aptitude, a writing exercise (e.g., a short autobiographical essay) to evaluate written communication skills, and a speaking exercise to evaluate oral communication skills.

Two commonly used situational tests are the in-basket exercise and the leaderless group discussion. Leaderless group discussions can bring out samples of

leadership behaviors, particularly if the problem or task is relevant to the participants or the job and can predict potential for leadership (Wendel, F. C., Schmidt, A. H., and Loch, J., 1992, p. 95). An in-basket exercise consists of letters, memos, and reports that supposedly have accumulated in the in-basket of a hypothetical manager. The candidate has a limited amount of time to deal with each of the managerial problems contained in these materials. A leaderless group discussion places candidates in a group situation where there is no designated leader. Sometimes the candidates are asked to represent competing viewpoints, with each candidate trying to persuade the others to adopt his or her viewpoint. Another variation is to have the candidates assume the roles of different managers trying to make a group decision, such as whether to merge with another company. Observers rate each candidate on qualities such as initiative, assertiveness, persuasiveness, dominance, and cooperation.

The assessment process in the centers typically takes 2 to 3 days. An overall evaluation of each candidate's management potential is made by several staff members who interview the candidate, examine test scores and biographical information, observe candidate behavior in the situational exercises, and then meet to discuss their assessment and resolve any disagreements. The assessors attempt to integrate the information from these diverse sources into a coherent picture of the motives, skills, and behavioral tendencies of each candidate (Kelley & Wendel, 1987).

Educational Assessment Center

An educational assessment center is a psychometric procedure emphasizing multiple elementary and secondary school activities, including individual and group exercises, used to develop a behavior profile on candidates seeking employment as principals. The information generated by the process is used to assist the candidate, school district, and university or college in answering personnel placement and development questions (Kelley & Wendel, 1987, p. 2).

An assessment center is a process, not a location. A project may conduct its assessment activities in different locations.

Assessor

An individual, usually a practicing administrator, who has been trained by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) to assess the performance levels of participants in an assessment center (Helquist, 1988, pp. 13-14). The assessor is trained in techniques of observation and assessment methodology (Helquist, 1988, p. 14). This individual is responsible for observing and categorizing participant behaviors, rating the level of performance (Helquist, 1988, p. 14), participating in a consensus session with other assessors and writing a final or summary report.

Participant

A candidate for an administrative position—or a newly hired candidate in an administrative position—who takes part in an assessment center (Helquist, 1988,

p. 13). For purposes of this study, all participants are currently employed in education, have administrative certification and are being assessed as newly appointed administrators or administrators with one year of experience in an elementary, middle, or high school setting.

Skill Dimensions

The NASSP Assessment Center identifies twelve skills to be assessed (Hughes, 1986):

1. **Problem Analysis**—Ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; searching for information with a purpose.
2. **Judgment**—Ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information; skill in identifying educational needs and priorities; ability to evaluate critically written communications.
3. **Organizational Ability**—Ability to plan, schedule, and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on one's time.
4. **Decisiveness**—Ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly.
5. **Leadership**—Ability to get others involved in solving problems;

ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to interact with a group effectively and to guide them to the accomplishment of a task.

6. Sensitivity—Ability to perceive the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; skill in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.
7. Stress Tolerance—Ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet.
8. Oral Communication—Ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts or ideas.
9. Written Communication—Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences—students, teachers, parents, et al.
10. Range of Interest—Competence to discuss a variety of subjects—educational, political, current events, economic, etc.; desire to actively participate in events.
11. Personal Motivation—Need to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing.

12. Educational Values—Possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change.

Three features of the assessment center method must be kept in mind (Wendel & Uerling, 1989, p. 74).

First, the assessment center process is based on the identification of behavioral dimensions related to job requirements (Wendel & Uerling, 1989, p. 74). In the NASSP Center Project, these behavioral dimensions are: problem analysis, judgment, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, stress tolerance, written communication, oral communication, range of interests, personal motivation and educational values (Wendel & Uerling, 1989, p. 74).

Second, exercises that elicit those desired behaviors are developed for participants. These exercises include leaderless group activities, in-baskets, fact-finding and interviews (Wendel & Uerling, 1989, p. 74).

Third, assessors are thoroughly trained in the nature of assessment center methodology, the behavioral dimensions and their relationship to job requirements, the expected behaviors or “look fors” in each exercise, and the process of observing, recording and reporting exhibited behavior (Wendel & Uerling, 1989, p. 74).

Multiple assessors make multiple assessments of participants’ behaviors in various exercises, including simulations designed to evoke job-related behaviors (Wendel & Uerling, 1989, p. 74).

The Research Questions

1. What effect does the level (elementary, middle, secondary) of New Jersey school administrator NASSP Assessment Center participants have on the discrete job behaviors within the skill dimensions identified in the NASSP Assessment Center process?

2. What effect does the number of elapsed years for New Jersey school administrator NASSP Assessment Center participants (elementary, middle, and secondary) have on the discrete job behaviors within the skill dimensions identified in the NASSP Assessment Center process?

Subsidiary Questions

1. What job behaviors within identified NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions are demonstrated with the most frequency as perceived by New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators who have participated in the assessment center process?

2. What job behaviors within identified NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions are demonstrated with the least frequency as perceived by New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators who have participated in the assessment center process?

3. Do New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators who have participated in the assessment center process perceive that an increase in

the demonstration of job behaviors within identified NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions improves their job performance?

4. With what frequency do New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators participate in professional development activities within the defined NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions?

The first two questions will be primarily used to “set the stage” and provide a frame of reference for the other questions.

Significance of the Research

The researcher has served several years as an assessor in the NJPSA (New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association)-sponsored assessment center for prospective and newly hired school administrators.

The process is one in which six candidates participate in several experiences and they are observed and evaluated by a team of six assessors during a two-day session. To complete the process, the assessors engage in a consensus activity after which the director of the assessment center gives the candidate a formal report.

Although there have been studies that analyze assessment center data and its connection to predictive validity, no research has been done on this assessment process and its effect, or the perceptions of its effect, on the discrete job behaviors of practicing school administrators who have been through the assessment center. This is an important aspect to consider. According to Lashway (1997) “even assessment centers, while more performance oriented, do not directly measure on-the-job

behavior. Although "inbasket" exercises and similar problems can provide helpful insights into a candidate's skills, they lack the rich content of a real-life situation, which may confront a leader with dozens of interrelated variables." (p. 4). Future studies will be able to build on this research, thereby expanding information and knowledge regarding the assessment center process as it is perceived from the perspective of the participants.

A process of this nature should have an impact on the performance of the participants, who in most instances have not yet attained an administrative position. Once they have been assessed and secure employment as a school administrator, it may be possible to utilize the results in a more comprehensive way to identify professional development needs.

Limitations of the Research

Limitations of this research are related to several variables. The research is limited to collecting a significant number of surveys from participants who have been through the NASSP Assessment Center process since its inception in the state of New Jersey. These participants may or may not be currently serving in elementary, middle or high school administrative positions in the state of New Jersey. Approximately five hundred surveys will be mailed to these participants.

The NASSP Assessment Center is mandated for all candidates for the principalship in New Jersey, making this focused area a limitation of the research. The researcher recognizes that research in the area of principal assessment is finite

and limited. This limitation will lead to the researcher's development and use of a new survey instruction based on perceptions of New Jersey school administrators. The survey will be administered by mail in April 2002. The perceptions will be based on the views of the individual participants and these perceptions may change over time.

Another limitation of the research is that one of the reviewers for the researcher is also an experienced assessor.

Hypothesis

Assuming the null hypothesis, there should be no significant difference in elementary, middle and secondary New Jersey school administrators' perceptions of the effect of discrete job behaviors within the NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions. Participation in an NASSP Assessment Center will have no significant effect on the perceptions of elementary, middle and secondary New Jersey school administrators with regard to their job behaviors within identified skill dimensions.

Organization of the Research

This research study is organized in five chapters. Chapter I, Introduction, provides the background information that covers: definitions of terms, the research question, subsidiary questions, significance of the research and the research limitations.

Chapter II, Review of Relevant Research and Literature, discusses the current and relevant work related to this research.

Chapter III, Methodology, will define the design, method of analysis and data collection. Internal and external validity measures will be incorporated throughout due to the use of an original survey instrument.

Chapter IV, Results and Findings, will detail and report the outcomes of the methodology chapter. Descriptive summaries will be provided, as well as the analyses.

Chapter V, Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations, will highlight all of the chapters and include the summary of the purpose of this research, discussion of findings and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Short History of Assessment Centers

The assessment center concept is not new. It has been an integral part of selection and development programs in the private and governmental sectors for many years. The premise is that if an organization wishes to know whom among its members, or which outside applicants, has the skills to perform in a job different from the one presently held, the best way to find out is to systematically observe those interested persons perform that job. The one who performs best should be selected and predictably will succeed—or at least do better than other applicants (Hughes, 1986).

Hundreds of organizations, including school systems, employ the process to select individuals for a variety of positions. It is used to promote police sergeants to the lieutenant grade; to select insurance salespersons; to cull managers from workers; to select auditors; and to select any number of other positions (Hughes, 1986). Because identification and development of successful managers is of critical importance to any agency, business, or institution, this method was developed to increase the probability of successful selection (Wendel et al, 1992, p. 86).

The origins of the assessment center concept arose out of the practical demands of large bureaucracies for new selection systems to combat critical manpower problems, and also to the more theoretical interests of psychologists in designing effective measurement tools to describe the individual personality. These dual roots of practical problem solving and theory based research have heavily influenced the evolution of the concept and clearly form the basis for the phenomenal popularity of the concept in current practice (Williamson & Schaalman, 1980).

Much work has gone into attempts to develop theoretically and conceptually grounded performance assessment systems that have practical use for evaluating potential leaders and selecting competent school administrators. Evaluation and selection activities in the business and military sectors have been employed for over three decades.

The precursors of assessment center principles are performance and situational tests. The systematic measurement of differences in human characteristics and behaviors probably began with Sir Francis Galton in the late 19th century. Major advances in this type of testing occurred in the early 1900s. Benet, for example, designed items/tasks to diagnose broad problem solving ability, judgment and learning skills requiring complex, overt behavior (Sirotnik & Durden, 1996, p. 2).

Advances in performance and situational testing occurred between 1930 and 1940 through the three sources of work generally cited as the origins of the assessment center concept: the research at Harvard Psychological Clinic led by

Murray; the Simoneit studies in Germany between World War I and World War II; and the British War Office Selection Board adaptation of the methods developed by Simoneit (Sironick & Durden, 1996, p. 3).

The Harvard study laid the conceptual foundation for the design of assessment centers. Murray (1938) felt that the individual is best described as the result of complex combinations of observable, situational demands and unobservable, underlying needs of the individual. By systematically varying the nature of the situation, one could observe the resultant behavior and assess the nature of the individual. Current assessment center designs are aligned with the Harvard study (Sirotnick & Durden, 1996, p. 3).

The work of Simoneit in Germany occurred during the same time as the Murray study (Williamson & Schaalman, 1980). From the beginning of the build-up of the German Armed Forces following World War I, psychologists, including Simoneit, were involved in the selection, training, organization and morale building of the military. The German assessment procedure for selecting future military officers pioneered the use of a multidimensional assessment approach based on principles of holistic and naturalistic evaluation (Sirotnick & Durden, 1996, p. 3). They obtained behavioral samples of intellectual and personality manifestations. The first two German landmarks of multiple assessments by multiple assessors are the cornerstones of most assessment center procedures in effect today. The Germans

introduced new means, such as leaderless group activities, for identifying men with potential for command (Wendel et al, 1992).

A third contributing source of the assessment center concept was the British adaptation of methods developed by Simoneit for selecting army officers. The exercises that were developed comprised more realistic situations, including group discussions and physical tests. These included leading and leaderless group situations because the War Officer Selection Board (WOSB) assessment procedures were built on the rationale that group situations provided the best opportunity for measuring leadership behavior. Leadership was defined as the ability to facilitate a group's attainment of goals (Sirotnik & Durden, 1996, p. 3). Features of the War Office Selection Boards included discussion problems, indoor and outdoor activities, short speeches, physical activities, and stressful situations (Wendel et al, 1992, p. 87).

The entry of the United States into World War II in the early 1940s triggered the initial application of the assessment centers concept in this country (Sirotnik & Durden, 1996, p. 3). The Office of Strategic Services (OSS) centers were the first fully developed multiple assessment programs for selection and placement designed in the United States. The primary purpose of the OSS program was to develop a set of activities to gauge the personalities of prospective employees in various OSS positions, including secret agents and saboteurs. Henry Murray, the former head of the Harvard Psychological Clinic, spearheaded the development of ingenious ways of selecting agents and in addition to paper-and-pencil tests, inventories, and essays,

extensive information was obtained by having each candidate engage in interviews and situational exercises (Wendel et al, 1992). The OSS program, although short-lived from 1943-1945, was structured around eight key steps. These steps are generally followed today in most assessment centers. The eight steps included:

1. Job analysis of the position for which candidates are to be assessed.
2. Listing of all personality determinants of successful and unsuccessful on the job performance....then select the variables to be assessed.
3. Development of a rating scale for each variable, as well as an overall rating.
4. Design a program of procedures to assess performances of participants for each of the variables.
5. Develop a description of each participant's personality (by variable) before making specific ratings, predictions, or recommendations.
6. Using nontechnical language, develop written descriptions that describe the performance of each participant in terms of his/her functioning within the organization.
7. Prior to making the final rating or recommendations for each participant, conference with assessment staff to

review and correct any of the participant's descriptions.

8. Construct experimental designs to evaluate assessment procedures. (Helquist, 1988, pp. 27-28)

Situational tests, particular to the OSS program, were developed with the belief that activities that simulated the actual work environment would be highly successful predictors of job performance because they evoked "samples" rather than "signs" of behavior.

Studies on the validity of assessment center predictions of managerial potential have found that this composite evaluation predicts later managerial success reasonably well (Yukl, 1998, p. 242). Around 1955, Douglas Bray of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T) developed a longitudinal research study designed to improve the recruiting and early training of management personnel. His hallmark Management Progress Study sought to identify the causes of turnover in management and the key predictors of managerial success. The AT&T study design included the use of an assessment center for tracking and predicting long-term job success (Sirotnik & Durden, 1996, p. 3).

The assessment center techniques were developed after the researchers identified 25 characteristics in four areas: managerial functions (organizing, planning, decision making), interpersonal relations (communication skills, personal impression, sensitivity), general abilities (intellectual ability, adaptability) and values and attitudes. The techniques included:

1. A two hour interview covering background, personal objectives, social values, and interests.
2. An inbasket of twenty-five items in which participants had to write letters, call meetings, and perform other job related tasks.
3. A business game during which the six participants work together to buy parts and manufacture a product.
4. A leaderless group exercise during which each participant tried to get his candidate for a promotion selected as the best of the six.

These initial processes have been utilized by later centers, including the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP).

An important discovery in the longitudinal research at AT&T was the effect of job situation on the relevance of individual traits for managerial success. The prediction of success based on a candidate's assessed traits was more accurate if the person had a job situation favorable to individual development. A favorable situation existed when a person was encouraged to develop management skills, was given challenging assignments with increased responsibility, and had a boss who served as a role model by setting an example of how a successful, achievement-oriented manager should act. Thus, advancement was due to a combination of the relevant

personal qualities and the opportunity for these qualities to be translated into competent managerial behavior. (Yukl, 1998, p. 242).

Although employed to a great extent in business, industry, government and the military for over three decades, the use of assessment centers has not been widespread in the field of educational administration. However, the increased attention to performance outcomes and alternative assessment generally, and the concern for quality school leadership particularly, has generated renewed interest in utilizing assessment centers in the preparation, selection and development of school administrators (Sirotnik & Durden, 199, p. 2).

Historical Perspective and Design of the NASSP Assessment Centers

In 1975, with assistance and direction from the American Psychological Association, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) developed personnel assessment materials and processes applicable to elementary and secondary school administration (Hersey, 1977; Thomson, 1983). The first assessment center was established in Prince William County, Virginia in 1976. The NASSP model is the most well-known administrator assessment system. Others operate around the United States and abroad. They are usually based in school districts or universities, vary in purpose, function, and operation, but all are relatively similar in design and structure.

After four years of research and development, a three-year validation study conducted by Neal Schmitt of Michigan State University was initiated in 1979 and completed in 1981. A summary statement from the validation study noted:

In conclusion, we see the assessment center as a content valid procedure for the selection of school administrators. Evidence concerning its criterion-related validity is also positive, especially as it relates to supervisory performance ratings. Further, assessment center ratings are related to later student perceptions of school climate.

(Hersey, 1987, p.7)

The concept was developed by Dr. Paul W. Hersey, NASSP's Director of Professional Assistance with the assistance of various experts, including members of the American Psychological Association. Members of a special committee of the American Psychological Association (Division 14) were extremely helpful in assisting Paul W. Hersey, NASSP's Director of Professional Assistance, with the design and implementation phases of the program. Among those who helped were industrial psychologists Thomas A. Jeswald from R.R. Donnelley & Sons and Joel L. Moses of AT&T (Moses, 1977).

The NASSP Assessment Center Project was originally designed to improve the selection processes for entry-level elementary and secondary school building administrators. As the project matured, a long-term professional development link was added and has become another major part of this effort (Hersey, 1987, p. 1).

NASSP Assessment Center Methodology is based on the identification of generic skill dimensions (important for success in the principalship) that can be observed during performance of certain job-related activities. Because no single set of managerial skills applies equally to all types of administrative positions, generalized skills that are important for success in the "target job" have been identified for use in the center (Hersey, 1987, p. 2).

The skill dimensions identified are: Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Leadership, Sensitivity, Stress Tolerance, Oral Communication, Written Communication, Range of Interests, Personal Motivation and Educational Values (Hersey, 1987, p. 2).

Once a skill dimension is identified and defined, specific activities or exercises that are used as data sources for assessment must be designed. Simulation exercises are frequently used to assess "samples" of actual behavior. For the skill dimension of Oral Communication, for example, "samples" of persons speaking in formal and informal settings would be observed, recorded and analyzed. This method of observing actual behavior could be contrasted with the measurement of communications skills through the administration of a vocabulary test (Hersey, 1987, p. 2).

An assessment center normally has a combination of simulation exercises, paper-and-pencil inbaskets, personal interviews and fact-finding exercises. Often, simulations include leaderless group discussions and case studies of school problems

relating to scheduling, grading, curriculum modifications, staff meetings, negotiations, enrollment reduction, and school financial difficulties (Hersey, 1987, p. 2).

The number of activities or exercises used in an assessment center varies from assessment center to assessment center. The NASSP Assessment Center has six to eight planned activities. Representative of these are leaderless group activities, inbaskets, fact-finding exercises and structured interviews (Hersey, 1987, pp. 2-3).

In a leaderless group activity participants, after receiving background information about a school issue for individual study, are asked to perform a specific task in a group setting since consensus on a plan of action is required. Quite often, leaderless group exercises measure interpersonal skills best i.e., Leadership, Sensitivity and Oral Communications (Hersey, 1987, p. 3).

Inbasket exercises provide participants with an opportunity to respond to a number of school problems presented through the use of written memoranda, letters and notes. Participants are assigned a specific role and, within a specific period of time, they display their skills in solving school problems using such skills as Problem Analysis, Judgment, Decisiveness, Organizational Ability, Educational Values and Written Communication (Hersey, 1987, p. 3).

During a fact-finding exercise a participant usually reads a brief description of a problem, seeks additional information from an independent resource, and develops a solution to the problem. A report containing the proposed solution is usually

prepared and presented orally to an observer at the conclusion of the exercise. This type of exercise often has multiple segments, and a participant is expected to complete each phase of the exercise within an allotted time. The exercise provides opportunities for the observation of Problem Analysis, Judgment, Oral Communication, Stress Tolerance and other important skill dimensions (Hersey, 1987, p. 3).

An assessment center may include the administration of tests and inventories on personality, intellectual ability, verbal and quantitative skills, aptitudes and interests. A structured interview is frequently conducted with each participant. The NASSP Assessment Center design requires a multiplicity of school-related activities and exercises to be conducted over two days. Therefore, the administration of any single test inventory or exercise does not constitute an assessment center that would meet Association Standards of Quality (Hersey, 1987, p. 3).

A director approved by the national staff heads each NASSP Assessment Center. The leadership of the director parallels that of a principal to a school; a good director is required for the operation of an effective assessment center. A special training program designed by NASSP is provided for all project directors (Hersey, 1987, p. 3).

Directors provide administrative leadership for an assessment center much as a principal does for a building. Directors recruit and screen candidates for assessor training; organize assessment centers; monitor exercises and the performance of

assessors; review report forms; conduct the jurying sessions that lead to consensus on each participant's performance; review and edit final report forms; conduct feedback sessions with participants; provide some updating of training for assessors; maintain communication with the NASSP Assessment Center Project staff, other directors, assessors, candidates for training, and individuals interested in learning more about the local assessment center. A director is responsible for maintaining quality control for efficient and effective assessment center operation (Hersey, 1987, p. 4).

Participants are assigned to perform exercises according to a predetermined assessment matrix. Assessors are also assigned to observe, record and report on participants' behaviors according to a predetermined schedule. Participants are observed by different assessors during each activity as a means of fulfilling certain psychometric requirements. Assessors also prepare written reports on specially designed forms for each exercise performed by every participant (Hersey, 1987, p. 4).

Assessors are trained to observe and record behavior displayed by participants and to write objective and comprehensive reports on the skill dimensions observed in the exercises. Learning to effectively participate in consensus discussions is also emphasized for each assessor. Written reports covering behavior in all exercises are required for each participant. These reports contain observations relating to each skill dimension and result in a diagnostic tool on behavior dimensions for use by each participant (Hersey, 1987, p. 4).

The written reports on the exercises serve as the basis for a discussion among the assessors about each participant's performance. The observations are recorded on specially designed exercise report forms. The assessors, working as a team, produce a final report that identifies the strengths, improvement needs and suggestions for each participant's development. The final report is the product of a consensus discussion among the assessors about each participant's performance on all of the behavior dimensions (Hersey, 1987, pp. 4-5).

All the information observed and analyzed is compiled in a final, written report. A copy of the report is reviewed with each participant as the director of the assessment center provides specific feedback to each participant in a confidential conference setting.

All training of assessor candidates is conducted by NASSP (Hersey, 1987, p. 5).

Each project has a unique funding approach depending upon the number and type of political entities participating in the program. In some projects, the local school districts, state department of education and universities are responsible for part or all costs associated with training. In others, educational foundations have been helpful. Training costs include copyrighted materials, travel, lodging, meals and related expenses for assessors and trainers (Hersey, 1987, p. 5).

Candidates for training are administrators (principal level and above) selected from school districts and other educational institutions participating in an NASSP

Assessment Center project. Candidates are selected for training who are highly qualified and successful administrators and who possess credibility as potential assessors. They must also possess a high energy level to meet the rigorous demand of the daily schedule in an assessment center (Hersey, 1987, p. 5).

Assessor training conducted by NASSP is held over a four-day period. The use of training manuals, standardized report forms, final report writing guides and other uniform processes help to increase the reliability of assessors' observations and written reports. Procedures for observing behaviors, recording observations, interpreting data, coding behaviors by skill dimension, writing reports and conducting structured interviews are provided (Hersey, 1987, p. 5).

After more than two decades of research and development related to this rigorous training program, NASSP has found that talented administrators need specialized training to become effective assessors. Assessors are trained to understand and internalize the meaning of each skill dimension and the "look fors" in each exercise. Training also emphasizes observing behaviors related to each skill dimension and activity. All assessors become proficient in classifying observed behaviors, rating behaviors, evaluating and integrating data, writing reports and providing developmental suggestions (Hersey, 1987, pp. 5-6).

In the NASSP Assessment Center Project, careful and rigorous training of assessors is the key to the successful operation of a center. After assessors are trained, NASSP Assessment Center Project staff members and their local assessment

center director monitor them when they function in their first assessment center. Other assessors also provide immediate feedback to assessor peers on the quality and clarity of written and oral reports during consensus discussions. Over the long term the greatest responsibility for monitoring is borne by project directors who observe assessors' work during the exercises and jurying sessions each time an assessment center is initiated. Most assessors find that training and serving as an assessor require much effort and commitment but also provide an excellent individualized professional development program. As long as assessors' work meets the "Standards of Quality" established for the NASSP Project, their names will remain on the roster of qualified NASSP assessors (Hersey, 1987, p. 6).

Meeting nine "Standards of Quality" can accredit a project. These "Standards" can be found in the NASSP Assessment Center Accreditation brochure and are used to evaluate and recognize national and international NASSP-approved assessment centers (Hersey, 1987, p. 6).

A minimum of six assessors, and a seventh who is specially trained to serve as the director, conduct the exercises in an assessment center. A team of assessors will usually spend five full days—the first two days in observing the participants in assessment exercises and the last three days in preparing reports, participating in consensus discussions and generating final reports. Oral feedback to participants relating to the final reports is given by the center director (Hersey, 1987, p. 6).

Generally, a team of six assessors will observe, record, analyze and agree upon the performances of twelve participants in an assessment center. Some centers have deviated from this 6 to 12 ratio, with the approval of NASSP. A common variation is to have a 6 to 6 ratio, which greatly reduces the workload and may reduce by 25% or more the days needed to conduct a center.

After a director and team of assessors are trained, a professional monitor assigned by the National Project staff conducts an on-site monitoring of the first two locally operating assessment centers (Hersey, 1987, p. 6). The agencies that have been accredited to run centers have typically been state departments of education, large school districts (or consortiums), or state-wide professional organizations, depending on the location. Subsequent monitoring is done by the local director who makes sure NASSP's "Standards of Quality" (NASSP, n.d. p. 2-3) are maintained.

The Standards of Quality are:

1. The technical design of the assessment center follows one of the recommended official NASSP models. This includes specific attention to the simulations and exercises used, the observation and behavior-recording procedures, the skill dimensions evaluated and the procedures for integrating multiple judgments.
2. All assessors used in the project are trained by NASSP personnel (or those officially designed by the Association) using training procedures and materials developed by the Association and the Division of

Industrial and Organizational Psychology of the American Psychological Association. These assessors must be certified by the trainer as having performed at a minimal level of competence in specific assessment tasks.

3. A one-day refresher course is given by the center director to all previously trained assessors who have been inactive in the project for a period of six months or more. This course will follow an approved outline of topics and procedures.
4. The assessment center has a director assigned (in addition to the required assessors) to administer the center in a professional manner with concern for the treatment of individuals, accuracy of results and overall quality of the operation. The director is a trained assessor and has served as an assessor in an accredited center. The director is appointed after consultation with NASSP.
5. A physical location (called an assessment center) conforms to the prescribed site and space requirements specified in the center design and recommended by NASSP.
6. Full documentation of each assessment center is maintained on file for a minimum of seven years for use in follow-up counseling of candidates and for research purposes.
7. As state and local developmental funds become available, each center provides appropriate training opportunities for qualifying candidates.

8. Participation in the NASSP Assessment Center program implies a commitment to improving selection procedures. As part of this commitment, each participating project assists NASSP in research efforts to establish validity of the center process and test new exercises, simulations, materials and developmental training procedures.
9. The general plan of all centers includes the following minimal considerations:
 - the purpose of assessment
 - the personnel to be assessed
 - the qualifications of those who will be trained and used as assessors
 - specific restrictions concerning personnel who will see the assessment data and how data are to be used
 - feedback procedure to participants and top management
 - security of all materials used in the assessment process
 - expected "life" of assessment center data—the length of time assessment data will be used for decision-making purposes
 - developmental suggestions for each candidate participating in assessment

After more than a decade of experience with this process, assessors and participants alike have identified many benefits that can be attributed to the assessment center. The center represents a validated process of assessing the generic

skills of potential school building administrators and can lead to the identification of superior administrators who will serve as successful leaders in schools. Both school districts and the potential administrators benefit from this service. In addition, administrators trained as assessors indicate the assessment center training and work represent one of the best professional development programs with which they have been identified (Hersey, 1987, p. 7).

The results confirmed that the NASSP process was helping predict who were the most likely to be successful as school principals and assistant principals in school districts throughout the nation.

Background of Other Public School Assessment Centers

NASSP has received a great deal of publicity regarding its center program, and may be thought of as being the first educational agency to use an assessment center. At least five other educational agencies or organizations have used, or continue to use, an assessment center process other than that used by NASSP (Helquist, 1988, p. 43).

Two Florida counties (Broward and Palm) and the Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative developed an assessment center in 1973. The goal was to identify administrative and supervisory personnel. Three centers were set up. Each complied with the standards of the Florida Department of Education (Helquist, 1988).

Broward's center was developed with technical assistance from Nova and Florida Atlantic Universities. Participants completed five exercises which included

an inbasket, a leaderless group, a scheduling exercise, a paper and pencil test, and small group grant writing exercise. The center was conducted over a two-day period (Helquist, 1988, p. 43).

The Palm Beach center also used technical assistance from Florida Atlantic University. Five major job functions were included in this center. These were further broken down into sixteen competencies, assessed in ten different exercises over a two-day period. Twenty participants were evaluated in each center (Helquist, 1988, p. 43).

The University of West Florida assisted the Panhandle Center with its development. This center used Development Dimensions, Inc. materials. They were adapted to meet the center's needs. Four exercises over two days were used to measure the skill dimensions. A maximum of twelve participants and six assessors were used in each center (Helquist, 1988, p. 44).

Maryland Schools in Montgomery County implemented a center to evaluate those staff members who wanted to become principals in the mid 1970s. Final ratings on each of the participants were arrived at through a process of consensus. Twelve assessors per center evaluated twenty-four participants. Five categories of behaviors were identified for assessment across five exercises (Helquist, 1988, p. 44).

The nearly immediate feedback provided to the participants was a unique design feature. The assessor shared exercise ratings with the participants as the

interview phase was conducted. In most centers, a director provides this feedback, rather than an assessor (Helquist, 1988, p. 44).

A cooperative assessment center was developed by the University of Mississippi Bureau of School Services to identify staff from rural school districts. When a superintendent nominated at least eight staff for participation, a center was conducted. A maximum of eighteen participants were allowed into one center. Twenty skills were measured using six exercises (Helquist, 1988, p. 45)

During the mid 1970s, the Peel Board of Education in Ontario, Canada utilized a pilot center to stem the dissatisfaction of the usual method of selecting a principal. Five exercises were used to assess ten skills. They were decision making, judgment, teacher evaluation, communication, problem solving, organization, motivation, planning, team building, and program implementation (Helquist, 1988, p. 45).

In 1982, the Dade County, Florida Public Schools initiated a Management Assessment Center to develop a pool of acceptable candidates for principal and assistant principal vacancies. Assessment Center Designs, Inc. secured a contract to design this center. Six exercises were used to assess nine skills. They were leadership, organizing and planning, perception, decision making, decisiveness, interpersonal relations, adaptability, oral communication and written communication (Helquist, 1988, p. 45).

The entire center process takes two days, with twelve assessors evaluating twelve participants. The entire process, including feedback is provided over a two-day period for this center (Helquist, 1988, p. 45).

Validation research, especially at Michigan State University has proved conclusively that the assessment center measures accurately the skills of potential administrators and the courts have agreed. The Kentucky Assessment Center operated by the University of Louisville reported very positive responses as late as 1988.

Recent Research of Educational Assessment Processes

Specific skill sets that principals must acquire to help them handle the issues of curriculum, community and school reform are outlined in the Standards of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) (1996) and are available on the Web. As the concept of school leadership has evolved from a more managerial orientation tone that focuses on instructional leadership, the definition of the qualities that principals should demonstrate has also evolved, with the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) leading the way (Tirozzi, 2001). The NASSP has developed a set of "21st-Century School Administrator Skills," which are closely aligned with the ISLLC standards. They appear in two NASSP documents—the "21st Century School Administrator Skills Self-Assessment and Observer Assessment."

The NASSP offers several assessment and development programs based on this new set of skills. "Selecting and Developing the 21st-Century Principal" is a

contemporary assessment tool that is designed to help identify or develop effective school leaders. It measures leadership potential by diagnosing the behavioral strengths and developmental needs of prospective principals. The NASSP Developmental Assessment Center (DAC) program has been designed specifically for development. It emphasizes the establishment (or revision) of a personal plan for career advancement. DAC provides current administrators with specific information about their strengths, warns them of potential pitfalls and suggests development possibilities they can use to build the skills they need to be effective school leaders (Tirozzi, 2001).

Over the past quarter-century, significant changes have been reshaping our nation and its educational structure (Murphy, Shipman & Pearlman, 1997). To meet these changes, educators and policy makers have launched a variety of initiatives to redefine the roles of school leaders in the 21st century (Murphy et al, 1997). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) was formed in 1994 to establish common professional standards for school leaders. The ISLLC operates under the aegis of the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) are two of ten professional educational associations affiliated with the ISLLC. The ISLLC is a consortium of states formed for the purpose of developing model standards and assessments for school leaders. ISLLC's primary

constituency is the state education agencies responsible for administrator licensing. It includes representatives of state agencies/departments of education and professional standards boards, with considerable participation by professional associates.

In addition to raising quality within the profession, it is the hope of the Consortium that the development of model standards will promote action on two fronts. First, ISLLC member states believe that the standards will provide useful information for decision-making within each state on a wide array of topics, such as program development and review, licensure, and advanced certification. Second, it is the hope of Consortium members that the creation of common standards will promote collaboration among the states, either collectively or in smaller groupings, on topics of mutual interest, such as reciprocity of licensure, assessment of administrative candidates.

The work of the Consortium builds on research about skillful stewardship by school administrators and evolving perspectives about society and education. It represents a major transition point as we continue the shift from an industrial to an information society.

In professional development and licensure, twenty-three states and several professional associations are involved in an effort to use the standards to strengthen professional development for school leaders, and a number of these states will also link this work to relicensure (Murphy et al, 1997).

To date, however, the most promising and extensive use of the standards has been in the area of assessment for licensure. In a unique partnership, the Educational Testing Service and six states (Illinois, Kentucky, Missouri, Mississippi, North Carolina and the District of Columbia) are developing comprehensive performance-based examinations for licensure. One notable element of the partnership is the collaborative effort to yoke powerful methodologies on performance-based assessment with the standards designed to shape leadership for tomorrow's schools (Murphy et al, 1997).

The first phase has been the development of an assessment battery to evaluate the extent to which prospective leaders can apply knowledge in the service of school improvement. The second phase focuses on the developing specifications and prototypes for portfolios that meet the same objective for current administrators. The assessment for initial licensure is a six-hour examination organized into two, two-hour modules and two one-hour modules. All the exercises require written responses, and as with other professions, assessments are scored by expert practitioners in the field. Expert scorers judge the candidate responses using a rubric based on the ISLLC standards and multiple sample candidate responses.

The content of the assessment is based on the standards developed by the ISLLC and on a national job analysis (Educational Testing Service, 1996). These standards are designed to capture what is essential about the role of school leaders—what makes a difference in whether a school community can provide experiences that

ensure all students succeed. They capture what research and practitioners have told the ISLLC representatives are critical about effective leadership. By focusing on the essential aspects of leadership—defined in relation to student success—the standards are designed to help transform the profession of educational administration and the roles of school administrators. The six ISLLC standards are:

1. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.
2. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
3. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
4. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

5. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
6. A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

A licensure test is designed to determine individuals who possess occupation-relevant knowledge and skills at the time of entry into their occupation or profession. In short, a licensure test may be viewed as a safeguard for the public—a mechanism that helps ensure that only individuals who possess important knowledge and skills may enter into professional practice.

The assessment is a six-hour examination organized into two two-hour modules and two one-hour modules. All of the exercises require the candidate to write a response. Teams of expert scorers are extensively trained to judge candidate responses using a rubric based on the ISLLC Standards and multiple sample candidate responses.

MODULE I: EVALUATION OF ACTIONS 1 (1 hour)

In the first one-hour section, there are 12 short vignettes. Each describes a situation a principal might commonly encounter and be required to respond to. Each vignette is followed by a focused question that asks what the principal might do next,

what factors the principal should consider in responding to the situation, how the principal might handle the situation or dilemma presented, and what the potential consequences of action in the situation are. The candidate is required to answer the questions with specific detail and to give a rationale for the answer when appropriate. This category includes vignettes that deal with situations drawn from and distributed among content areas, such as due process, safety, facilities, budget, discipline, and technology (i.e., its use in information management rather than in instruction), and scheduling.

MODULE II: SYNTHESIS OF INFORMATION AND PROBLEM SOLVING (2 hours)

This section of the assessment consists of two one-hour case analyses. Each case is anchored in issues of learning and teaching. In this section, candidates are presented with two different sets of several documents, some of which may be repeated later in part II. Candidates will also be given a short scenario describing a school and its community. Candidates are required to examine all documents and select from these documents relevant information to answer questions that pose complex problems and that require the candidate to propose courses of action to address the problems.

The two sets of documents are relevant to an elementary school setting and to a secondary school setting.

MODULE III: ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION AND DECISION-MAKING

(2 hours)

In this section, candidates are presented with eight documents, typical of those encountered by school principals. At least six of the eight documents should relate to issues involving learning and teaching. Using the information in each document, candidates respond to a series of three questions about the document. The types of documents used in this section may include:

- Assessment data
- Portions of school improvement plans
- Budget information
- Schedules
- Resource allocation documents
- Staff evaluations
- Curriculum information

The types of questions may include:

- What is the important issue in the data presented in this document?
- What other information would you need to assess the information presented in the document?
- Where would you get such information?
- What important patterns do you observe in the data presented in the document?

What steps would you take with your staff to address the issues raised by the data presented in the document?

How would you present the information contained in this document to (parents, community organizations, staff, etc.)?

MODULE IV: EVALUATION OF ACTIONS II (1 hour)

In the second one-hour section, there are six longer vignettes. Each presents a dilemma based on learning and teaching issues. The candidate is asked a focused analytical question, or two such questions in some cases. The response requires the candidate to balance competing claims for resources, prioritize actions, articulate the instructional issues raised by the situation explain instructional and curricular strategies appropriate in responding to the situation and discuss instructional implications of a situation.

In addition to raising quality within the profession, it is the hope of the Consortium that the development of model standards will promote action on two fronts. First ISLLC member states believe that the standards will provide useful information for decision-making within each state on a wide array of topics, such as program development and review, licensure, and advanced certification. Second, it is the hope Consortium members that the creation of common standards will promote collaboration such as reciprocity of licensure and assessment of administrative candidates (Murphy et al, 1997).

The second phase of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) development project with Educational Testing Service (ETS) is well under way. In Phase II, ETS is developing a portfolio for school leaders based on the performances and knowledge embodied in the six ISLLC Standards for School Leaders. States will be able to use this portfolio for licensure renewal or permanent licensure purposes (ISLLC, 1999).

The field test version of the ISLLC Assessment Portfolio (ETS, 1999) consists of six Components. They are:

Component A.1: Facilitating the Vision of Learning Within the School Community. The focus of this component is ability of the candidate to analyze important aspects of his/her school or district in terms of their impact on student learning.

Component A.2: Sustaining A Culture Conducive to Student Learning. The focus of this component is the candidate's response to a significant barrier to student learning in his/her school or district.

Component B.1: Understanding and Responding to the Larger Context. The focus of this component is the candidate's and his/her staff's response to a larger (a statewide, regional, or national) political, social, economic, legal or cultural issue/trend that affects student learning in the candidate's school or district.

Component B.2: Collaborating with Families and Community. The focus of this component is the candidate's collaboration with families and the community in order to advance student learning.

Component C.1: Supporting Professional Growth and Development. The focus of this component is the candidate's support of the professional growth and development of staff members directed to improvement of student learning.

Component C.2: Organizing Resources for an Effective Learning Environment. The focus of this component is the candidate's advancement of student learning through the resolution of competing claims by two or more individuals or parties regarding the allocation of resources within his/her school or district.

Candidates are required to complete four Components during the two-year field test period. They must do A.1 and A.2. They then have a choice in selecting either B.1 or B.2 and a choice between C.1 and C.2.

Each component consists of four commentary questions and one reflection question. Each of the commentary questions requires that a response be no more than two pages in length. Furthermore, the response must be supported by documentation. A document may consist of a memo or letter, a meeting agenda, a newspaper article, or any other similar artifact that supports and gives evidence to the response. Each question is limited to a total of five pages of documents. The response to the

reflection question is also limited to two pages; however this section requires no documentation. Typically, the reflection questions asks the candidate to look back on what was done to complete the portfolio Component and to assess what was learned and how this new information will be used in similar situations in the future.

Each Component contains directions intended to provide the candidate with ample suggestions and guidelines for selecting issues, choosing appropriate documents and completing the process. Furthermore, each Component describes the Standards being addressed in the exercise and used in scoring the completed Component. The Candidate Bulletin, included with the portfolio material, gives each candidate specific assistance in formatting the written work, where to get assistance, and how to send the completed project back to ETS.

Each state has designated contact people to assist candidates. These contact people are available if candidates have questions about the portfolio process, requirements, or any other state-specific issues (description of ISLLC School Leaders Portfolio in Work in Progress, 1999).

The field-testing phase of this project is targeted for completion in summer 2002. Participating states are Indiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina and Ohio.

The ISLLC sees the portfolio as flexible instrument that can accommodate both "hard" and "soft" licensure uses. They defined "soft" licensure as when candidates earn their continued license simply by completing the components

according to the task specifications. They defined "hard" licensure as when a candidate must complete a sufficient level of accomplishment to meet a passing score established by the state.

Initially, NASSP received verbal confirmation that candidates who performed well in the assessment process succeeded highly when appointed to a principalship or assistant principalship. Then, a Michigan State University research team, led by Neal Schmitt, conducted a formal validity study (1982) with a sample of candidates who had gone through assessment centers and been assigned to administrative positions. Results from the study confirmed that the NASSP Assessment Center process can help predict accurately who is most likely to be successful as a school principal or assistant principal.

At the conclusion of the NASSP Assessment Center program, participants are given extensive feedback on their performance in each of the 12 generalized skills areas. However, because further development is left for independent pursuit, it frequently gets pushed aside due to other pressures. NASSP assessment consortium members and Dr. Hersey concluded that Assessment Center effectiveness would be enhanced greatly if it were used in conjunction with a structured developmental program. In 1982, NASSP shifted a major part of the focus in assessment work from identification and selection to development of aspiring administrators through coaching, training, education and experience. The Springfield Simulation is designed

to meet this development need. Participants in this simulation are drawn from graduates of the NASSP Assessment Center process (Hersey, 1987, p. 7).

The Springfield Development Program

A new long-term developmental phase of NASSP's Assessment Center Project was initiated in August 1982 (Hersey, 1987, p. 7). The "Springfield" approach has been designed to be used in conjunction with the assessment center selection program and has seven important developmental components. It begins with each participant conducting an analysis of developmental needs. This helps the participant to re-analyze the Assessment Center feedback and to decide upon priorities for development. Some participants want to improve their best skills, while others put a higher priority on improvement of weaker skills (Hersey, 1987, p. 7).

The NASSP Springfield development program begins with participants focusing on six generic skill dimensions: Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Leadership and Sensitivity (Hersey, 1987, p. 7).

During the Springfield simulation the participant is assigned to one of 20 positions in a prototypical school district. The participants receive their position assignments at an orientation conducted the day before the actual simulation. During that orientation, they are introduced to the six behaviors for effective performance (Hersey, 1987, p. 7).

Twelve to fifteen weeks after the simulation, a follow-up seminar (step six, full day) is held for all participants. The key behaviors are reviewed and generalized to on-the-job situations. Individual progress on behavioral objectives is reviewed to reinforce developmental learning. New personal follow-up goals are established as needed (Hersey, 1987, p. 8).

Finally, in the weeks following this meeting, Developmental Mentors and participants determine together the length of time they will continue their developmental relationship.

For most participants, this relationship has continued for years (Hersey, 1987, p. 8).

In summary, behavior modeling was chosen as the principal training strategy for development because industrial and educational research has shown it to be effective in shaping and developing a wide variety of social and judgmental skills (Hersey, 1987, p. 8). When embedded in a realistic simulation, the principles of modeling, rehearsal and reinforcement can lead to rapid skill development, participant enthusiasm about the development process, and most important, effective transfer of skill to on-the-job performance (Hersey, 1987, p. 8). This transfer also is enhanced and supported by continuing evaluation and feedback from a person who serves as a mentor.

NASSP's Assessment Center Project, initiated in 1975 to help identify and develop effective school administrators, continues to receive widespread enthusiasm and interest from many educators. This comprehensive instructional program has

provided assessment for more than 6,000 participants and is currently operating in 50 centers in the United States, Canada, Germany and Australia.

Not all organizations use the process for selection. The Diagnostic Development Center, a governmental agency, uses its assessment center solely for development purposes. Newly selected candidates for the "senior executive service candidate pool" go through a two-day assessment center, from which the information forms a basis for a 12 to 18 month individual development program.

The Assessment Center Technology (ACT) process has its best future as a developmental tool, rather than solely for selection (Hughes, 1986, p. 19). Assessment Center Technology promises a systematic way to diagnose the degree to which relevant job skills are present (Hughes, 1986, p. 19). A host of possibilities exists including local job and task analyses, locally or commercially developed exercises and skills-based seminars and self-development packages (Hughes, 1986, p. 19). All of these could form the basis for prescribed improvement programs and productive administrator renewal programs (Hughes, 1986, p. 19). Unusual economies are possible, as well, when the assessment center approach is used for self-assessment and self-development (Hughes, 1986, p. 19). These are possibilities to be explored by school districts.

A study of the ADI (Administrator Diagnostic Inventory) assessment system yielded some interesting findings. Sirotnick and Durden, (1996) conducted a study to determine what needs to be done for an assessment system to be used responsibly for

principal preparation, selection and professional development. Their conclusion was that the ADI system may yield better results as a diagnostic tool than a selection and certification instrument.

The major use of administrator performance assessment has been for selection purposes. The NASSP Assessment Center model has been the subject of a number of validity studies of varying scope and magnitude. For example, in a study by Schmitt and Cohen (1990), modest predictive validity coefficients were found between overall NASSP performance scores and ratings of on-the-job performance by the assessees themselves, their supervisors, a teacher sample, and a composite of the teachers and supervisor.

The effects of assessment center participation have received limited overall attention in research. Although previous studies have concentrated on content, criterion, construct validity and reliability of the NASSP Assessment Center, few have examined the connection between the assessment process and what happens as a result of participation.

The following three studies are cited from Helquist's dissertation (1988):

Bley (1983) studied the attitudes of participants and non-participating administrators in four California school districts toward the use of the assessment center process. He found that there was support for assessment centers being:

1. An integral part of the administrator selection process.

2. Reliable in assessing skill dimensions.
3. Used as a basis for staff development of principals.
4. Used as a basis for staff development of administrative candidates.

Farmer (1985) investigated the effects of participation in a center by employees of a Maryland school system. He studied the opinions of assistant principal participants, teacher participants, and principals who had participants in their buildings. Farmer reached seven conclusions:

1. Participants agreed that the center was fair and objective, but disagreed on how the results should be used.
2. On 50% of the dimensions, principals rated staff from their building higher than did the center.
3. Assistant principals felt that their current position provided training in the skill dimensions assessed by the center.
4. Teachers felt that their current position did not provide training in the skill dimensions assessed by the center.
5. Participants agreed that there were both positive and negative effects resulting from

the center.

6. Participants and the school district agreed upon which of the 12 skill dimensions were the five most important: 1) Leadership, 2) Organizational Ability, 3) Problem Analysis, 4) Judgment, and 5) Sensitivity.
7. The most dissatisfied group of participants were those who were classified as not being recommended for future administrative consideration by the center.

Walden (1985) also studied the effect of center participation. She looked at the effect of center participation on the subsequent self-improvement of participants. Her main purpose was to determine if there were any relationships between center participation and behavior changes in selected participants (N=12). She found that:

1. Most participants make plans to improve their skills.
2. Most participants follow through on improvement plans for skills where they agree with the center's ratings.
3. When participants disagree with a center finding, they consider that part of the

center to be invalid.

4. The greatest amount of self-improvement activity occurs when a district uses center results as a basis for classes, etc.
5. The greatest negative influence on professional growth occurs when a district uses the center ratings as a basis for promotion.
6. Most center participants show some skill growth after assessment.
7. Participants and supervisors feel that self-improvement is one result of center participation. (Helquist, 1988, pp.87-89)

In addition, Ford's dissertation (1987) studied NASSP Assessment center candidates to determine the assessees' attitudes toward the overall management of the principal assessment center. In a later dissertation study, Brockel (1989) surveyed 250 New Jersey superintendents/chief school administrators to determine what were the most important skills, proficiencies and traits most often generic to middle management (principals).

Summary

This chapter was divided into four major sections—a short history of assessment centers, historical perspective and design of the NASSP Assessment

Centers, background of other public school assessment centers and recent research of educational assessment processes. Although assessment centers have their roots in the beginning of this century, the application of the process has been a relatively recent phenomenon in the field of education.

The NASSP Assessment Program is the most widely known and used in education. It is a well-validated process and an intense experience for the participants. A highlight of this program is the use of experts as assessors—practitioners who have “walked the walk and talked the talk.”

Other public school systems have utilized the process and adapted it to meet their needs. There are over 60 NASSP Assessment Centers operating throughout the country and internationally in Bermuda, Canada, Ontario, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island .

Recent research is indicative of a growing trend in the use of assessments to identify and select school administrators with the potential to be successful. Assessments continue to be used in industry and their purpose is two-fold: they are good predictors of employees with management potential and they identify areas that need to be improved.

The results of some recent dissertation studies were presented in the last section.

These studies have focused on participant perceptions about the process, the developmental aspects of the process, management of the overall process and the

identification of skills, proficiencies and traits most often generic to middle management (principals).

None of the previous studies have investigated the participants' perceptions with regard to NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions and job behaviors.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to answer a number of questions about the perceptions of New Jersey elementary and secondary school administrators relative to their participation in the NASSP Assessment Center process. It provides a description of the procedures that will be used in the selection of the sample, and the processes followed in the development of the research instrument, including preliminary testing and the final revision of the instrument. This chapter also describes the procedures followed to collect, organize and analyze the data. The methodology of this study is divided into six sections: 1) the research questions, 2) population of the study, 3) variables studied, 4) data collection procedures, and 5) techniques to be used in the data analysis.

Research Questions

1. What effect does the level (elementary, middle, secondary) of New Jersey school administrator NASSP Assessment Center participants have on the discrete job behaviors within the skill dimensions identified in the NASSP Assessment Center process?

2. What effect does the number of elapsed years for New Jersey school administrator NASSP Assessment Center participants (elementary, middle, and

secondary) have on the discrete job behaviors within the skill dimensions identified in the NASSP Assessment Center process?

Subsidiary Questions

1. What job behaviors within identified NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions are demonstrated with the most frequency as perceived by New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators who have participated in the assessment center process?

2. What job behaviors within identified NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions are demonstrated with the least frequency as perceived by New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators who have participated in the assessment center process?

3. Do New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators who have participated in the assessment center process perceive that an increase in the demonstration of job behaviors within identified NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions improves their job performance?

4. With what frequency do New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators participate in professional development activities within the identified NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions?

Population of the Study

The population of this study included New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators who have been assessed since 1994. The NASSP assessment center process became a requirement for licensure in 1995.

A formal request was made to the Director of the New Jersey NASSP Assessment Center to make a mailing list of participants available to the researcher. The number of participants who have been assessed since 1994 is approximately 500.

The participants who have been assessed come from a variety of school districts throughout the state.

A solicitation letter was sent to each of the participants on the list, along with a survey. The researcher was interested in having all participants included in the sample. The researcher did not have to administer the questionnaire. The respondents simply completed the questionnaire and returned it via mail to the researcher.

A stamped, self-addressed envelope was included with each survey for ease of return. The participants were not asked to identify themselves in any way. Their participation in this survey research was totally voluntary. There was no attempt on the part of the researcher to identify any one particular respondent or school district. All returned surveys were secured in the home office file cabinet of the researcher.

Data Collection

The survey instrument was constructed by the researcher and checked for reliability through a pilot test (Appendix D). A random selection of 20 participants received surveys in the mail. An acceptable rate of response (10 surveys) was obtained. In the pilot test a covariance matrix was used for this analysis. The overall alpha for 72/73 questions was over .95. Major issues involving the construction of surveys were addressed. These included precision of expression, objectivity, relevance, suitability to the problem situation, and probability of favorable reception and return (Leedy, 1997). The validity of the survey was checked through a jury of experts and tied into the conceptual framework (12 NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions). Experienced assessors were able to properly evaluate these areas. The experienced assessors were three retired principals and superintendents with long educational careers that have spanned 30 years or more. Dr. Frank Volpe, Dr. Robert Gavin and Dr. Ronald Batistoni have been involved with the NASSP Assessment Center in New Jersey since its inception in the mid-1980s. All have served in the capacity of Center Director or Co-Director.

The researcher collected data in April and May 2002. A simple random sampling technique was used on the total population for the pilot test.

Data Analysis

This study called for finding the extent of perceived behaviors. A one-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) was used to convey the frequencies of discrete job behaviors within identified NASSP assessment skill dimensions. The Tukey HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) was also used to analyze trends and statistically significant survey information. The data was collected and analyzed with the Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) version 11.0 for Windows.

Qualitative data was coded to extract similarities in perceptions from the data and interpreted. The researcher also considered the use of qualitative software because content could be easily analyzed and computers can recode information as needed.

Method of Analysis

The survey instrument (see Appendix A) used a Likert scale to rate statements that comprise each skill dimension. In addition, open-ended questions were included to incorporate qualitative data in this study. The Likert scale contained a rating scale from 1 to 5: 1=hardly ever; 2=on occasion; 3=sometimes; 4=frequently; 5=almost always. Lines for writing comments were provided for each skill dimension and the concluding open-ended question. The survey was composed of 73 questions in the 12 NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions: Problem Analysis-7 questions; Judgment-7 questions; Organizational Ability-7 questions; Decisiveness-6 questions; Leadership-7 questions; Sensitivity-9 questions;

Stress Tolerance-5 questions; Oral Communication- 4 questions; Written Communication- 4 questions; Range of Interest-4 questions; Personal Motivation- 6 questions; and Educational Values-7 questions.

A one-way analysis of the variance (ANOVA) of the mean scores resulting from survey data was performed. The null hypothesis stated that there should be no significant difference in elementary, middle and secondary New Jersey school administrators' perceptions of the effect of discrete job behaviors within the NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions.

Significance was established at the .05 level. Specifically, the dependent variables examined were level of the administrators (elementary, middle or secondary) and the number of years that had passed since the administrators were assessed.

Rejection of the null hypothesis would mean that there would be significant differences in the elementary, middle and secondary New Jersey school administrators' perceptions of the effect of discrete job behaviors within the NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions.

The next chapter details the results and findings of the study.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators regarding the NASSP skill dimensions and job behaviors.

This chapter will provide a detailed presentation of the data obtained from the survey and a complete response to the research questions. The data will be detailed in (5) subsections: response rate, background information, gender, administrator level, school district, ethnic background and year of participation in the NASSP Assessment Center.

Response Rate

The survey was piloted early April 2002 for reliability across the 73 questions. Twenty surveys were mailed to participants in the New Jersey NASSP Assessment Center. By mid April 2002 the remaining 480 surveys were mailed. In each mailing the researcher included a letter of introduction, the six page Administrator Assessment Program Survey (AAPS), a page on which the participant could request a copy of the survey results and a postage-paid self-addressed envelope requesting that the survey be returned by April 23, 2002. A total of 47 surveys were returned as undeliverable from the post office. Of the remaining 453, 4 surveys were returned

blank. Out of a population of 449 surveys, the researcher by mid May 2002 received a total of 140 surveys. This number represents a 31% response rate, which is acceptable in social science research.

Background Information

The participants completed the AAPS survey. The first section of the survey contained demographic data: gender, current position, level of administration (elementary, middle, secondary, District Office or Other), years in education, years in current position, school district (urban, suburban or rural), ethnicity (White non-Hispanic, Hispanic, African-American or Other), and the year of participation in the assessment center (1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001 or 2002).

Gender

Out of a total of 139 respondents, 59 (13.0%) indicated that they were males and 80 (17.7%) indicated that they were females. One respondent neglected to place a check mark in this category. There were 21 more females than males, a 7% difference. These responses were re-coded for data analysis: male-1, female-2. The exhibited frequencies for gender appear in Appendix D.

Level of Administrator

The respondents were asked to identify their current position. Out of a total of 140 respondents, 51 (11.3%) indicated that they were elementary level administrators, 33 (7.3%) indicated that they were middle level administrators, 34 (7.5%) indicated that they were secondary administrators, 15 (3.3%) indicated that they held District Office positions and 7 (1.5%) indicated that they held Other positions. These

responses were not coded for data analysis. The exhibited frequencies for level of administrator appear in Table 1.

Table 1

Exhibited Frequencies for Level of Administrator

		LEVEL			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Elementary	51	11.3	36.4	36.4
	Middle	33	7.3	23.6	60.0
	Secondary	34	7.5	24.3	84.3
	District Office	15	3.3	10.7	95.0
	Other	7	1.5	5.0	100.0
	Total	140	30.9	100.0	
Missing	System	313	69.1		
Total		453	100.0		

Years of Experience in Education

Out of a total of 139 respondents, there was a range of numbers of total years experience in education, from 2 to 37 years. In this category, the years of experience with the highest frequency was 13, while the years of experience with the lowest frequency were 2, 32, and 37. The responses were not coded for data analysis. The exhibited frequencies for total years in education appear in Appendix E.

Years in Current Position

Out of a total of 138 respondents, almost 25% had 3 or less years of experience in their current position. These responses were not coded for data analysis.

The exhibited frequencies for years in current position appear in Appendix E.

School District

Out of a total of 137 respondents, 29 (6.4%) were from urban districts, 103 (22.7%) were from suburban districts and 5 (1.1%) were from rural districts. 3 respondents did not identify their school districts. These responses were re-coded for data analysis: urban-1, suburban-2, rural-3. The exhibited frequencies for school district appear in Appendix E.

Ethnic Background

Out of 137 respondents, 123 (27.2%) identified themselves as White, non-Hispanic, 4 (.9%), Hispanic, 9 (2.0%) African-American and 1 (.2%) Other. 3 respondents neglected to identify their ethnic backgrounds. The responses were re-coded for data analysis: White non-Hispanic-1, Hispanic-2, African-American-3, Other-4. The exhibited frequencies for ethnic background appear in Appendix E.

Year of Participation in the NASSP Assessment Center

Out of a total of 140 respondents, the frequency with regard to the year of participation was lowest for 1994 and 1997. All other years had frequencies of above 10, with 2000 and 2001 being the highest frequencies of 24 and 40 respectively. The responses were re-coded for data analysis: 1994-1, 1995-2, 1996-3, 1997-4, 1998-5, 1999-6, 2000-7, 2001-8 and 2002-9. The exhibited frequencies for year of participation appear in Table 2.

Table 2

Exhibited Frequencies for Year of Participation

What year did you participate in the Assessment Center?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1994	2	.4	1.4	1.4
	1995	12	2.6	8.6	10.0
	1996	11	2.4	7.9	17.9
	1997	7	1.5	5.0	22.9
	1998	11	2.4	7.9	30.7
	1999	14	3.1	10.0	40.7
	2000	24	5.3	17.1	57.9
	2001	40	8.8	28.6	86.4
	2002	19	4.2	13.6	100.0
	Total	140	30.9	100.0	
Missing	System	313	69.1		
Total		453	100.0		

A oneway ANOVA was calculated on the AAPS survey scores for level of administration. This oneway analysis of variance on each of the 73 items in the 12 NASSP skill dimensions. Significance was set at the .05 level and 5 questions met this level of significance. The ANOVA for level of administration appears in Table 3.

Table 3

ANOVA for Level of Administration

ANOVA for Level (Q1 – 11)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q1	Between Groups	1.585	4	.396	.804	.525
	Within Groups	66.551	135	.493		
	Total	68.136	139			
Q2	Between Groups	.819	4	.205	.533	.712
	Within Groups	51.831	135	.384		
	Total	52.650	139			
Q3	Between Groups	.466	4	.116	.311	.870
	Within Groups	50.506	135	.374		
	Total	50.971	139			
Q4	Between Groups	2.235	4	.559	1.171	.326
	Within Groups	64.415	135	.477		
	Total	66.650	139			
Q5	Between Groups	.767	4	.192	.391	.815
	Within Groups	65.636	134	.490		
	Total	66.403	138			
Q6	Between Groups	1.516	4	.379	.619	.650
	Within Groups	82.734	135	.613		
	Total	84.250	139			
Q7	Between Groups	7.555	4	1.889	1.094	.362
	Within Groups	231.409	134	1.727		
	Total	238.964	138			
Q8	Between Groups	2.074	4	.519	2.020	.095
	Within Groups	34.668	135	.257		
	Total	36.743	139			
Q9	Between Groups	2.173	4	.543	2.778	.029
	Within Groups	26.398	135	.196		
	Total	28.571	139			
Q10	Between Groups	1.584	4	.396	1.257	.290
	Within Groups	42.215	134	.315		
	Total	43.799	138			
Q11	Between Groups	.164	4	.041	.097	.983
	Within Groups	56.584	134	.422		
	Total	56.748	138			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Level (Q12-22)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q12	Between Groups	.426	4	.106	.200	.938
	Within Groups	70.676	133	.531		
	Total	71.101	137			
Q13	Between Groups	1.593	4	.398	.687	.602
	Within Groups	77.716	134	.580		
	Total	79.309	138			
Q14	Between Groups	6.204	4	1.551	.819	.515
	Within Groups	249.811	132	1.893		
	Total	256.015	136			
Q15	Between Groups	3.245	4	.811	1.156	.333
	Within Groups	93.334	133	.702		
	Total	96.580	137			
Q16	Between Groups	2.184	4	.546	1.096	.361
	Within Groups	66.251	133	.498		
	Total	68.435	137			
Q17	Between Groups	7.993	4	1.998	3.509	.009
	Within Groups	75.746	133	.570		
	Total	83.739	137			
Q18	Between Groups	1.418	4	.354	.831	.508
	Within Groups	56.727	133	.427		
	Total	58.145	137			
Q19	Between Groups	2.109	4	.527	1.202	.313
	Within Groups	57.906	132	.439		
	Total	60.015	136			
Q20	Between Groups	3.278	4	.820	2.095	.085
	Within Groups	51.642	132	.391		
	Total	54.920	136			
Q21	Between Groups	6.822	4	1.705	.934	.447
	Within Groups	239.289	131	1.827		
	Total	246.110	135			
Q22	Between Groups	1.425	4	.356	.794	.531
	Within Groups	59.655	133	.449		
	Total	61.080	137			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Level (Q23-33)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q23	Between Groups	.395	4	.099	.298	.879
	Within Groups	43.990	133	.331		
	Total	44.384	137			
Q24	Between Groups	3.459	4	.865	2.212	.071
	Within Groups	51.997	133	.391		
	Total	55.457	137			
Q25	Between Groups	1.943	4	.486	1.919	.111
	Within Groups	33.659	133	.253		
	Total	35.601	137			
Q26	Between Groups	1.584	4	.396	.837	.504
	Within Groups	62.909	133	.473		
	Total	64.493	137			
Q27	Between Groups	6.569	4	1.642	.867	.485
	Within Groups	249.927	132	1.893		
	Total	256.496	136			
Q28	Between Groups	2.944	4	.736	1.565	.187
	Within Groups	63.013	134	.470		
	Total	65.957	138			
Q29	Between Groups	1.693	4	.423	.914	.458
	Within Groups	62.034	134	.463		
	Total	63.727	138			
Q30	Between Groups	1.221	4	.305	.621	.648
	Within Groups	65.388	133	.492		
	Total	66.609	137			
Q31	Between Groups	8.473	4	2.118	2.163	.076
	Within Groups	131.210	134	.979		
	Total	139.683	138			
Q32	Between Groups	2.858	4	.714	2.314	.061
	Within Groups	41.372	134	.309		
	Total	44.230	138			
Q33	Between Groups	1.970	4	.493	1.178	.323
	Within Groups	56.044	134	.418		
	Total	58.014	138			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Level (Q34-44)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q34	Between Groups	13.308	4	3.327	2.216	.071
	Within Groups	198.137	132	1.501		
	Total	211.445	136			
Q35	Between Groups	1.250	4	.313	.845	.499
	Within Groups	49.921	135	.370		
	Total	51.171	139			
Q36	Between Groups	.993	4	.248	1.129	.346
	Within Groups	29.693	135	.220		
	Total	30.686	139			
Q37	Between Groups	2.331	4	.583	1.168	.328
	Within Groups	67.354	135	.499		
	Total	69.686	139			
Q38	Between Groups	.916	4	.229	.640	.635
	Within Groups	48.256	135	.357		
	Total	49.171	139			
Q39	Between Groups	2.231	4	.558	1.196	.315
	Within Groups	62.941	135	.466		
	Total	65.171	139			
Q40	Between Groups	.715	4	.179	.347	.845
	Within Groups	69.421	135	.514		
	Total	70.136	139			
Q41	Between Groups	1.704	4	.426	1.336	.260
	Within Groups	42.742	134	.319		
	Total	44.446	138			
Q42	Between Groups	.679	4	.170	1.074	.372
	Within Groups	21.177	134	.158		
	Total	21.856	138			
Q43	Between Groups	24.339	4	6.085	3.128	.017
	Within Groups	258.741	133	1.945		
	Total	283.080	137			
Q44	Between Groups	1.912	4	.478	.846	.498
	Within Groups	75.699	134	.565		
	Total	77.612	138			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Level (Q45-55)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q45	Between Groups	1.973	4	.493	1.065	.377
	Within Groups	62.099	134	.463		
	Total	64.072	138			
Q46	Between Groups	1.988	4	.497	.747	.562
	Within Groups	89.163	134	.665		
	Total	91.151	138			
Q47	Between Groups	.544	4	.136	.306	.873
	Within Groups	59.513	134	.444		
	Total	60.058	138			
Q48	Between Groups	8.783	4	2.196	1.161	.331
	Within Groups	251.544	133	1.891		
	Total	260.326	137			
Q49	Between Groups	.453	4	.113	.139	.968
	Within Groups	109.547	134	.818		
	Total	110.000	138			
Q50	Between Groups	.676	4	.169	.389	.816
	Within Groups	58.230	134	.435		
	Total	58.906	138			
Q51	Between Groups	1.135	4	.284	.835	.505
	Within Groups	45.570	134	.340		
	Total	46.705	138			
Q52	Between Groups	25.741	4	6.435	3.293	.013
	Within Groups	259.911	133	1.954		
	Total	285.652	137			
Q53	Between Groups	.371	4	.093	.228	.922
	Within Groups	54.363	134	.406		
	Total	54.734	138			
Q54	Between Groups	1.734	4	.433	.659	.622
	Within Groups	88.802	135	.658		
	Total	90.536	139			
Q55	Between Groups	.364	4	.091	.278	.892
	Within Groups	44.321	135	.328		
	Total	44.686	139			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Level (Q56-66)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q56	Between Groups	6.687	4	1.672	.703	.592
	Within Groups	316.479	133	2.380		
	Total	323.167	137			
Q57	Between Groups	2.147	4	.537	1.070	.374
	Within Groups	67.703	135	.502		
	Total	69.850	139			
Q58	Between Groups	2.598	4	.649	1.130	.345
	Within Groups	77.574	135	.575		
	Total	80.171	139			
Q59	Between Groups	7.354	4	1.838	1.553	.191
	Within Groups	159.818	135	1.184		
	Total	167.171	139			
Q60	Between Groups	21.360	4	5.340	2.644	.036
	Within Groups	268.611	133	2.020		
	Total	289.971	137			
Q61	Between Groups	.273	4	.068	.353	.842
	Within Groups	26.127	135	.194		
	Total	26.400	139			
Q62	Between Groups	1.613	4	.403	.965	.429
	Within Groups	56.013	134	.418		
	Total	57.626	138			
Q63	Between Groups	.731	4	.183	.824	.512
	Within Groups	29.954	135	.222		
	Total	30.686	139			
Q64	Between Groups	2.104	4	.526	2.299	.062
	Within Groups	30.889	135	.229		
	Total	32.993	139			
Q65	Between Groups	3.313	4	.828	2.277	.064
	Within Groups	49.108	135	.364		
	Total	52.421	139			
Q66	Between Groups	10.324	4	2.581	1.235	.299
	Within Groups	277.994	133	2.090		
	Total	288.319	137			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Level (Q67-73)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q67	Between Groups	.714	4	.178	.559	.693
	Within Groups	43.079	135	.319		
	Total	43.793	139			
Q68	Between Groups	1.274	4	.319	.697	.595
	Within Groups	61.662	135	.457		
	Total	62.936	139			
Q69	Between Groups	1.077	4	.269	.785	.537
	Within Groups	46.316	135	.343		
	Total	47.393	139			
Q70	Between Groups	1.658	4	.414	1.343	.257
	Within Groups	41.364	134	.309		
	Total	43.022	138			
Q71	Between Groups	.494	4	.123	.231	.920
	Within Groups	72.078	135	.534		
	Total	72.571	139			
Q72	Between Groups	2.145	4	.536	.749	.560
	Within Groups	95.942	134	.716		
	Total	98.086	138			
Q73	Between Groups	11.693	4	2.923	1.422	.230
	Within Groups	269.366	131	2.056		
	Total	281.059	135			

An analysis of 73 survey questions was done using a oneway ANOVA. Significance was set at the .05 level. The following questions met this level of significance (see Table 4).

Table 4

Levels of Significance for Administrative Level

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>
Q9 I ask follow-up questions to clarify information.	.029
Q17 I delegate responsibilities to others and follow up to determine their progress.	.009
Q43 I have participated in professional development activities related to sensitivity.	.017
Q52 I have participated in professional development activities related to oral communication.	.013
Q60 I have participated in professional development activities related to range of interest.	.036

The following questions , although not statistically significant, were indicative of possible trends and included in this analysis. The level of significance for these questions was over .050 and less than 1.00 (see Table 5).

Table 5

Levels of Significance Indicative of Trends for Level of Administration

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>
Q8 I seek to identify the cause of a problem.	.095
Q20 I reflect on the overall picture and determine the relative importance of items before taking action.	.085
Q24 I identify relevant facts and consider them when making decisions.	.071
Q31 I encourage the use of charts and/or visual aids during the discussion.	.076
Q32 I support others who help move the group toward achieving its goal.	.061
Q34 I have participated in professional development activities related to leadership.	.071
Q64 I am self-disciplined.	.062
Q65 I directly confront personal and professional obstacles.	.064

A Post Hoc test, Tukey HSD (Honest Significant Difference) was then used to further analyze the survey questions with respect to levels of school administration. The method is a multiple comparison procedure designed to make all pairwise comparisons of means while maintaining the Type I error rate at the predetermined α (*alpha*) level (Hinkle, Wiersma & Jurs, 1998, p. 622). The Tukey HSD (Honest Significant Difference) revealed more details about the questions that reflected a significant difference of .05 or less based on the oneway ANOVA. The Tukey HSD for question 9 is exhibited in Table 6.

Table 6

Tukey HSD (Q9)**Q9. I ask questions to clarify information.**

Tukey HSD^{a,b}

LEVEL	N	Subset for alpha = .05
		1
Elementary	51	4.57
Other	7	4.71
Secondary	34	4.74
Middle	33	4.82
District Office	15	4.93
Sig.		.115

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

- a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 17.310.
- b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

On a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons, a mean difference was found to be almost one-half point (.36-statistically significant) higher for district office administrators than elementary administrators. The Tukey HSD for question 9 shows

an alpha of 4.57 for elementary school administrators and an alpha of 4.93 for district office administrators. There is, however, no statistical difference between the other levels (see Table 6).

Table 7

Tukey HSD (Q17)

Q17. I delegate responsibilities to others and follow up to determine their progress.

Tukey HSD^{a,b}

LEVEL	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
Elementary	50	3.68	
District Office	14	3.86	3.86
Middle	33	4.06	4.06
Secondary	34	4.21	4.21
Other	7		4.43
Sig.		.257	.183

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 17.007.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

On a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons, a mean difference was found to be slightly higher than one-half point (.53-statistically significant) higher for secondary administrators than elementary administrators. The Tukey HSD (Subset 1) for question 17 shows an alpha of 3.68 for elementary administrators and an alpha of 4.21 for secondary administrators. There is, however, no statistical difference between the other levels (see Table 7).

Table 8

Tukey HSD (Q24)

Q24 I identify relevant facts and consider them when making decisions.

Tukey HSD^{a,b}

LEVEL	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
Elementary	50	4.28	
Secondary	34	4.41	4.41
Middle	33	4.45	4.45
District Office	14	4.50	4.50
Other	7		5.00
Sig.		.843	.053

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 17.007.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Although the oneway ANOVA displayed a .071 level of significance—to be given consideration as a trend, on a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons, a mean difference was found to be almost 1 point (.72-statistically significant) higher for other administrators than elementary school administrators. This Tukey HSD for question 24 shows an alpha of 5.00 for other and an alpha of 4.28 for elementary school administrators (see Table 8).

Table 9

Tukey HSD (Q43)

Q43. I have participated in professional development activities related to sensitivity.

Tukey HSD^{a,b}

LEVEL	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
Secondary	34	2.38	
Middle	33	2.48	
District Office	14	2.64	
Elementary	51	2.96	2.96
Other	6		4.33
Sig.		.772	.051

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 15.752.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

On a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons, a mean difference was found to be almost 2 points (1.95-statistically significant) higher for other administrators than secondary administrators. The Tukey HSD for question 43 shows an alpha of 2.38 for secondary administrators and an alpha of 4.33 for other administrators (see Table 9).

On a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons, a mean difference was found to be almost 2 points (1.85-statistically significant) higher for other administrators than middle school administrators. The Tukey HSD for question 43 shows an alpha of 2.48 for middle school administrators and an alpha of 4.33 for other administrators. There is, however, no statistical difference between the other levels.

Table 10

Tukey HSD (Q52)

Q52. I have participated in professional development activities related to oral communication.

Tukey HSD^{a,b}

LEVEL	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
Secondary	34	2.50	
District Office	14	2.57	
Middle	33	2.91	
Elementary	51	2.96	
Other	6		4.67
Sig.		.887	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 15.752.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

On a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons, several mean differences were found to exist. A mean difference was found to be almost 2 points (1.71-statistically significant) higher for other administrators than elementary school administrators. The Tukey HSD for question 52 shows an alpha of 2.96 for elementary school administrators and an alpha of 4.67 for other administrators (see Table 10).

Another mean difference was found to be almost 2 points (1.76-statistically significant) higher for other administrators than middle school administrators. The Tukey HSD for question 52 shows an alpha of 2.91 for middle school administrators and an alpha of 4.67 for other administrators.

A third mean difference was found to be over 2 points (2.17-statistically significant) higher for other administrators than district office administrators. The

Tukey HSD for question 52 shows an alpha of 2.57 for district administrators and an alpha of 4.67 for other administrators.

Table 11

Tukey HSD (Q60)

Q60. I have participated in professional development activities related to range of interest.

Tukey HSD^{a,b}

LEVEL	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
Middle	33	1.79	
Secondary	34	2.38	2.38
Elementary	50	2.40	2.40
District Office	15	2.53	2.53
Other	6		3.67
Sig.		.576	.085

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 15.972.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

On a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons, a mean difference was found to be almost 2 points (1.88-statistically significant) higher for other administrators than middle school administrators. The Tukey HSD for question 60 shows an alpha of 1.79 for middle school administrators and an alpha of 3.67 for other administrators (see Table 11).

Table 12

Tukey HSD (Q64)**Q64 I am self-disciplined.**Tukey HSD^{a,b}

LEVEL	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
District Office	15	4.40	
Middle	33	4.67	4.67
Elementary	51	4.73	4.73
Secondary	34	4.82	4.82
Other	7		4.86
Sig.		.075	.768

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

- a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 17.310.
- b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

Although the oneway ANOVA displayed a .062 level of significance—to be given consideration as a trend, on a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons, a mean difference was found to be almost one-half point (.42-statistically significant) higher for secondary school administrators than district office administrators. This Tukey HSD for question 64 shows an alpha of 4.82 for secondary school administrators and an alpha of 4.40 for district office administrators (see Table 12).

ANOVA for Year of Participation (Q12-22)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q12	Between Groups	2.840	8	.355	.671	.716
	Within Groups	68.262	129	.529		
	Total	71.101	137			
Q13	Between Groups	1.980	8	.247	.416	.910
	Within Groups	77.330	130	.595		
	Total	79.309	138			
Q14	Between Groups	15.016	8	1.877	.997	.442
	Within Groups	240.999	128	1.883		
	Total	256.015	136			
Q15	Between Groups	7.410	8	.926	1.340	.229
	Within Groups	89.169	129	.691		
	Total	96.580	137			
Q16	Between Groups	4.286	8	.536	1.077	.383
	Within Groups	64.149	129	.497		
	Total	68.435	137			
Q17	Between Groups	3.739	8	.467	.754	.644
	Within Groups	80.000	129	.620		
	Total	83.739	137			
Q18	Between Groups	2.827	8	.353	.824	.583
	Within Groups	55.318	129	.429		
	Total	58.145	137			
Q19	Between Groups	1.641	8	.205	.450	.889
	Within Groups	58.373	128	.456		
	Total	60.015	136			
Q20	Between Groups	3.809	8	.476	1.192	.309
	Within Groups	51.111	128	.399		
	Total	54.920	136			
Q21	Between Groups	26.357	8	3.295	1.904	.065
	Within Groups	219.753	127	1.730		
	Total	246.110	135			
Q22	Between Groups	3.209	8	.401	.894	.524
	Within Groups	57.871	129	.449		
	Total	61.080	137			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Year of Participation (Q23-33)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q23	Between Groups	1.488	8	.186	.559	.809
	Within Groups	42.896	129	.333		
	Total	44.384	137			
Q24	Between Groups	1.816	8	.227	.546	.820
	Within Groups	53.641	129	.416		
	Total	55.457	137			
Q25	Between Groups	3.236	8	.404	1.612	.127
	Within Groups	32.365	129	.251		
	Total	35.601	137			
Q26	Between Groups	5.332	8	.666	1.453	.181
	Within Groups	59.161	129	.459		
	Total	64.493	137			
Q27	Between Groups	26.696	8	3.337	1.859	.072
	Within Groups	229.800	128	1.795		
	Total	256.496	136			
Q28	Between Groups	3.670	8	.459	.957	.472
	Within Groups	62.287	130	.479		
	Total	65.957	138			
Q29	Between Groups	4.888	8	.611	1.350	.225
	Within Groups	58.839	130	.453		
	Total	63.727	138			
Q30	Between Groups	6.118	8	.765	1.631	.122
	Within Groups	60.490	129	.469		
	Total	66.609	137			
Q31	Between Groups	16.064	8	2.008	2.112	.039
	Within Groups	123.619	130	.951		
	Total	139.683	138			
Q32	Between Groups	2.140	8	.268	.826	.581
	Within Groups	42.090	130	.324		
	Total	44.230	138			
Q33	Between Groups	7.289	8	.911	2.335	.022
	Within Groups	50.725	130	.390		
	Total	58.014	138			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Year of Participation (Q34-44)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q34	Between Groups	16.515	8	2.064	1.356	.222
	Within Groups	194.931	128	1.523		
	Total	211.445	136			
Q35	Between Groups	3.003	8	.375	1.021	.424
	Within Groups	48.168	131	.368		
	Total	51.171	139			
Q36	Between Groups	2.288	8	.286	1.320	.239
	Within Groups	28.397	131	.217		
	Total	30.686	139			
Q37	Between Groups	4.152	8	.519	1.037	.411
	Within Groups	65.534	131	.500		
	Total	69.686	139			
Q38	Between Groups	1.502	8	.188	.516	.843
	Within Groups	47.670	131	.364		
	Total	49.171	139			
Q39	Between Groups	7.453	8	.932	2.115	.039
	Within Groups	57.718	131	.441		
	Total	65.171	139			
Q40	Between Groups	4.817	8	.602	1.208	.299
	Within Groups	65.319	131	.499		
	Total	70.136	139			
Q41	Between Groups	6.077	8	.760	2.574	.012
	Within Groups	38.369	130	.295		
	Total	44.446	138			
Q42	Between Groups	.792	8	.099	.611	.767
	Within Groups	21.064	130	.162		
	Total	21.856	138			
Q43	Between Groups	15.949	8	1.994	.963	.468
	Within Groups	267.131	129	2.071		
	Total	283.080	137			
Q44	Between Groups	3.992	8	.499	.881	.534
	Within Groups	73.619	130	.566		
	Total	77.612	138			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Year of Participation (Q45-55)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q45	Between Groups	2.343	8	.293	.617	.762
	Within Groups	61.729	130	.475		
	Total	64.072	138			
Q46	Between Groups	6.428	8	.803	1.233	.285
	Within Groups	84.723	130	.652		
	Total	91.151	138			
Q47	Between Groups	3.398	8	.425	.974	.459
	Within Groups	56.660	130	.436		
	Total	60.058	138			
Q48	Between Groups	6.755	8	.844	.430	.902
	Within Groups	253.571	129	1.966		
	Total	260.326	137			
Q49	Between Groups	8.317	8	1.040	1.329	.235
	Within Groups	101.683	130	.782		
	Total	110.000	138			
Q50	Between Groups	4.830	8	.604	1.451	.181
	Within Groups	54.077	130	.416		
	Total	58.906	138			
Q51	Between Groups	.817	8	.102	.289	.969
	Within Groups	45.888	130	.353		
	Total	46.705	138			
Q52	Between Groups	13.883	8	1.735	.824	.583
	Within Groups	271.769	129	2.107		
	Total	285.652	137			
Q53	Between Groups	5.744	8	.718	1.905	.064
	Within Groups	48.989	130	.377		
	Total	54.734	138			
Q54	Between Groups	10.327	8	1.291	2.108	.039
	Within Groups	80.209	131	.612		
	Total	90.536	139			
Q55	Between Groups	5.536	8	.692	2.316	.023
	Within Groups	39.150	131	.299		
	Total	44.686	139			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Year of Participation (Q56-66)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q56	Between Groups	37.233	8	4.654	2.100	.040
	Within Groups	285.934	129	2.217		
	Total	323.167	137			
Q57	Between Groups	7.528	8	.941	1.978	.054
	Within Groups	62.322	131	.476		
	Total	69.850	139			
Q58	Between Groups	6.583	8	.823	1.465	.176
	Within Groups	73.589	131	.562		
	Total	80.171	139			
Q59	Between Groups	18.269	8	2.284	2.009	.050
	Within Groups	148.902	131	1.137		
	Total	167.171	139			
Q60	Between Groups	22.130	8	2.766	1.332	.233
	Within Groups	267.841	129	2.076		
	Total	289.971	137			
Q61	Between Groups	1.712	8	.214	1.136	.344
	Within Groups	24.688	131	.188		
	Total	26.400	139			
Q62	Between Groups	3.793	8	.474	1.145	.338
	Within Groups	53.833	130	.414		
	Total	57.626	138			
Q63	Between Groups	1.912	8	.239	1.088	.375
	Within Groups	28.774	131	.220		
	Total	30.686	139			
Q64	Between Groups	3.506	8	.438	1.947	.058
	Within Groups	29.487	131	.225		
	Total	32.993	139			
Q65	Between Groups	3.348	8	.418	1.117	.356
	Within Groups	49.074	131	.375		
	Total	52.421	139			
Q66	Between Groups	19.221	8	2.403	1.152	.334
	Within Groups	269.097	129	2.086		
	Total	288.319	137			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Year of Participation (Q66-73)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q67	Between Groups	4.650	8	.581	1.945	.058
	Within Groups	39.143	131	.299		
	Total	43.793	139			
Q68	Between Groups	2.731	8	.341	.743	.654
	Within Groups	60.204	131	.460		
	Total	62.936	139			
Q69	Between Groups	2.956	8	.370	1.089	.375
	Within Groups	44.437	131	.339		
	Total	47.393	139			
Q70	Between Groups	1.307	8	.163	.509	.848
	Within Groups	41.714	130	.321		
	Total	43.022	138			
Q71	Between Groups	5.176	8	.647	1.258	.271
	Within Groups	67.395	131	.514		
	Total	72.571	139			
Q72	Between Groups	6.379	8	.797	1.130	.347
	Within Groups	91.707	130	.705		
	Total	98.086	138			
Q73	Between Groups	9.779	8	1.222	.572	.799
	Within Groups	271.279	127	2.136		
	Total	281.059	135			

An analysis of 73 survey questions was done using a oneway ANOVA. Significance was set at the .05 level. The following questions met this level of significance (see Table 14).

Table 14

Levels of Significance for Year of Participation in the Assessment Center

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>
Q31 I encourage the use of charts and/or visual aids during the discussion.	.039
Q33 I move to the goals of the organization by supporting, clarifying or restating group decisions.	.022
Q39 I weigh the quality of my responses.	.039
Q41 I use clear, sensitive language when responding to the requests of others for assistance.	.012
Q54 My writing contains no errors in grammar, syntax or spelling.	.039
Q55 I demonstrate effective skills, including the writing of memos, letters, notes, etc. for different audiences.	.023
Q56 I have participated in professional development activities related to written communication.	.040

The following questions, although not statistically significant, were indicative of possible trends and included in this analysis. The level of significance for these questions was over .050 and less than 1.00 (see Table 15).

Table 15

Levels of Significance Indicative of Trends for Year of Participation in the Assessment Center

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>
Q21 I have participated in professional development activities related to organizational ability.	.065
Q27 I have participated in professional development activities related to decisiveness.	.072
Q53 I write clearly and concisely.	.064
Q57 I demonstrate competence in the discussion of educational, political, current events, economic and other topics.	.054
Q64 I am self-disciplined.	.058
Q67 I have a well-reasoned educational philosophy.	.058

The Tukey HSD, a Post Hoc test, was again used to further analyze the survey questions with respect to year of participation in the NASSP Assessment Center. The Tukey HSD (Honest Significant Difference) revealed more details about the questions that reflected a significant difference of .05 or less based on the oneway ANOVA.

The Tukey for question 31 is exhibited in Table 16.

Table 16

Tukey HSD (Q31)

Q31. I encourage the use of charts and/or visual aids during the discussion.

Tukey HSD^{a,b}

What year did you participate in the Assessment Center?	N	Subset for alpha = .05
		1
2001	40	3.38
1996	11	3.64
1997	7	3.71
1995	12	3.75
2000	24	3.75
2002	19	3.89
1998	11	4.00
1994	2	4.50
1999	13	4.54
Sig.		.288

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.150.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

On a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons, a mean difference was found to be more than one point (1.16-statistically significant) higher for those participants in 1999 than the 2001 participants. The Tukey HSD for question 31 shows an alpha of

3.38 for the 2001 participants and an alpha of 4.54 for the 1999 participants. There is, however, no statistical difference between the other years (see Table 16).

Although the results of the oneway ANOVA displayed statistically significant results for questions 33, 39, 41 and 59—with values of .022, .039, .012 and .050 respectively, the Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons revealed no statistically significant data for these questions. It was therefore not necessary to use the Tukey HSD measure. Table 17 exhibits results for question 54.

Table 17

Tukey HSD (Q54)

Q54. My writing contains no errors in grammar, syntax or spelling.

Tukey HSD^{a,b}

What year did you participate in the	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
1996	11	3.64	
2002	19	4.21	4.21
2001	40	4.28	4.28
2000	24	4.29	4.29
1995	12	4.42	4.42
1994	2	4.50	4.50
1998	11	4.55	4.55
1999	14	4.57	4.57
1997	7		5.00
Sig.		.283	.517

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

- a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.191.
- b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

On a Post Hoc Test of Multiple Comparisons, a mean difference was found to be more than one point (1.36-statistically significant) higher for 1997 participants

than 1996 participants. The Tukey HSD for question 54 shows an alpha of 3.64 for 1996 participants and an alpha of 5.00 for 1997 participants. There is however, no statistical difference between other years (see Table 17).

Table 18

Tukey HSD (Q55)

Q55. I demonstrate effective skills, including the writing or memos, letters, notes. etc. for different audiences.

Tukey HSD^{a,b}

What year did you participate in the	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
1996	11	4.09	
1994	2	4.50	4.50
1999	14	4.57	4.57
2001	40	4.58	4.58
2000	24	4.67	4.67
2002	19	4.68	4.68
1998	11	4.73	4.73
1995	12	4.92	4.92
1997	7		5.00
Sig.		.065	.648

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

- a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.191.
- b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

On a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons, two important mean differences were found. One mean difference was found to be almost one point (.83-statistically significant) higher for 1995 participants than for 1996 participants. The Tukey HSD for question 55 shows an alpha of 4.09 for 1996 participants and an alpha of 4.92 for 1995 participants (see Table 18).

The other mean difference was also found to be almost one point (.91- statistically significant) higher for 1997 participants than for 1996 participants. The Tukey HSD for question 55 shows an alpha of 4.09 for 1996 participants and an alpha of 5.00 for 1997 participants.

Table 19

Tukey HSD (Q56)

Q56. I have participated in professional development activities related to written communication.

Tukey HSD^{a,b}

What year did you participate in the	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
1998	11	1.82	
1996	10	2.40	2.40
2000	24	2.50	2.50
1995	12	2.75	2.75
2001	40	2.93	2.93
1994	2	3.00	3.00
1999	13	3.00	3.00
2002	19	3.21	3.21
1997	7		4.43
Sig.		.628	.145

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

- a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.084.
- b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

On a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons, a mean difference was found to be more than 2 points (2.61- statistically significant) higher for 1997 participants than for 1998 participants. The Tukey HSD for question 56 shows an alpha of 1.82 for 1998 participants and 4.43 for 1997 participants. There is, however, no statistical difference between the other years (see Table 19).

Although the oneway ANOVA exhibited question 57 as not statistically significant with a value of .054, deeper investigation through a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons produced another result. The results for question 57 are exhibited in Table 20.

Table 20

Tukey HSD (Q57)

Q57. I demonstrate competence in the discussion of educational, political, current events, economic and other topics.

Tukey HSD^{a,b}

What year did you participate in the	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
1996	11	3.55	
2000	24	4.04	4.04
2002	19	4.05	4.05
2001	40	4.20	4.20
1995	12	4.25	4.25
1998	11	4.27	4.27
1997	7	4.29	4.29
1999	14	4.43	4.43
1994	2		5.00
Sig.		.200	.122

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.191.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

On a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons, a mean difference was found to be almost one point (.88-statistically significant) higher for participants in 1999 than for participants in 1996. The Tukey HSD for question 57 shows an alpha of 3.55 for 1996 participants and an alpha of 4.43 for 1999 participants. There is, however, no statistical difference between the other years (see Table 20).

A oneway ANOVA was run to analyze the 73 survey questions with respect to gender. Again, significance was set at the .05 level. A number of questions met this level of significance (see Table 21).

Table 21

Levels of Significance for Gender

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>
Q23 I take action to bring issues to closure.	.006
Q33 I move to the goals of the organization by supporting, clarifying or restating group decisions.	.033
Q49 I make no errors in grammar and usage when I speak.	.004
Q52 I have participated in professional development activities related to oral communication.	.027
Q54 My writing contains no errors in grammar, syntax or spelling.	.013
Q55 I demonstrate effective skills, including the writing of memos, letters, notes, etc. for different audiences.	.001
Q59 I participate in community and service organizations.	.042

The following questions, although not statistically significant, were indicative of possible trends and included in this analysis. The level of significance for these questions was over .050 and less than 1.00 (see Table 22).

Table 22

Levels of Significance Indicative of Trends for Gender

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>
Q17 I delegate responsibilities to others and follow up to determine their progress.	.060
Q20 I reflect on the overall picture and determine the relative importance of items before taking action.	.075
Q30 I discourage inappropriate behaviors that keep the group from moving forward.	.096
Q35 I offer verbal and non-verbal recognition of the feelings, concerns and needs of others.	.086
Q43 I have participated in professional development activities related to sensitivity.	.071
Q48 I have participated in professional development activities related to stress tolerance.	.099
Q53 I write clearly and concisely.	.070

A Post Hoc test was attempted on this data set to further analyze the survey questions with respect to gender. No Post Hoc test results were generated because the oneway ANOVA will not generate data between two groups. The data set must contain more than two groups. The ANOVA for gender is exhibited in Table 23 .

Table 23

ANOVA for Gender

ANOVA for Gender (Q1-11)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q1	Between Groups	.113	1	.113	.228	.634
	Within Groups	67.844	137	.495		
	Total	67.957	138			
Q2	Between Groups	.047	1	.047	.122	.727
	Within Groups	52.399	137	.382		
	Total	52.446	138			
Q3	Between Groups	.777	1	.777	2.131	.147
	Within Groups	49.957	137	.365		
	Total	50.734	138			
Q4	Between Groups	.728	1	.728	1.513	.221
	Within Groups	65.920	137	.481		
	Total	66.647	138			
Q5	Between Groups	.620	1	.620	1.296	.257
	Within Groups	65.032	136	.478		
	Total	65.652	137			
Q6	Between Groups	.506	1	.506	.828	.364
	Within Groups	83.681	137	.611		
	Total	84.187	138			
Q7	Between Groups	.022	1	.022	.013	.910
	Within Groups	238.934	136	1.757		
	Total	238.957	137			
Q8	Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.002	.962
	Within Groups	36.186	137	.264		
	Total	36.187	138			
Q9	Between Groups	.028	1	.028	.136	.713
	Within Groups	28.461	137	.208		
	Total	28.489	138			
Q10	Between Groups	.681	1	.681	2.158	.144
	Within Groups	42.942	136	.316		
	Total	43.623	137			
Q11	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.985
	Within Groups	56.493	136	.415		
	Total	56.493	137			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Gender (Q12-22)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q12	Between Groups	.731	1	.731	1.430	.234
	Within Groups	69.050	135	.511		
	Total	69.781	136			
Q13	Between Groups	.124	1	.124	.213	.645
	Within Groups	79.094	136	.582		
	Total	79.217	137			
Q14	Between Groups	.247	1	.247	.130	.719
	Within Groups	255.628	134	1.908		
	Total	255.875	135			
Q15	Between Groups	1.050	1	1.050	1.485	.225
	Within Groups	95.519	135	.708		
	Total	96.569	136			
Q16	Between Groups	.492	1	.492	.982	.324
	Within Groups	67.712	135	.502		
	Total	68.204	136			
Q17	Between Groups	2.181	1	2.181	3.610	.060
	Within Groups	81.557	135	.604		
	Total	83.737	136			
Q18	Between Groups	.047	1	.047	.109	.742
	Within Groups	57.895	135	.429		
	Total	57.942	136			
Q19	Between Groups	.344	1	.344	.774	.380
	Within Groups	59.531	134	.444		
	Total	59.875	135			
Q20	Between Groups	1.287	1	1.287	3.226	.075
	Within Groups	53.470	134	.399		
	Total	54.757	135			
Q21	Between Groups	3.191	1	3.191	1.747	.189
	Within Groups	242.913	133	1.826		
	Total	246.104	134			
Q22	Between Groups	.411	1	.411	.945	.333
	Within Groups	58.698	135	.435		
	Total	59.109	136			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Gender (Q23-33)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q23	Between Groups	2.371	1	2.371	7.670	.006
	Within Groups	41.731	135	.309		
	Total	44.102	136			
Q24	Between Groups	.104	1	.104	.255	.614
	Within Groups	55.180	135	.409		
	Total	55.285	136			
Q25	Between Groups	.003	1	.003	.012	.914
	Within Groups	35.179	135	.261		
	Total	35.182	136			
Q26	Between Groups	.033	1	.033	.073	.788
	Within Groups	62.171	135	.461		
	Total	62.204	136			
Q27	Between Groups	3.905	1	3.905	2.073	.152
	Within Groups	252.441	134	1.884		
	Total	256.346	135			
Q28	Between Groups	.233	1	.233	.483	.488
	Within Groups	65.543	136	.482		
	Total	65.775	137			
Q29	Between Groups	.011	1	.011	.022	.881
	Within Groups	63.591	136	.468		
	Total	63.601	137			
Q30	Between Groups	1.328	1	1.328	2.815	.096
	Within Groups	63.679	135	.472		
	Total	65.007	136			
Q31	Between Groups	.660	1	.660	.646	.423
	Within Groups	138.963	136	1.022		
	Total	139.623	137			
Q32	Between Groups	.680	1	.680	2.140	.146
	Within Groups	43.233	136	.318		
	Total	43.913	137			
Q33	Between Groups	1.910	1	1.910	4.642	.033
	Within Groups	55.974	136	.412		
	Total	57.884	137			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Gender (Q34-44)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q34	Between Groups	3.582	1	3.582	2.313	.131
	Within Groups	207.529	134	1.549		
	Total	211.110	135			
Q35	Between Groups	1.088	1	1.088	2.986	.086
	Within Groups	49.933	137	.364		
	Total	51.022	138			
Q36	Between Groups	.238	1	.238	1.092	.298
	Within Groups	29.849	137	.218		
	Total	30.086	138			
Q37	Between Groups	.502	1	.502	.996	.320
	Within Groups	69.109	137	.504		
	Total	69.612	138			
Q38	Between Groups	.760	1	.760	2.157	.144
	Within Groups	48.262	137	.352		
	Total	49.022	138			
Q39	Between Groups	.067	1	.067	.141	.708
	Within Groups	64.725	137	.472		
	Total	64.791	138			
Q40	Between Groups	.167	1	.167	.329	.567
	Within Groups	69.632	137	.508		
	Total	69.799	138			
Q41	Between Groups	.067	1	.067	.208	.649
	Within Groups	44.078	136	.324		
	Total	44.145	137			
Q42	Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.005	.942
	Within Groups	21.166	136	.156		
	Total	21.167	137			
Q43	Between Groups	6.757	1	6.757	3.302	.071
	Within Groups	276.250	135	2.046		
	Total	283.007	136			
Q44	Between Groups	.013	1	.013	.024	.877
	Within Groups	75.965	136	.559		
	Total	75.978	137			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Gender (Q45-55)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q45	Between Groups	.045	1	.045	.099	.753
	Within Groups	62.281	136	.458		
	Total	62.326	137			
Q46	Between Groups	.011	1	.011	.016	.898
	Within Groups	90.598	136	.666		
	Total	90.609	137			
Q47	Between Groups	.160	1	.160	.364	.547
	Within Groups	59.818	136	.440		
	Total	59.978	137			
Q48	Between Groups	5.179	1	5.179	2.759	.099
	Within Groups	253.376	135	1.877		
	Total	258.555	136			
Q49	Between Groups	6.662	1	6.662	8.767	.004
	Within Groups	103.338	136	.760		
	Total	110.000	137			
Q50	Between Groups	.189	1	.189	.439	.509
	Within Groups	58.629	136	.431		
	Total	58.819	137			
Q51	Between Groups	.146	1	.146	.428	.514
	Within Groups	46.289	136	.340		
	Total	46.435	137			
Q52	Between Groups	10.064	1	10.064	5.013	.027
	Within Groups	271.016	135	2.008		
	Total	281.080	136			
Q53	Between Groups	1.307	1	1.307	3.344	.070
	Within Groups	53.164	136	.391		
	Total	54.471	137			
Q54	Between Groups	4.015	1	4.015	6.392	.013
	Within Groups	86.057	137	.628		
	Total	90.072	138			
Q55	Between Groups	3.517	1	3.517	11.743	.001
	Within Groups	41.030	137	.299		
	Total	44.547	138			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Gender (Q56-66)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q56	Between Groups	3.757	1	3.757	1.612	.206
	Within Groups	314.681	135	2.331		
	Total	318.438	136			
Q57	Between Groups	1.926	1	1.926	3.885	.051
	Within Groups	67.902	137	.496		
	Total	69.827	138			
Q58	Between Groups	.973	1	.973	1.693	.195
	Within Groups	78.725	137	.575		
	Total	79.698	138			
Q59	Between Groups	5.004	1	5.004	4.229	.042
	Within Groups	162.132	137	1.183		
	Total	167.137	138			
Q60	Between Groups	1.319	1	1.319	.633	.428
	Within Groups	281.411	135	2.085		
	Total	282.730	136			
Q61	Between Groups	.037	1	.037	.191	.663
	Within Groups	26.323	137	.192		
	Total	26.360	138			
Q62	Between Groups	.757	1	.757	1.815	.180
	Within Groups	56.700	136	.417		
	Total	57.457	137			
Q63	Between Groups	.059	1	.059	.265	.607
	Within Groups	30.574	137	.223		
	Total	30.633	138			
Q64	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.994
	Within Groups	32.489	137	.237		
	Total	32.489	138			
Q65	Between Groups	.036	1	.036	.095	.759
	Within Groups	52.194	137	.381		
	Total	52.230	138			
Q66	Between Groups	2.190	1	2.190	1.056	.306
	Within Groups	280.015	135	2.074		
	Total	282.204	136			

(table continues)

ANOVA for Gender (Q67-73)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Q67	Between Groups	.307	1	.307	.976	.325
	Within Groups	43.132	137	.315		
	Total	43.439	138			
Q68	Between Groups	.193	1	.193	.423	.516
	Within Groups	62.512	137	.456		
	Total	62.705	138			
Q69	Between Groups	.053	1	.053	.155	.695
	Within Groups	47.184	137	.344		
	Total	47.237	138			
Q70	Between Groups	.656	1	.656	2.113	.148
	Within Groups	42.214	136	.310		
	Total	42.870	137			
Q71	Between Groups	.176	1	.176	.336	.563
	Within Groups	71.881	137	.525		
	Total	72.058	138			
Q72	Between Groups	.011	1	.011	.015	.901
	Within Groups	97.467	136	.717		
	Total	97.478	137			
Q73	Between Groups	2.209	1	2.209	1.071	.303
	Within Groups	274.206	133	2.062		
	Total	276.415	134			

However, it appears to this researcher that there are questions related to gender that are worth further investigation. A more in-depth look at these questions is sure to provide statistically significant information.

Frequencies of Behaviors

In looking at frequencies of behaviors embedded in the 73 survey items, subsidiary research questions were posed about the behaviors that are exhibited with the greatest frequency and those that are exhibited with the least frequency. After careful examination of the frequency of job behaviors, it was noted by the researcher that 61 questions (84%) yielded high-end responses, that is, most respondents

answered with a choice of 3 (sometimes), 4 (frequently), or 5 (almost always). This means that the respondents perceive that they strongly demonstrate the behaviors in the 12 NASSP skill dimensions.

The researcher took another look at the frequencies to see which questions yielded more low-end behavior responses—specifically 1 (hardly ever) or 2 (on occasion).

Question 7 is exhibited in Table 24. It is a question that addresses professional development in the area of problem analysis and 53 of 139 respondents “hardly ever” and “on occasion” have participated.

Table 24

Professional Development in Problem Analysis

Q7. I have participated in professional development activities related to problem analysis.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	hardly ever	26	5.7	18.7	18.7
	on occasion	27	6.0	19.4	38.1
	sometimes	40	8.8	28.8	66.9
	frequently	25	5.5	18.0	84.9
	almost always	21	4.6	15.1	100.0
	Total	139	30.7	100.0	
Missing	System	314	69.3		
	Total	453	100.0		

Question 14 is exhibited in Table 25. It is a question that addresses professional development in the area of judgment and almost 66 of 137 respondents “hardly ever” and “on occasion” have participated in professional development activities.

Table 25

Professional Development in Judgment

Q14. I have participated in professional development activities related to judgment.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	hardly ever	39	8.6	28.5	28.5
	on occasion	27	6.0	19.7	48.2
	sometimes	36	7.9	26.3	74.5
	frequently	16	3.5	11.7	86.1
	almost always	19	4.2	13.9	100.0
	Total	137	30.2	100.0	
Missing	System	316	69.8		
Total		453	100.0		

Question 21 is exhibited in Table 26. It is a question that addresses professional development in the area of organizational ability and approximately 51 of 136 respondents "hardly ever" and "on occasion" have participated.

Table 26

Professional Development in Organizational Ability

Q21. I have participated in professional development activities related to organizational ability.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	hardly ever	27	6.0	19.9	19.9
	on occasion	24	5.3	17.6	37.5
	sometimes	42	9.3	30.9	68.4
	frequently	19	4.2	14.0	82.4
	almost always	24	5.3	17.6	100.0
	Total	136	30.0	100.0	
Missing	System	317	70.0		
Total		453	100.0		

Question 27 is exhibited in Table 27. It is a question that addresses professional development in the area of decisiveness and about 63 of 137 respondents “hardly ever” and “on occasion” have participated.

Table 27

Professional Development in Decisiveness

Q27. I have participated in professional development activities related to decisiveness.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	hardly ever	42	9.3	30.7	30.7
	on occasion	21	4.6	15.3	46.0
	sometimes	40	8.8	29.2	75.2
	frequently	16	3.5	11.7	86.9
	almost always	18	4.0	13.1	100.0
	Total	137	30.2	100.0	
Missing	System	316	69.8		
Total		453	100.0		

Question 34 is exhibited in Table 28. It is a question that address professional development in the area of leadership and approximately 27 of 137 respondents “hardly ever” and “on occasion” have participated in professional development activities.

Table 28

Professional Development in Leadership

Q34. I have participated in professional development activities related to leadership.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	hardly ever	15	3.3	10.9	10.9
	on occasion	12	2.6	8.8	19.7
	sometimes	42	9.3	30.7	50.4
	frequently	36	7.9	26.3	76.6
	almost always	32	7.1	23.4	100.0
	Total	137	30.2	100.0	
Missing	System	316	69.8		
Total		453	100.0		

Question 43 is exhibited in Table 29. It is a question that addresses professional development in the area of sensitivity and about 65 of 138 respondents “hardly ever” and “on occasion” have participated in professional development activities.

Table 29

Professional Development in Sensitivity.

Q43. I have participated in professional development activities related to sensitivity.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	hardly ever	37	8.2	26.8	26.8
	on occasion	28	6.2	20.3	47.1
	sometimes	34	7.5	24.6	71.7
	frequently	13	2.9	9.4	81.2
	almost always	26	5.7	18.8	100.0
	Total	138	30.5	100.0	
Missing	System	315	69.5		
Total		453	100.0		

Question 48 is exhibited in Table 30. It is a question that addresses professional development in the area of stress tolerance and about 67 of 138 respondents “hardly ever” and “on occasion” have participated.

Table 30

Professional Development in Stress Tolerance.

Q48. I have participated in professional development activities related to stress tolerance.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	hardly ever	37	8.2	26.8	26.8
	on occasion	30	6.6	21.7	48.6
	sometimes	31	6.8	22.5	71.0
	frequently	21	4.6	15.2	86.2
	almost always	19	4.2	13.8	100.0
	Total	138	30.5	100.0	
Missing	System	315	69.5		
Total		453	100.0		

Question 52 is exhibited in Table 31. It is a question that addresses professional development in the area of oral communication and approximately 56 of 138 respondents “hardly ever” and “on occasion” have participated.

Table 31

Professional Development in Oral Communication

Q52. I have participated in professional development activities related to oral communication.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	hardly ever	36	7.9	26.1	26.1
	on occasion	20	4.4	14.5	40.6
	sometimes	33	7.3	23.9	64.5
	frequently	24	5.3	17.4	81.9
	almost always	25	5.5	18.1	100.0
	Total	138	30.5	100.0	
Missing	System	315	69.5		
Total		453	100.0		

Question 56 is exhibited in Table 32. It is a question that addresses professional development in the area of written communication and approximately 65 of 138 respondents “hardly ever” and “on occasion” have participated.

Table 32

Professional Development in Written Communication.

Q56. I have participated in professional development activities related to written communication.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	hardly ever	39	8.6	28.3	28.3
	on occasion	26	5.7	18.8	47.1
	sometimes	24	5.3	17.4	64.5
	frequently	17	3.8	12.3	76.8
	almost always	32	7.1	23.2	100.0
	Total	138	30.5	100.0	
Missing	System	315	69.5		
Total		453	100.0		

Question 60 is exhibited in Table 33. It is a question that addresses professional development in the area of range of interest and approximately 82 of 138 respondents “hardly ever” and “on occasion” have participated.

Table 33

Professional Development in Range of Interest

Q60. I have participated in professional development activities related to range of interest.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	hardly ever	63	13.9	45.7	45.7
	on occasion	19	4.2	13.8	59.4
	sometimes	21	4.6	15.2	74.6
	frequently	19	4.2	13.8	88.4
	almost always	16	3.5	11.6	100.0
	Total	138	30.5	100.0	
Missing	System	315	69.5		
Total		453	100.0		

Question 66 is exhibited in Table 34. It is a question that addresses professional development in the area of personal motivation and approximately 73 of 138 respondents “hardly ever” and “on occasion” have participated.

Table 34

Professional Development in Personal Motivation

Q66. I have participated in professional development activities related to personal motivation.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	hardly ever	49	10.8	35.5	35.5
	on occasion	24	5.3	17.4	52.9
	sometimes	27	6.0	19.6	72.5
	frequently	18	4.0	13.0	85.5
	almost always	20	4.4	14.5	100.0
	Total	138	30.5	100.0	
Missing	System	315	69.5		
Total		453	100.0		

Question 73 is exhibited in Table 35. It is a question that addresses professional development in the area of educational values and about 58 of 136 respondents “hardly ever” and “on occasion” have participated.

Table 35

Professional Development in Educational Values

Q73. I have participated in professional development activities related to educational values.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	hardly ever	35	7.7	25.7	25.7
	on occasion	23	5.1	16.9	42.6
	sometimes	29	6.4	21.3	64.0
	frequently	25	5.5	18.4	82.4
	almost always	24	5.3	17.6	100.0
	Total	136	30.0	100.0	
Missing	System	317	70.0		
Total		453	100.0		

Analysis of Qualitative Data

Qualitative Data was not coded for analysis in this study. Qualitative data about the perceptions of New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators regarding the NASSP Assessment Center and job behaviors was provided in each skill domain and a summary open-ended question that read:

Do you feel that if you increase the demonstration of job behaviors within identified NASSP skill dimensions your job performance will improve? Why or why not?

The answer to the open-ended question addressed subsidiary research question 3. The perceptions of the majority of respondents who answered this question indicated that yes, an increase in the demonstration of job behaviors within identified NASSP skill dimensions would improve job performance. Another topic that frequently arose was the need for professional development for administrators.

Qualitative Data Comments

Yes. The NASSP skill dimensions can act as a framework for professional growth for novice administrators.

I do feel that if I increased my demonstrations of job behaviors w/in identified NASSP skill dimensions my job performance would improve. The glitch is finding the time and financial support to participate in such p.d. activities. When you are alone and the only administrator in the building, it is difficult to leave the building unattended. I am not comfortable supervising the every day building activities from a cell phone when I am out.

Most definitely! Increased knowledge and skill in the identified areas will improve and/or enhance one's job performance.

I think my job behaviors are very good. My job performance will improve as I gain more experience in my new position.

I feel that there is always room for improvement in job performance.

Yes, the skill dimensions are good indicators of job performance.

To some extent, but job performance is significantly affected by the education, training and professionalism of the persons with who you work.

Yes. The job behaviors identified by NASSP are essential to being an effective Educational Leader. Each skill helps me to focus on a particular area—as I improve each area, I grow as an individual as well as an educational leader.

These are idealistic goals for an administrator to follow and can certainly guide toward exemplary performance. I wonder what kinds of professional development is “out there” available to match some of these identified behaviors. Districts would be wise to offer administrators support and professional development in related areas. They should begin to incorporate the terminology of these standards in their administrative evaluation criteria. The PSA Assessment is less meaningful because it was private for the individual and not formally seen by anyone in the district. For many, this was a positive (keeping it private) yet it hinders the program from meaning growth & application.

Yes. Being motivated, positive and enthusiastic about job behaviors presents a situation where a well-rounded job can be performed.

The NASSP skill dimensions are reflective of a good administrator/leader. Targeting these skills in any field will improve job performance.

Yes. I have experienced the results of focused hard work. Overall school/student/individual and my performance improves. It is contagious, energizing, gratifying and the right thing to do.

Absolutely! These skill dimensions cover many of the areas that are essential to master in order to be an effective administrator.

Certainly these are all critical areas. However participation in the assessment center did nothing to improve my job performance. My mentor and colleagues are aware of my work and my personal attributes. They give me thoughtful and meaningful feedback which allows me to grow into this job. The assessment center was a total waste of time and an incredible financial burden. Their report told me what I said and did in an artificial situation. The assessors do not know me, nor the work I do. This process may be helpful before a person begins this job. However, anyone who is actually performing the job has little to gain from the process and an entire day and \$1,100 to lose!

Yes. The NASSP skills outlined would be a benefit to any school administrator.

Yes+No—Yes b/c I believe you will learn to be more efficient and a better producer. No b/c as you become more efficient you will be expected to do more, thus being overloaded, over worked—It becomes a fine balance.

I agree that if I increase the demonstration of job behaviors within identified NASSP skill dimensions my job performance will improve because I see this experience not so much as an assessment as a reaffirmation of the skills I currently possess.

Yes—The skills were targeted at real life, job related areas. Textbooks can only take you so far. A taste of reality is required to enhance long-term retention of essential knowledge. A wise man learns from his mistakes. The wiser man learns from the mistakes of others. The content of the assessment was invaluable.

Yes, all identified skills are critically important for successful administrative leadership.

I feel that improvement of skills are beneficial in any position. I try to take advantage of local workshops and encourage others to do so. I also share articles from professional journals when they can benefit colleagues.

Each of the behaviors identified in this survey is important to job performance. It is interesting to note that, while my district has an excellent staff development piece, leadership skills are not addressed.

Situations call for the effective use of a variety of these skills. Simply having the skills is not enough. Knowing which combination to use in a specific situation is what makes for effective leadership and problem solving. I personally found the activities of the Assessment Center worthless to me. I received very high ratings but it was only because I assessed the "game" and applied the anticipated combination of responses to "win." I was personally astonished by the poor quality of the final report which I demanded be redone because of numerous errors in spelling and grammar. Even though I pointed out all the errors to the evaluator, the final copy did not reflect all corrections. I found the process to be of no educational or personal value—just expensive.

There is always room for improvement. Staying aware of these skills dimensions and remaining reflective, always tends to give on a better prospective of job performance, while demonstrating ways to become better at what we do.

I feel that you can always improve aspects of your job performance. The NASSP Skill Dimensions can help you identify areas of professional development on which

you can focus. If you strive to heighten your level of proficiency regarding a specific job behavior, your overall performance is certain to improve.

One's job performance improves through the day-to-day handling of situations that arise. You can attain professional development activities to enhance your knowledge-base; however, application of skills to particular situations and the outcome of those situations is the best manner to increase your job performance.

Your question is confusing. Certainly, if I increase behaviors in skills that pertain to my job, my performance will improve.

Yes. My overall job performance will improve based on recommendations by the NASSP assessment. It will lower my stress tolerance, improve my organizational skills and allow me to function more efficiently and effectively. I found the NASSP assessment very beneficial.

Of course! The NASSP skill dimensions are broad areas that form the foundation of any principal's job. If you asked whether the actual assessment center experience was a valuable one, I'd have a completely different response.

No. I believe that if I am an honest person, I always strive to do my best and I continue loving kids, that alone will improve (or maintain) my job performance. The NASSP Performance Assessment was a waste of time and money.

The skills identified are important ones to educational leaders. These behaviors engender the respect, trust, and support of the teaching staff, and, therefore, improve my overall effectiveness.

Yes—developing these professional and personal skills can only improve the quality of leadership provided by an administrator.

I do believe that might be true, but believe that on-the-job experiences have been most beneficial. Mistake and error in judgement have been my most significant teachers. As a result, I have been more of a resource to new administrators who value my personal experiences and the wisdom gained from making errors but learning from them. The NASSP identified skills can certainly keep an administrator focused on areas of importance, therefore improvement in such skills should have a direct impact on job performance and behaviors.

Yes—since these behaviors are essential for job performance. When analyzed and detailed, individuals become more aware and many will alter behaviors.

No. Leadership, sensitivity & both written and oral communication are the most important job behaviors that, by their demonstrative behaviors, will have the greatest impact with the staff.

NASSP skill dimensions are definitely helpful for those having difficulty; however, it should come naturally.

I feel that my job performance will improve based on exposure + experience. I feel the behaviors identified by NASSP are in-born to management culture and are necessary to be successful.

Of course my job performance will improve because every point you questioned in this survey leads to success in administration. Professional development or lack of is always an issue. The prof. Development is almost non-existent for administrators. Only teachers are focused upon for development.

Yes, it will improve. The identified skills are important ones for ed. leadership.

I believe the strengths I demonstrate directly impact my job. My weaknesses are not as relevant.

No. I believe more professional development hours should be required for administrators.

Sure. There may be other job behaviors that need to be addressed, but improvement in any area is likely to improve job performance. I am not sure the performance assessment accurately identifies strengths and weaknesses. I would recommend the assessment take place on the job, so assessors could observe the administrator in a "real" environment.

No—I feel that my job performance is limited by my principal. I do the best that I can on job behaviors identified by NASSP. By the way, I found the results of the assessment center to be invalid. They did not reflect me then or now. In my opinion it was a waste of time and \$.

We certainly always strive to improve ourselves.

Yes! The NASSP has identified skills that are necessary for being a successful school administrator.

As I continue to grow in my position, I feel I will have a greater influence on the educational program. In reflecting on the skills in the survey, if I were to strengthen my skills in the areas of organizational ability and leadership it would necessarily impact on improved job performance. These two areas are directly related to job performance.

When I completed this survey I realized that I do use many of the skills assessed. However I firmly believe participation in the Assessment Center is a total waste of time and money.

Yes—I think it directly correlates with my job expectations.

My current job has too many daily responsibilities. My job performance would improve with the addition of either an asst. principal or a district wide curriculum director to share responsibilities.

No, because those I need to improve are not that detrimental to my position, and I feel do not effect my job performance.

I believe that if I increase the demonstration of job behaviors my performance has a greater chance of improvement. There are so many variables and outside factors influencing a principal's job on a daily basis, that one can only do one's best on any given day.

Practice what you preach! Improvement through consistent job behavior is expected, either direct or indirect improvement. Others will attempt to exemplify these improved behaviors and that is part of being a leader.

Yes, the skills are signs of effective leadership.

The years of experience may be more valuable to me at this time. My diversified background has afforded opportunities beyond NASSP skill dimensions.

Absolutely. Modeling is always a reasonable way to teach a skill, and although being a principal is a complex job, certain behaviors are known to be needed. It makes sense to be sure new principals possess those qualities.

Yes, but it must be in addition to how will you relate to people & situations. One must have a defined sense of self before increased job performance can occur.

Yes. There are specific job behaviors such as stress tolerance and organizational ability that when practiced and refined will increase job performance. The demands of the school administrator require frequent "tune-ups" of personal and professional job behaviors.

I am not sure that I understand the question fully. The skill areas encompass education administration and, consequently, increasing or improve job behaviors would improve job performance. I found that the Assessment Program was a valuable experience with useful feedback.

The NASSP placed me in situations, that were evaluated both positively & critically. I implemented many of the recommendations of the evaluations. I believe that administrators should take this course over 5-10 years.

Since I was a supervisor and an assistant vice principal, for 3 years, and a doctoral candidate, before my assessment. Many of its exercises were repetitive to my professional experiences and my doctoral studies. The NASSP assessment had little effect on my overall job performance. I scored "very high" to "high to very high" in 8 out of 12 dimensions, and the other four dimensions were "more than high."

Yes. Even though the skill dimensions are different, if administrators constantly keep them in mind and work to improve areas of weakness job performance will improve. These skills take into consideration every aspect of an administrator's job—it would be silly to ignore them.

The job behaviors I possess are a result of my own performance ethic, my course work at Rider University in Ed. Administration, workshops attended and my experience as a former principal. Although I strongly believe that the NASSP program for principal assessment can prove beneficial it does not in anyway contribute to my job behaviors. I am proud to say I scored high to very high in my assessment. I believe this program would prove more beneficial to individuals completing Ed administration programs or administrators with less than 1 year experience. "On the job experiences" identify an individual's weaknesses more than participating in "controlled" scenarios, such as the NASSP assessment.

Yes. However while at the assessment center, some of the activities did not relate to my specific job. I think it would be beneficial for the Assessment Center to observe the candidates at their place of employment. Then they could hone in on the specific skills listed above that would be useful/helpful to the candidate.

Yes and no. While I believe "practice makes perfect," I cannot say that everyone is able to perform all of the above job behaviors w/out professional dev't focusing on them. Practicing a skill that is not productive or of value would obviously not be a wise choice.

I believe the areas of problem analysis, judgment, organization, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, communication, stress tolerance & values are the key areas to focus upon when you acquire a principalship. Each day every area is challenging. I do believe to improve in these areas you need professional development opportunities, time for reflective thinking & a confidential colleague to share thoughts.

The NASSP skill dimensions are objectives that all administrators utilize on a daily basis. The enhancement of these objectives or behaviors will enable administrators to perform their job responsibilities in an exemplary manner.

Yes because I believe this skill list identifies some very important skills crucial to my effectiveness as a leader. To improve upon some areas will undoubtedly result in improved performance.

It has the potential to because it will provide administrators with road maps to excellence and effective leadership styles.

I feel there is always room to improve job performance. If the NASSP skill dimensions are identified and one can identify oneself strengths and weaknesses I am sure job performance can be improved.

Only if the environment was receptive to and valued the dimensions. Otherwise, opportunities/expectations will not support their successful implementation.

Yes. Although I believe each job behavior is important, I would classify some as more critical than others. In an elementary setting, especially, communication w/children, teachers, and parents is a high priority. Organization, decisiveness, and consensus building are also key to good building leadership.

Yes. All skills listed are important not only in the educational field but can be applied in other professions as well. In school leadership, however, people are the clients/products of our work, so it is necessary to relate to staff & students to improve productivity.

No, I feel if I continue to do as I am doing I will achieve. I didn't think I got anything out of the assessment.

Yes. These are necessary skills if you want to be in a leadership position.

Interestingly enough, I scored quite well regarding the majority of the NASSP skill dimensions when I participated in the assessment center this fall. I have implemented one of the two suggestions offered with respect to my feedback. Consequently, several staff members have complimented my job performance relative to the change I have made. From a more theoretical perspective, I absolutely believe the skill dimensions the NASSP has identified outline the framework for educational leaders. Therefore, the answer to your question is yes!!

Yes, it is important to engage in reflective practice that informs how we lead others.

These skills are generally acknowledged as necessary for leadership. I feel that I could benefit from increased working “stress tolerance,” “range of interest” and confrontation (within “personal motivation”). These are areas that may make be better off physically and emotionally.

Yes, I do feel my job performance will improve because there is always room for improvement. I learn something new everyday and it is important to me that I enhance my leadership skills so that I am an effective leader.

Difficult to answer, initial answer, yes! With more jobs added to each position time allotment becomes a problem. I’m not avoiding the issue, but time is the governing factor and everything needs to be to the point. My weakest area would be personal satisfaction, I’m satisfied with what I do, my goals aren’t always met by my timeline—long term goals, when relying on others who don’t have same goals as curriculum coordinator.

Absolutely yes! However, there is little time in the day to day life of an assistant principal to reflect on job behaviors. I feel that my job performance will improve with experience.

Job performance improves by continuous self-evaluation, realistic mission statement, and ownership shared with passionate colleagues.

Many of these characteristics would result in improvements for most people professionally and personally. Therefore, by demonstrating the identified behaviors when possible and appropriate, job performance would improve.

I have to respond with a cautioned ‘yes.’ All skill dimensions are important; therefore exhibiting those skills more frequently should inevitably improve job performance. However, there are several other intangible factors which may also positively or negatively affect job performance.

Absolutely! I am not sure, however, that these job behaviors were “taught” in EDAS courses. It was assumed that you already knew the proper behaviors and how to best implement them to improve your own job performance. Unfortunately, many administrators do not know or implement many of these behaviors!

No, simulation or demonstration of job behaviors does not discern a true picture of one’s job performance. It is critical for school leaders to participate in professional development activities related to each skill dimension. I have not participated in any as a principal—only as a teacher & reading specialist (previous careers).

Practice makes perfect.

Yes. As always, the more training & practice you receive, the better one will perform. Experience, also, yields improved job performance.

Yes—the assessment center provided a “check” on my personal skills and abilities. Although quite labor intensive, the assessment experience will be one that I long remember and always value.

This is difficult to answer. The NASSP assessment in which I participated in 1996 was in my opinion poorly conceived and ineptly implemented. It was clearly a model that appeared to be originally formulated for elementary administration and hastily reworked to accommodate those of us at the secondary level! Quick, facile answers to questions posed by former elementary administrators were encouraged. Those same administrators (retired) appeared to be unfamiliar with secondary trends or issues. Quite frankly I found the whole process to be a consummate waste of time!

Stress tolerance and organizational ability suffer because of the demands on my position and the multitude of tasks & responsibilities I have. My job performance (physical well-being and simply getting day-to-day management to flow smoothly) would improve if I took the time to train & organize my office staff, if I had a top quality admin. assistant or secretary and if technology were in place to reduce the volumes of paper and increase efficiency of operation.

Yes, but identifying what you want/need to do in a situation & being able to do it are very different things. I certainly like to think I possess the qualities that are the subject of the Assessment Center. However, you often get caught up with so many problems/issues that it becomes impossible to apply these qualities or skills to a situation.

Absolutely. These skill areas specifically represent the skills necessary to be an effective leader. These are areas that I continually work to improve.

Yes, these skill dimensions can be interpreted as leadership “best practices.” Attention to these indicators and subsequent reflection on their relationship to job performance can only lead to improvement.

Yes, leading by example is critical for success.

One would assume yes, however, practical application prevails. Applying behavior to theory only works in the vacuum of academia. When you take into account who is measuring the performance, the politics surrounding the job performance, and the nature of the job being observed for performance behaviors, the best situation can be manipulated to be positive or negative. It has been my experience that most times, outstanding job performance (with or without NASSP consideration) takes second

place to politics or political correctness. In order to improve job performance within our profession, we need to change our priorities.

Yes, I believe my job performance will improve because I believe in leading by example.

I definitely feel that if the demonstration of behaviors were increased, job performance would improve. It allows the observers to actually see and realize the identified skill.

I believe that assessment center accurately identified areas of strength and need. If I use the results to focus on professional growth, I feel my job performance will improve.

Yes. The skills are important ones for an administrator to answer.

I do not believe so, nothing prepares one for this job than actually experiencing it. More aspiring candidates need to do internships with a vintage principal. On-the-job training!

The training received in many cases do not provide the skill level needed to do the job adequately. Further to the point mentoring system is also questionable.

I believe that anyone who participates to increase skills in the above referenced areas will improve their job performance. Therefore, ongoing training is essential to performance.

I felt the dynamics of your group swayed the way I felt during the group activities. Some people were too overbearing. I liked the individual assessment tool better.

My job as an elementary school principal has taken over my entire life. Principals of large schools need assistant administrators to help with the social forces of today's schools.

I don't feel the increase will have any significant impact upon job performance. Not to sound egotistical, but I probably couldn't do any better than I do on a daily basis. By the way, the Assessment Center was of 0 value to me and most of my colleagues here.

I scored exceptionally well at the NASSP. I believe that I was highly cognizant of the job behaviors identified by NASSP due to my graduate courses and work through Georgian Court College, Lakewood, NJ.

Yes. The skills outlined are import for effective leadership. The trick is to have opportunities to learn & refine them on the job instead of outside in a workshop or course.

Not sure what you mean by this. I do believe that you need to do (perform).

I am not very familiar with NASSP skill dimensions but I do feel that professional development is important. It is difficult to obtain information on workshops and development activities.

My job performance may improve with increase demonstration if it is being assessed.

Any demonstration of quality skills will enhance an individual's ability to do their job. There is always room for improvement.

Yes—The skill dimensions are a solid guideline to success in educational leadership. I have found that the toughest part of my job as a principal is being motivated to change the status quo in my school. The only way to move a school forward is t do all of these things mentioned in this skill.

Yes—all the skills which are identified are critical to success in the position. These identified skills should always be addressed in the daily activities of the job.

Yes—the info is based on research and this supports effective change.

It made me aware of the skill dimensions of leadership; I hope I improved but subjectively I can't really tell. By your 30 year, or sooner, your skill set is set—difficult to change behavior without a plan or mentor. My then supervisor didn't even discuss the assessment results with me—it was a formality, not a place to start a dialogue. If you want more than compliance then it must be tied into supervision and/or job performance evaluation, beyond the initial assessment. Personally, I liked the process since it validated many things I was doing right, and it gave me insight into how others evaluate a supervisory role.

I feel I do an excellent job as a high school administrator. My answers reflect this feeling—with the exception of the professional development questions. I would be very interest in finding professional development workshops on these topics.

Yes as it will allow me to recognize and address weaknesses in my leadership style. My scores from my assessment have proven to be accurate and identified the areas that needed to be improved upon for greater effectiveness.

Yes yes. The skills listed encompass a wide range of skills needed to be an effective leader. To increase these skills would only enhance my performance. The difficult task is juggling all of these skills frequently enough to obtain mastery or competence.

Additional comments, arranged by NASSP skill dimensions, have been placed in Appendix D by the researcher.

Reliability Analysis

A covariance matrix was used to determine the reliability of the survey instrument used in this research study. Use of this matrix provides a large number of reliability coefficients for multiple-scale items.

Since correlation matrices can be expanded to incorporate any number of variables, they are useful devices for showing correlations between all possible pairs of variables when, in fact, many variables are being studied (Witte, 1997, p.146). Each question on the AAPS was intra-correlated to produce an overall alpha of over .95 for 72/73 questions. The detailed reliability coefficients are exhibited in Table 36.

Table 36

Reliability Coefficients

***** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis *****

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS -SCALE (ALPHA)

*** Q9 has zero variance

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS -SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Q1	1.0000				
Q2	.7638	1.0000			
Q3	.0000	-.2182	1.0000		
Q4	-.3750	-.2182	.0000	1.0000	
Q5	-.2500	-.5092	.0000	.6667	1.0000
Q6	.2182	.5238	-.2182	.3273	-.1455
Q7	-.4310	-.3553	-.4789	-.0479	-.0319
Q8	.6667	.5092	-.3333	.1667	.1111
Q10	.0754	.2632	-.6030	-.4523	-.5528
Q11	.0754	-.0658	-.3015	-.4523	-.3015
Q12	.3227	.5634	-.2582	.0000	-.2152
Q13	-.1111	-.0242	.1111	.3889	.2593
Q14	-.6286	-.4311	-.1796	.1796	-.0299
Q15	-.2857	-.5300	-.4286	-.0714	.4286
Q16	-.3273	-.4286	.6547	.3273	.2182
Q17	-.2182	-.0476	-.2182	.2182	-.2182
Q18	.0000	.1627	-.1491	.0000	-.2485
Q19	-.3015	-.3948	.3015	-.0754	-.0503
Q20	.2182	.0476	-.2182	-.2182	-.1455
Q21	-.5571	-.5268	-.1857	.0928	.0619
Q22	.5121	.5309	-.1280	-.8322	-.7682
Q23	-.3727	-.1627	-.1491	-.3727	-.4969
Q24	.1021	.3563	-.4082	-.1021	-.4082
Q25	-.1667	-.2182	-.3333	-.6667	-.4444
Q26	-.1667	-.2182	-.3333	-.6667	-.4444
Q27	-.8199	-.6475	.0000	.2343	.1562
Q28	.2182	.5238	-.6547	.3273	-.1455
Q29	.3750	.7638	-.5000	.2500	-.2500
Q30	-.3750	-.2182	.2500	.0625	-.1667
Q31	.4286	.4053	-.1429	-.0714	-.2857
Q32	.2182	.5238	-.6547	-.2182	-.5092
Q33	.0000	.2182	-.2000	.0000	-.3333
Q34	-.4015	-.4005	.0000	.1147	.0765

Q35	-.1280	-.3073	.1280	-.1921	-.1280
Q36	-.2500	-.3273	.0000	-.3750	-.2500
Q37	-.1562	-.0341	-.4685	.1562	.3644
Q38	-.2500	-.3273	.0000	-.3750	-.2500
Q39	-.2182	-.0476	-.2182	.2182	.1455
Q40	-.1562	-.0341	-.7809	-.2343	-.1562
Q41	.0000	.1627	-.4472	-.3727	-.4969
Q42	-.1667	-.2182	-.3333	-.6667	-.4444
Q43	-.6699	-.5331	-.2364	.2758	.1839
Q44	-.2500	-.1455	-.3333	-.1667	-.1111
Q45	-.1021	.0891	-.4082	.1021	.0680
Q46	-.2500	.2182	-.6667	.2500	-.1111
Q47	-.0754	.0658	-.3015	-.3015	-.4523

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Q48	-.7717	-.6362	-.1715	.3430	.2287
Q49	-.0754	-.2632	-.3015	-.3015	-.2010
Q50	-.0754	-.2632	.0000	-.3015	-.2010
Q51	-.0754	-.2632	.0000	-.3015	-.2010
Q52	-.3462	-.4532	-.2308	-.0385	.1026
Q53	.0000	-.1627	-.1491	-.3727	-.2485
Q54	.0479	-.1463	-.0958	-.0479	-.0319
Q55	.0000	-.1627	-.1491	-.3727	-.2485
Q56	-.2278	-.5114	-.2604	.0651	.3689
Q57	.0000	-.1627	-.4472	-.3727	-.2485
Q58	-.4082	-.0891	-.4082	-.1021	-.4082
Q59	-.3180	.1619	-.3180	.0530	-.1413
Q60	-.5590	-.4880	.0000	.3727	.0000
Q61	.6667	.5092	.3333	-.6667	-.4444
Q62	1.0000	.7638	.0000	-.3750	-.2500
Q63	.6667	.5092	-.3333	.1667	.1111
Q64	-.1667	-.2182	.3333	.1667	.1111
Q65	.2182	.0476	-.2182	-.2182	-.1455
Q66	-.0909	-.4166	.0909	-.1364	.0606
Q67	.0754	-.0658	.0000	-.8292	-.5528
Q68	-.2343	-.3067	-.1562	-.5466	-.3644
Q69	.1562	.0341	-.4685	-.5466	-.3644
Q70	.3750	.2182	-.5000	-.3750	-.2500
Q71	.0000	-.1627	-.1491	-.3727	-.2485
Q72	.3727	.1627	-.1491	-.7454	-.4969
Q73	-.1796	-.4311	-.1796	-.0449	.1197

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

Q6	Q7	Q8	Q10	Q11
----	----	----	-----	-----

Q6	1.0000				
Q7	-.1463	1.0000			
Q8	.5092	.0319	1.0000		
Q10	.2632	.6354	.3015	1.0000	
Q11	-.0658	.4910	.3015	.7727	1.0000
Q12	.5634	-.2473	.4303	.3892	.3892
Q13	.2182	-.3512	.1111	-.1340	.2010
Q14	-.0392	.6365	-.1197	.4603	.5957
Q15	-.2182	.5336	.0476	.3015	.5169
Q16	.0476	-.1463	-.2182	-.3948	-.0658
Q17	.4286	.3553	.2182	.3948	.3948
Q18	.1627	.0714	.2485	.4495	.6742
Q19	-.3948	.4910	-.2010	.0909	.3182
Q20	.0476	.6897	.5092	.5922	.5922
Q21	-.3242	.8182	-.0619	.4479	.5879
Q22	-.0279	-.0368	.1280	.6177	.6177
Q23	-.1627	.6425	-.2485	.6742	.6742
Q24	.3563	.2737	.4082	.7385	.7385
Q25	-.2182	.6705	-.1111	.8040	.8040
Q26	-.2182	.6705	-.1111	.8040	.8040
Q27	-.3067	.7180	-.4165	.1884	.1884
Q28	.5238	.0627	.5092	.2632	-.0658
Q29	.7638	.0479	.6667	.4523	.0754
Q30	-.2182	.3113	-.2500	.1131	.3015
Q31	.0935	.2600	.5238	.3015	.0861
Q32	.5238	.4807	.5092	.9211	.5922
Q33	.6547	.2873	.3333	.6030	.3015
Q34	-.4005	.7911	-.0765	.2075	.2075
Q35	-.0279	.3311	.1280	.4247	.8107
Q36	.2182	.2873	-.1667	.4523	.4523
Q37	-.0341	.5535	.1562	.2825	.0471
Q38	-.3273	.2873	-.1667	.4523	.8292
Q39	.4286	.1463	.2182	.3948	.3948
Q40	.3067	.5535	.1562	.7534	.5180
Q41	.4880	.4997	.2485	.8989	.6742
Q42	-.2182	.6705	-.1111	.8040	.8040
Q43	-.3612	.7322	-.1839	.2614	.3802
Q44	.2182	.6066	.1111	.7035	.7035
Q45	.5345	.1173	.2722	.4924	.4924
Q46	.5819	.1277	.1111	.4523	.2010
Q47	.3948	.3754	.2010	.8182	.8182
Q48	-.2620	.7228	-.2287	.2327	.3620
Q49	.0658	.3754	.2010	.5909	.8182
Q50	.0658	.5198	.2010	.5909	.8182
Q51	.0658	.5198	.2010	.5909	.8182
Q52	-.4532	.5821	.0256	.3943	.7422

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

Q6	Q7	Q8	Q10	Q11
----	----	----	-----	-----

Q53	.1627	.3570	.2485	.6742	.8989
Q54	.0627	.0826	.3512	.3466	.7797
Q55	.1627	.3570	.2485	.6742	.8989
Q56	-.5114	.5736	.1736	.2159	.5103
Q57	-.1627	.6425	.2485	.6742	.6742
Q58	-.0891	.4692	-.2722	.4308	.1231
Q59	.1619	.0102	-.3887	.0959	-.3835
Q60	.0000	.5711	.0000	.2247	.3371
Q61	-.2182	-.6066	-.1111	-.2010	-.2010
Q62	.2182	-.4310	.6667	.0754	.0754
Q63	.5092	.0319	1.0000	.3015	.3015
Q64	.5092	-.2873	-.1111	-.2010	-.2010
Q65	.0476	.2717	.5092	.5922	.9211
Q66	-.6150	.4963	.0909	.1645	.5756
Q67	-.0658	.2022	-.2010	.5455	.5455
Q68	.0341	.4936	-.1562	.6592	.6592
Q69	.0341	.6432	.3644	.8947	.8947
Q70	.2182	.5268	.6667	.8292	.8292
Q71	.1627	.3570	.2485	.6742	.8989
Q72	.1627	.2142	.2485	.6742	.6742
Q73	-.2352	.2925	.1796	.3249	.7311

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Q12	1.0000				
Q13	.7172	1.0000			
Q14	.2319	.4191	1.0000		
Q15	.0000	.1111	.4362	1.0000	
Q16	.0000	.4607	.3527	.0935	1.0000
Q17	.2817	.2667	.6271	.2182	.4286
Q18	.7698	.7454	.6693	.1065	.1627
Q19	-.1946	.0335	.5957	.3015	.5922
Q20	.0000	-.2667	.3527	.4053	.0476
Q21	-.1199	.0619	.8505	.4244	.0810
Q22	.4959	.0142	.0230	-.0549	-.3073
Q23	.1925	.0828	.8032	.3194	.1627
Q24	.7906	.4990	.6233	.1166	-.0891
Q25	.0000	-.2593	.4789	.5238	-.2182
Q26	.0000	-.2593	.4789	.5238	-.2182
Q27	-.3024	-.0174	.7433	.2900	.2045
Q28	.2817	-.0242	-.0392	-.2182	-.4286
Q29	.6455	.1667	.0449	-.2857	-.3273
Q30	.1614	.3889	.7409	.1071	.6001
Q31	-.1844	-.5238	-.2053	-.4286	-.5300
Q32	.5634	-.0242	.3527	.0935	-.4286
Q33	.2582	-.1111	.1796	-.1429	-.2182
Q34	-.4443	-.3059	.5357	.1966	.1001
Q35	.3306	.4410	.7129	.4939	.5309

Q36	.0000	-.1111	.2694	.4286	.2182
Q37	.0000	-.1562	.1683	.3793	-.3749
Q38	.3227	.4444	.7184	.4286	.2182
Q39	.5634	.5092	.4311	.2182	-.0476
Q40	.2016	-.1562	.3085	.6024	-.3749
Q41	.3849	-.0828	.4016	.3194	-.1627
Q42	.0000	-.2593	.4789	.5238	-.2182
Q43	-.1017	.1839	.8634	.4166	.1548
Q44	.4303	.2593	.7184	.6667	.2182
Q45	.7906	.6351	.4766	.4666	.0891
Q46	.6455	.4444	.4191	.1905	-.1455
Q47	.5839	.3015	.6228	.3446	.0658
Q48	-.1107	.2287	.9087	.4655	.2994
Q49	.1946	.1340	.4874	.5599	.0658
Q50	.1946	.1340	.6228	.5599	.3948
Q51	.1946	.1340	.6228	.5599	.3948
Q52	.0993	.3162	.7875	.5385	.0504
Q53	.3849	.2485	.5355	.5324	.1627
Q54	.4946	.6066	.5505	.3968	.2717
Q55	.3849	.2485	.5355	.5324	.1627
Q56	-.2521	-.0289	.4209	.4836	-.2273
Q57	-.1925	-.4141	.2677	.3194	-.4880

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Q58	-.2635	-.4082	.2566	-.1750	-.5345
Q59	.0000	-.2002	-.1333	-.2877	-.5320
Q60	-.1925	.0828	.7363	.1065	.3253
Q61	.0000	-.2593	-.7184	-.4286	-.2182
Q62	.3227	-.1111	-.6286	-.2857	-.3273
Q63	.4303	.1111	-.1197	.0476	-.2182
Q64	.0000	.1111	-.1197	.0476	.5092
Q65	.5634	.4607	.5487	.4053	.0476
Q66	-.2347	.0101	.5062	.3506	.1785
Q67	.0000	-.3015	.0542	.3015	-.0658
Q68	.0000	-.1909	.3927	.5131	.0341
Q69	.2016	-.1909	.3927	.5131	-.3067
Q70	.3227	-.1111	.2694	.4286	-.3273
Q71	.3849	.2485	.5355	.5324	.1627
Q72	.1925	-.2485	.0000	.3194	-.1627
Q73	.1159	.3193	.5161	.4362	-.0392

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Q17	1.0000				
Q18	.4880	1.0000			
Q19	.3948	.2247	1.0000		
Q20	.4286	.1627	.5922	1.0000	
Q21	.3242	.4152	.5879	.4863	1.0000
Q22	.0279	.4772	.0386	.2515	-.0476
Q23	.4880	.5556	.6742	.4880	.6920
Q24	.5345	.9129	.1231	.3563	.4170
Q25	.2182	.2485	.3015	.5092	.5571
Q26	.2182	.2485	.3015	.5092	.5571
Q27	.1363	.1164	.5415	.2045	.8555
Q28	.4286	.1627	-.3948	.0476	-.1216
Q29	.3273	.3727	-.3015	.2182	-.0928
Q30	.4910	.5590	.8668	.3273	.5571
Q31	-.0935	-.1065	-.1292	.4053	.1592
Q32	.4286	.4880	-.0658	.5238	.2837
Q33	.2182	.1491	-.3015	.2182	.1857
Q34	.1502	.0000	.7263	.6008	.8094
Q35	.5867	.6680	.6177	.5309	.5468
Q36	.3273	.0000	.0754	.2182	.1393
Q37	-.3067	-.1164	.0471	.3067	.3770
Q38	.3273	.7454	.4523	.2182	.6035
Q39	.0476	.4880	-.2632	-.0476	.3242
Q40	.3749	.1164	-.1884	.3067	.2320
Q41	.4880	.3333	.0000	.4880	.2768
Q42	.2182	.2485	.3015	.5092	.5571
Q43	.3612	.4112	.6178	.3268	.9220
Q44	.5092	.4969	.4523	.5819	.5261
Q45	.3563	.6086	-.1231	.0891	.1516
Q46	.5092	.4969	-.3015	-.1455	.0619
Q47	.5922	.6742	.1364	.3948	.3919
Q48	.4491	.3835	.6205	.2994	.9076
Q49	.5922	.4495	.1364	.3948	.3919
Q50	.5922	.4495	.5909	.7237	.5319
Q51	.5922	.4495	.5909	.7237	.5319
Q52	.2854	.6307	.5102	.3861	.8713
Q53	.4880	.5556	.2247	.4880	.4152
Q54	.5643	.7853	.2022	.2717	.3735
Q55	.4880	.5556	.2247	.4880	.4152
Q56	-.0568	.1941	.2159	.3409	.7615
Q57	.1627	.1111	.0000	.4880	.5536
Q58	.0891	.0000	-.1846	-.0891	.4170
Q59	-.3932	-.2370	-.5433	-.5320	-.1181
Q60	.6506	.3333	.4495	.3253	.7613
Q61	-.5092	-.2485	-.2010	-.2182	-.6809
Q62	-.2182	.0000	-.3015	.2182	-.5571

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Q63	.2182	.2485	-.2010	.5092	-.0619
Q64	.2182	-.2485	-.2010	-.2182	-.3714
Q65	.4286	.8133	.2632	.5238	.4863
Q66	.2182	.3388	.7127	.5753	.7259
Q67	.0658	.0000	.0909	.2632	.0280
Q68	.3067	.1164	.1884	.3749	.3480
Q69	.3067	.3492	.1884	.7157	.4930
Q70	.3273	.3727	.0754	.7638	.3714
Q71	.4880	.5556	.2247	.4880	.4152
Q72	.1627	.1111	.0000	.4880	.0000
Q73	.2352	.5355	.0542	.1568	.6003

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26
Q22	1.0000				
Q23	.4772	1.0000			
Q24	.5750	.6086	1.0000		
Q25	.5548	.7454	.4082	1.0000	
Q26	.5548	.7454	.4082	1.0000	1.0000
Q27	-.3199	.5820	.0956	.3644	.3644
Q28	-.0279	-.1627	.3563	-.2182	-.2182
Q29	.1921	.0000	.6124	-.1667	-.1667
Q30	.1280	.7454	.4082	.1667	.1667
Q31	.1280	-.1065	.1166	.0476	.0476
Q32	.5309	.4880	.8018	.5092	.5092
Q33	.1280	.1491	.4082	.3333	.3333
Q34	-.2056	.5130	.0468	.3059	.3059
Q35	.3443	.6680	.5750	.5548	.5548
Q36	.1921	.3727	.1021	.6667	.6667
Q37	-.1800	.1164	.0638	.1562	.1562
Q38	.5121	.7454	.6124	.6667	.6667
Q39	.0279	.1627	.5345	.2182	.2182
Q40	.2200	.3492	.3825	.6768	.6768
Q41	.4772	.5556	.6086	.7454	.7454
Q42	.5548	.7454	.4082	1.0000	1.0000
Q43	-.1917	.6462	.3539	.3415	.3415
Q44	.2988	.7454	.6124	.6667	.6667
Q45	.2091	.3043	.6667	.2722	.2722
Q46	.0854	.2485	.6124	.1111	.1111
Q47	.5405	.6742	.8001	.7035	.7035
Q48	-.2855	.6391	.3151	.3430	.3430
Q49	.3474	.4495	.4924	.7035	.7035
Q50	.3474	.6742	.4924	.7035	.7035
Q51	.3474	.6742	.4924	.7035	.7035
Q52	.1674	.6307	.5339	.5385	.5385
Q53	.4772	.5556	.6086	.7454	.7454
Q54	.3311	.3570	.6648	.3512	.3512
Q55	.4772	.5556	.6086	.7454	.7454

Q56	-.1167	.1941	.1594	.3906	.3906
Q57	.2863	.3333	.3043	.7454	.7454
Q58	.0523	.3043	.1667	.4082	.4082
Q59	-.0950	-.0790	-.0865	-.0353	-.0353
Q60	-.2863	.4444	.3043	.2485	.2485
Q61	.5548	-.2485	-.2722	-.1111	-.1111
Q62	.5121	-.3727	.1021	-.1667	-.1667
Q63	.1280	-.2485	.4082	-.1111	-.1111
Q64	-.2988	-.2485	-.2722	-.1111	-.1111
Q65	.5309	.4880	.8018	.5092	.5092
Q66	.1280	.4743	.2227	.3939	.3939
Q67	.6177	.4495	.1231	.8040	.8040

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26
Q68	.3799	.5820	.2550	.8850	.8850
Q69	.5799	.5820	.5738	.8850	.8850
Q70	.5121	.3727	.6124	.6667	.6667
Q71	.4772	.5556	.6086	.7454	.7454
Q72	.6680	.3333	.3043	.7454	.7454
Q73	.1380	.2677	.4399	.4789	.4789

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q27	Q28	Q29	Q30	Q31
Q27	1.0000				
Q28	-.3067	1.0000			
Q29	-.2343	.7638	1.0000		
Q30	.5271	-.2182	-.0625	1.0000	
Q31	-.0446	.4053	.4286	-.2500	1.0000
Q32	.0341	.5238	.7638	.0546	.4053
Q33	.1562	.2182	.5000	-.2500	.4286
Q34	.7882	-.1502	-.1147	.5449	.3605
Q35	.2799	-.3073	-.1280	.6082	-.2378
Q36	.1562	-.3273	-.2500	-.0625	-.2857
Q37	.4634	-.0341	.2343	-.0390	.1562
Q38	.3514	-.3273	-.2500	.5625	-.2857
Q39	.3067	-.0476	.3273	-.0546	-.0935
Q40	.0976	.3067	.2343	-.2343	-.0669
Q41	.1164	.1627	.3727	.0000	.1065
Q42	.3644	-.2182	-.1667	.1667	.0476
Q43	.8493	-.0172	-.0788	.6699	-.0338
Q44	.4165	-.1455	.1667	.4583	-.2857
Q45	.0638	.0891	.4082	.1021	-.4082

Q57	.2863	.3333	.3043	.7454	.7454
Q58	.0523	.3043	.1667	.4082	.4082
Q59	-.0950	-.0790	-.0865	-.0353	-.0353
Q60	-.2863	.4444	.3043	.2485	.2485
Q61	.5548	-.2485	-.2722	-.1111	-.1111
Q62	.5121	-.3727	.1021	-.1667	-.1667
Q63	.1280	-.2485	.4082	-.1111	-.1111
Q64	-.2988	-.2485	-.2722	-.1111	-.1111
Q65	.5309	.4880	.8018	.5092	.5092
Q66	.1280	.4743	.2227	.3939	.3939
Q67	.6177	.4495	.1231	.8040	.8040

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26
Q68	.3799	.5820	.2550	.8850	.8850
Q69	.5799	.5820	.5738	.8850	.8850
Q70	.5121	.3727	.6124	.6667	.6667
Q71	.4772	.5556	.6086	.7454	.7454
Q72	.6680	.3333	.3043	.7454	.7454
Q73	.1380	.2677	.4399	.4789	.4789

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q27	Q28	Q29	Q30	Q31
Q27	1.0000				
Q28	-.3067	1.0000			
Q29	-.2343	.7638	1.0000		
Q30	.5271	-.2182	-.0625	1.0000	
Q31	-.0446	.4053	.4286	-.2500	1.0000
Q32	.0341	.5238	.7638	.0546	.4053
Q33	.1562	.2182	.5000	-.2500	.4286
Q34	.7882	-.1502	-.1147	.5449	.3605
Q35	.2799	-.3073	-.1280	.6082	-.2378
Q36	.1562	-.3273	-.2500	-.0625	-.2857
Q37	.4634	-.0341	.2343	-.0390	.1562
Q38	.3514	-.3273	-.2500	.5625	-.2857
Q39	.3067	-.0476	.3273	-.0546	-.0935
Q40	.0976	.3067	.2343	-.2343	-.0669
Q41	.1164	.1627	.3727	.0000	.1065
Q42	.3644	-.2182	-.1667	.1667	.0476
Q43	.8493	-.0172	-.0788	.6699	-.0338
Q44	.4165	-.1455	.1667	.4583	-.2857
Q45	.0638	.0891	.4082	.1021	-.4082
Q46	.0260	.5819	.5833	.0417	-.2857

Q47	.1648	.0658	.3015	.2638	-.0861
Q48	.8839	-.0748	-.1286	.6646	-.1470
Q49	.0471	.0658	-.0754	.0754	-.0861
Q50	.2825	-.2632	-.0754	.4523	-.0861
Q51	.2825	-.2632	-.0754	.4523	-.0861
Q52	.5766	-.1175	-.1538	.5385	-.0110
Q53	.1164	-.1627	.0000	.1863	-.1065
Q54	-.0299	.0627	.0479	.3113	-.1505
Q55	.1164	-.1627	.0000	.1863	-.1065
Q56	.4981	-.0852	-.2278	.0651	.2976
Q57	.2328	.1627	.0000	-.1863	.5324
Q58	.4144	.3563	.1021	-.1021	.4082
Q59	.1987	.1619	.2120	-.3445	.0151
Q60	.6402	.1627	.0000	.4658	.2130
Q61	-.6768	-.2182	-.1667	-.2500	.0476
Q62	-.8199	.2182	.3750	-.3750	.4286
Q63	-.4165	.5092	.6667	-.2500	.5238
Q64	-.1562	-.2182	-.1667	-.2500	-.4286
Q65	.0341	.0476	.2182	.3273	.0935
Q66	.4117	-.2182	-.3182	.5455	.2208
Q67	-.0471	-.3948	-.3015	-.0754	-.1292
Q68	.2683	-.3067	-.2343	.0390	-.1562
Q69	.1463	.0341	.1562	.0390	.2900
Q70	-.0390	.2182	.3750	-.0625	.4286
Q71	.1164	-.1627	.0000	.1863	-.1065
Q72	-.2328	-.1627	.0000	-.1863	.1065

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q27	Q28	Q29	Q30	Q31
Q73	.2524	-.0392	-.1796	.0674	.0513
	Q32	Q33	Q34	Q35	Q36
Q32	1.0000				
Q33	.6547	1.0000			
Q34	.1001	.0000	1.0000		
Q35	.2515	.1280	.2350	1.0000	
Q36	.2182	.5000	-.1147	.5121	1.0000
Q37	.3067	.1562	.4658	-.1800	-.1562
Q38	.2182	.0000	.1721	.8322	.3750
Q39	.4286	.6547	-.1001	.3073	.3273
Q40	.6475	.4685	-.0717	.2200	.6247
Q41	.8133	.7454	.0000	.4772	.7454
Q42	.5092	.3333	.3059	.5548	.6667
Q43	.1548	-.0788	.7775	.4137	-.0788
Q44	.5819	.3333	.2677	.7255	.5833
Q45	.5345	.4082	-.2810	.4704	.4082

Q46	.5819	.3333	-.3059	.0854	.1667
Q47	.7237	.6030	-.0346	.7335	.6784
Q48	.1123	.0000	.7279	.4831	.0857
Q49	.3948	.3015	-.0346	.7335	.6784
Q50	.3948	.3015	.3113	.9265	.6784
Q51	.3948	.3015	.3113	.9265	.6784
Q52	.2182	-.0769	.5471	.6599	.0385
Q53	.4880	.4472	.0000	.8589	.7454
Q54	.2717	.0958	-.0879	.8217	.2873
Q55	.4880	.4472	.0000	.8589	.7454
Q56	.0568	.0000	.5675	.3000	-.0651
Q57	.4880	.4472	.3420	.2863	.3727
Q58	.3563	.4082	.2810	-.2091	.1021
Q59	.1619	.3180	-.1459	-.6379	-.0530
Q60	.1627	.2981	.5985	.4772	.1863
Q61	-.2182	-.3333	-.4588	-.2988	-.1667
Q62	.2182	.0000	-.4015	-.1280	-.2500
Q63	.5092	.3333	-.0765	.1280	-.1667
Q64	-.2182	.3333	-.4588	.1280	.6667
Q65	.5238	.2182	.1001	.8103	.2182
Q66	-.0198	-.2727	.6882	.5936	-.0909
Q67	.2632	.3015	-.1383	.4247	.8292
Q68	.3749	.4685	.0717	.5799	.9370
Q69	.7157	.4685	.2508	.5799	.5466
Q70	.7638	.5000	.1721	.5121	.3750
Q71	.4880	.4472	.0000	.8589	.7454
Q72	.4880	.4472	-.1710	.4772	.7454

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q32	Q33	Q34	Q35	Q36
Q73	.1568	.1796	.1236	.5979	.2694
	Q37	Q38	Q39	Q40	Q41
Q37	1.0000				
Q38	-.1562	1.0000			
Q39	.3749	.3273	1.0000		
Q40	.2683	.2343	.3749	1.0000	
Q41	.1164	.3727	.4880	.8148	1.0000
Q42	.1562	.6667	.2182	.6768	.7454
Q43	.3816	.5123	.1892	.1354	.0587
Q44	.3644	.5833	.5092	.6247	.7454
Q45	.2550	.4082	.8018	.5738	.6086
Q46	.1041	.1667	.5092	.6247	.4969
Q47	-.0471	.6784	.5922	.6592	.8989
Q48	.3214	.5145	.2620	.1875	.1278
Q49	-.2825	.6784	.2632	.6592	.6742

Q50	-.0471	.6784	.2632	.4238	.6742
Q51	-.0471	.6784	.2632	.4238	.6742
Q52	.2042	.8077	.2854	.2042	.1720
Q53	-.1164	.7454	.4880	.5820	.7778
Q54	-.3441	.7663	.3553	.2543	.3570
Q55	-.1164	.7454	.4880	.5820	.7778
Q56	.3660	.4231	.2273	.1627	.0000
Q57	.1164	.3727	.1627	.5820	.5556
Q58	.0638	.1021	.0891	.3825	.3043
Q59	.3808	-.3180	.3007	.2152	.0790
Q60	-.1164	.3727	.1627	.1164	.2222
Q61	-.3644	-.1667	-.5092	-.3644	-.2485
Q62	-.1562	-.2500	-.2182	-.1562	.0000
Q63	.1562	-.1667	.2182	.1562	.2485
Q64	-.3644	-.1667	.2182	.1562	.2485
Q65	-.0341	.7638	.4286	.3067	.4880
Q66	.0142	.5909	-.1785	-.1278	-.0678
Q67	-.1884	.4523	.0658	.5180	.6742
Q68	-.0244	.5466	.3067	.7073	.8148
Q69	.2195	.5466	.3067	.7073	.8148
Q70	.2343	.3750	.3273	.6247	.7454
Q71	-.1164	.7454	.4880	.5820	.7778
Q72	-.1164	.3727	.1627	.5820	.7778
Q73	-.1122	.7184	.4311	.3085	.2677

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q42	Q43	Q44	Q45	Q46
Q42	1.0000				
Q43	.3415	1.0000			
Q44	.6667	.4466	1.0000		
Q45	.2722	.1287	.7485	1.0000	
Q46	.1111	.1839	.4444	.7485	1.0000
Q47	.7035	.2139	.8040	.7385	.5528
Q48	.3430	.9732	.5145	.2100	.2287
Q49	.7035	.2139	.5528	.4308	.3015
Q50	.7035	.3327	.8040	.4308	.0503
Q51	.7035	.3327	.8040	.4308	.0503
Q52	.5385	.8305	.4872	.2512	.1026
Q53	.7454	.1762	.7454	.6086	.2485
Q54	.3512	.2793	.4470	.5083	.2873
Q55	.7454	.1762	.7454	.6086	.2485
Q56	.3906	.6464	.1519	-.0266	-.1736
Q57	.7454	.2937	.2485	.0000	.0000
Q58	.4082	.3539	-.0680	-.1667	.2722
Q59	-.0353	-.0585	-.1413	.0865	.3887
Q60	.2485	.7049	.2485	.0000	.1242
Q61	-.1111	-.7093	-.4444	-.4082	-.4444
Q62	-.1667	-.6699	-.2500	-.1021	-.2500
Q63	-.1111	-.1839	.1111	.2722	.1111

Q64	-.1111	-.4466	.1111	.2722	.1111
Q65	.5092	.3268	.5819	.5345	.2182
Q66	.3939	.6520	.2121	-.2227	-.3939
Q67	.8040	-.2139	.4523	.1846	-.0503
Q68	.8850	.1108	.6768	.3825	.1562
Q69	.8850	.2339	.6768	.3825	.1562
Q70	.6667	.1182	.5833	.4082	.1667
Q71	.7454	.1762	.7454	.6086	.2485
Q72	.7454	-.2937	.4969	.3043	.0000
Q73	.4789	.4388	.2694	.2933	.1197

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q47	Q48	Q49	Q50	Q51
Q47	1.0000				
Q48	.2844	1.0000			
Q49	.7727	.2844	1.0000		
Q50	.7727	.4137	.7727	1.0000	
Q51	.7727	.4137	.7727	1.0000	1.0000
Q52	.4175	.7783	.5334	.5334	.5334
Q53	.8989	.2557	.8989	.8989	.8989
Q54	.6642	.3121	.8086	.6642	.6642
Q55	.8989	.2557	.8989	.8989	.8989
Q56	.0785	.5805	.3729	.2748	.2748
Q57	.4495	.2557	.6742	.4495	.4495
Q58	.1846	.3151	.1846	-.1231	-.1231
Q59	-.0959	-.0727	-.4155	-.5753	-.5753
Q60	.3371	.7670	.4495	.4495	.4495
Q61	-.3015	-.8003	-.3015	-.3015	-.3015
Q62	-.0754	-.7717	-.0754	-.0754	-.0754
Q63	.2010	-.2287	.2010	.2010	.2010
Q64	.2010	-.2287	.2010	.2010	.2010
Q65	.7237	.2994	.7237	.7237	.7237
Q66	.1096	.5769	.3837	.5208	.5208
Q67	.5909	-.1551	.5909	.5909	.5909
Q68	.7534	.2143	.7534	.7534	.7534
Q69	.7534	.2143	.7534	.7534	.7534
Q70	.6784	.0857	.6784	.6784	.6784
Q71	.8989	.2557	.8989	.8989	.8989
Q72	.6742	-.2557	.6742	.6742	.6742
Q73	.4874	.4466	.7581	.4874	.4874

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

Q52	Q53	Q54	Q55	Q56
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Q52	1.0000				
Q53	.5160	1.0000			
Q54	.6557	.7853	1.0000		
Q55	.5160	1.0000	.7853	1.0000	
Q56	.8112	.2911	.3866	.2911	1.0000
Q57	.5160	.5556	.3570	.5556	.6793
Q58	.2198	.0000	-.1173	.0000	.2923
Q59	-.3180	-.3950	-.5990	-.3950	-.2208
Q60	.5734	.3333	.4284	.3333	.4852
Q61	-.4872	-.2485	-.2873	-.2485	-.4774
Q62	-.3462	.0000	.0479	.0000	-.2278
Q63	.0256	.2485	.3512	.2485	.1736
Q64	-.4872	.2485	.0319	.2485	-.4774
Q65	.7218	.8133	.8988	.8133	.4830
Q66	.8182	.3388	.4963	.3388	.7456
Q67	.0464	.6742	.2022	.6742	-.0785
Q68	.2763	.8148	.3441	.8148	.1423
Q69	.5166	.8148	.4936	.8148	.4473
Q70	.4231	.7454	.5268	.7454	.4231
Q71	.5160	1.0000	.7853	1.0000	.2911
Q72	.0573	.7778	.3570	.7778	.0000
Q73	.7875	.6693	.8085	.6693	.7716

Q57 Q58 Q59 Q60 Q61

Q57	1.0000				
Q58	.6086	1.0000			
Q59	-.0790	.5626	1.0000		
Q60	.4444	.4564	-.2370	1.0000	
Q61	-.2485	-.2722	-.0353	-.7454	1.0000
Q62	.0000	-.4082	-.3180	-.5590	.6667
Q63	.2485	-.2722	-.3887	.0000	-.1111
Q64	-.2485	-.2722	-.0353	.0000	-.1111
Q65	.4880	-.0891	-.5320	.3253	-.2182
Q66	.4743	.0371	-.6456	.5421	-.2121
Q67	.4495	.1231	-.0639	-.1124	.3015
Q68	.5820	.2550	-.0497	.2328	-.1562
Q69	.8148	.2550	-.2152	.2328	-.1562
Q70	.7454	.1021	-.3180	.1863	-.1667
Q71	.5556	.0000	-.3950	.3333	-.2485
Q72	.5556	.0000	-.2370	-.1111	.2485
Q73	.6693	.2566	-.3236	.5355	-.4191

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

Correlation Matrix

	Q62	Q63	Q64	Q65	Q66
Q62	1.0000				
Q63	.6667	1.0000			

Q64	-.1667	-.1111	1.0000		
Q65	.2182	.5092	-.2182	1.0000	
Q66	-.0909	.0909	-.5152	.5753	1.0000
Q67	.0754	-.2010	.3015	.2632	.0274
Q68	-.2343	-.1562	.3644	.3749	.1278
Q69	.1562	.3644	-.1562	.7157	.4117
Q70	.3750	.6667	-.1667	.7638	.3636
Q71	.0000	.2485	.2485	.8133	.3388
Q72	.3727	.2485	.2485	.4880	.0678
Q73	-.1796	.1796	-.1197	.7447	.5878

Q67 Q68 Q69 Q70 Q71

Q67	1.0000				
Q68	.8947	1.0000			
Q69	.6592	.7561	1.0000		
Q70	.4523	.5466	.9370	1.0000	
Q71	.6742	.8148	.8148	.7454	1.0000
Q72	.8989	.8148	.8148	.7454	.7778
Q73	.1895	.3927	.5329	.4939	.6693

Q72 Q73

Q72	1.0000	
Q73	.2677	1.0000

Note. N of Cases = 10.0; Reliability Coefficients 72 items; Alpha = .9532; Standardized item alpha = .9532

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators with regard to the effect of NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions and their job behaviors.

To address this question, the researcher has framed this study within the historical context of assessment center principles and the precursors of performance and situational tests of Sir Francis Galton in the late 19th century. Benet advanced this type of testing in the early 1900s with designed items and tasks to diagnose problem solving ability and learning skills that required overt behavior. Military applications further advanced the assessment center concept—in Germany following World War I and then adapted by the British War Office Selection Board. The work of Murray at the Harvard Psychological Clinic laid the foundation for the design of assessment centers. The assessment process subsequently found its way into the worlds of business and industry, largely due to the work of Douglas Bray of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T). Assessment centers have been used to select managerial personnel within industry (Schmitt & Cohen, 1990). However, the use of assessment centers in educational research has not been widespread.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) developed the Assessment Center Project in 1975 and established the first assessment center in 1976 in Prince William County, Virginia. By the end of 1979, 12 centers were initiated and that figure grew to 20 by the end of 1981. Today there are over 60 operating centers in more than 20 states and international locales, including Bermuda and Canada. Neal Schmitt of Michigan State University conducted a three-year validation study from 1979 to 1981. A summary statement from the validation study noted:

In conclusion, we see the assessment center as a content valid procedure for the selection of school administrators. Evidence concerning its criterion-related validity is also positive, especially as it relates to supervisory performance ratings. Further, assessment center ratings are related to later student perceptions of school climate.

(Hersey, 1987, p. 7).

Results from the study confirmed that the NASSP Assessment Center process can help predict accurately who is most likely to be successful as a school principal or assistant principal (Hersey, 1986, p. 16).

Previous doctoral studies have focused on participant perceptions about the process, the developmental aspects of the process, management of the overall process and the identification of skills, proficiencies and traits most often generic to middle management (principals). Bley (1983) studied the attitudes of participants and non-participating administrators in four California school districts toward the use of the

assessment center process. Farmer (1985) investigated the effect of participation in a center among assistant principals, teachers and principals in a Maryland school system. None of the previous studies have investigated the participants' perceptions toward NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions and job behaviors. The researcher looked at the Twelve Skill Dimensions that are assessed in an NASSP Assessment Center. They are Problem Analysis, Judgment, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Leadership, Sensitivity, Stress Tolerance, Oral Communication, Written Communication, Range of Interest, Personal Motivation, and Educational Values. An Administrator Assessment Program Survey (AAPS) was constructed to gather data to respond to the research question.

Statement of the Research Questions

1. What effect does the level (elementary, middle, and secondary) of New Jersey school administrator NASSP Assessment Center participants have on the discrete job behaviors within the skill dimensions identified in the NASSP Assessment Center process?

2. What effect does the number of elapsed years for New Jersey school administrator NASSP Assessment Center participants (elementary, middle and secondary) have on the discrete job behaviors within the skill dimensions identified in the NASSP Assessment Center process?

To answer the research questions, the researcher examined a hypothesis that addressed the perceptions of New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary NASSP Assessment Center participants. Assuming the null hypothesis, there should be no

significant difference in elementary, middle and secondary New Jersey school administrators' perceptions of the effect of discrete job behaviors within the NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions. Participation in an NASSP Assessment Center will have no effect on the perceptions of elementary, middle and secondary New Jersey school administrators with regard to their job behaviors within identified skill dimensions.

Answers to the research questions have been developed through the use of ANOVA, frequency and reliability tables as well as multiple comparisons and the Tukey measurement for significant differences.

Statement of the Subsidiary Questions

1. What job behaviors within identified NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions are demonstrated with the most frequency as perceived by New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators who have participated in the NASSP Assessment Center process?

2. What job behaviors within identified NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions are demonstrated with the least frequency as perceived by New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators who have participated in the NASSP Assessment Center process?

3. Do New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators who have participated in the NASSP Assessment Center process perceive that an increase in the demonstration of job behaviors within identified NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions improves their job performance?

4. With what frequency do New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators participate in professional development activities within the defined NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions?

Answers to the subsidiary questions have been developed through the use of frequency tables and the examination of qualitative statements made by the respondents.

The data used for the analysis of the hypothesis presented in this study were as follows:

1. The participants' Likert scale ratings to 73 questions in 12 skill dimensions.
2. The participants' qualitative responses to open-ended comments sections in 12 skill dimensions and a concluding open-ended question.

Conclusions

The results of this study indicate that the level of New Jersey school administrator (elementary, middle or secondary, district office or other) does have an effect on the discrete job behaviors within the skill dimensions identified in the NASSP Assessment Center process. The data gathered from respondents found significant differences in survey questions 9, 17, 43, 52 and 60. All of these questions were analyzed using a oneway ANOVA. Significance was set at the .05 level. Survey question 9—I ask follow-up questions to clarify information—produced a .029 level of significance. Survey question 17—I delegate responsibilities to others and follow up to determine their progress—produced a .009 level of

significance. Survey question 43—I have participated in professional development activities related to sensitivity—produced a .017 level of significance. Survey question 52—I have participated in professional development activities related to oral communication—produced a .013 level of significance. Survey question 60—I have participated in professional development activities related to range of interest—produced a .036 level of significance.

The NASSP skill dimensions addressed in these questions are Judgment (Q9), Organizational Ability (Q17), Sensitivity (Q43), Oral Communication (Q52) and Range of Interest (Q60). This may suggest that respondents on all levels consider these areas very important job behaviors. A number of the qualitative comments support this view. For example, one respondent commented: “I always maintain the right to make the final decision based on formal/legal requirements over group point of view (Judgment).” Another noted: “I have to be well-organized (Organizational Ability). One respondent felt that Sensitivity is very important: “This is so important. It alone can make or break a principalship. People’s perceptions are their realities.” In the area of Oral Communication, one respondent wrote: “This is more important than one might think. We are judged by how we speak, dress, write, and act.” Respondents also commented upon Range of Interest. One wrote: “I have always been involved in my church, my community, coaching, and family commitments.”

The results of this study also indicate that the number of years that have elapsed since the participants were assessed does have an effect on the job behaviors

within the skill dimensions identified in the NASSP Assessment Center process. The data gathered from respondents found significant differences in survey questions 31, 33, 39, 41, 54, 55 and 56. All of these questions were analyzed using a oneway ANOVA. Significance was set at the .05 level. Survey question 31—I encourage the use of charts and/or visual aids during the discussion—produced a .039 level of significance. Survey question 33—I move to the goals of the organization by supporting, clarifying or restating group decisions—produced a .022 level of significance. Survey question 39—I weigh the quality of my responses—produced a .039 level of significance. Survey question 41—I use clear, sensitive language when responding to the requests of others for assistance—produced a .012 level of significance. Survey question 54—My writing contains no errors in grammar, syntax or spelling—produced a .039 level of significance. Survey question 55—I demonstrate effective skills, including the writing of memos, letters, notes, etc. for different audiences—produced a .023 level of significance. Survey question 56—I have participated in professional development activities related to written communication—produced a .040 level of significance.

The NASSP skill dimensions addressed in these questions are Leadership (Q31, Q33), Sensitivity (Q39, Q41), Written Communication (Q54, Q55 and 56). This may suggest that these areas and their respective job behaviors are important. This is true regardless of the number of years that have elapsed since the respondents participated in the NASSP Assessment Center. A number of the qualitative comments support this view. For example, one respondent commented: “This is the

most important skill dimension (Leadership)." Another wrote: "Accessibility and credibility aid me when dealing with issues that may be emotionally charged (Sensitivity)." In the area of Written Communication, one respondent wrote: "I am an effective and persuasive writer." Especially worthy of note is that three questions produced levels of significance in the area of Written Communication. It appears that being an effective writer is a high priority for school administrators.

Upon further analysis of the results for level of administrator (elementary, middle, secondary, district office or other) and number of years elapsed since participation in an NASSP Assessment Center), a Post Hoc test of Multiple Comparisons and the Tukey Honest Significant Difference these identified survey questions validated these results by also showing statistical significance.

Although not a research question, the issue of gender aroused the curiosity of the researcher. A oneway ANOVA was used to analyze gender. Significance was set at the .05 level. Survey question 23—I take action to bring issues to closure—produced a .006 level of significance. Survey question 33—I move to the goals of the organization by supporting, clarifying or restating group decisions—produced a .033 level of significance. Survey question 49—I make no errors in grammar and usage when I speak--produced a .004 level of significance. Survey question 52—I have participated in professional development activities related to oral communication—produced a .027 level of significance. Survey question 54—My writing contains no errors in grammar, syntax or spelling—produced a .013 level of significance. Survey question 55—I demonstrate effective skills, including the writing of memos, letters,

notes, etc. for different audiences—produced a .001 level of significance. Survey question 59—I participate in community and service organizations—produced a .042 level of significance.

The NASSP skill dimensions addressed in these questions are Decisiveness (Q23), Leadership (Q33), Oral Communication (Q49, Q52), Written Communication (Q54, Q55) and Range of Interest (Q59). This may suggest that these are important job behaviors regardless of gender. However, upon further analysis could not validate these findings. No Post Hoc tests results were generated because the oneway ANOVA could not generate data between two groups.

The results of this study indicate that the level of New Jersey school administrator (elementary, middle, secondary, district office or other) does have an effect on the discrete job behaviors within the skill dimensions identified in the NASSP Assessment Center. The data gathered from respondents found significant differences in five survey questions through the analysis of a oneway ANOVA and through closer examination by using a Post Hoc test of Comparative Means and the Tukey Honest Significant Difference measurement. Therefore, the Null Hypothesis is rejected for research question one.

The results of this study indicate that the number of elapsed years for New Jersey school administrators (elementary, middle, secondary, district office or other) does have an effect on the discrete job behaviors within the skill dimensions identified in the NASSP Assessment Center. The data gathered from respondents found significant differences in five survey questions through the analysis of a

oneway ANOVA and significant differences in two additional survey questions using a Post Hoc test of Comparative Means and the Tukey Honest Significant Difference measurement. Therefore, the Null Hypothesis is rejected for research question two. The subsidiary questions were answered by careful examination of frequency tables for following: job behaviors within identified NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions demonstrated with the most frequency, job behaviors demonstrated with the least frequency and participation in professional development activities within the defined NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions.

The results of the study indicate that the majority of survey questions, 61 of 73 (84%) yielded more high-end behavior responses—specifically 3 (sometimes), 4 (frequently) or 5 (almost always). This demonstrated that the majority of participants perceived that they strongly demonstrated the discrete job behaviors within the 12 identified NASSP Assessment Center dimensions.

The results of the study also indicate that in 12 of the 73 (16%) survey questions the low-end behavior responses—specifically 1 (hardly ever) and 2 (on occasion) appeared to be related to professional development activities within each of the 12 identified NASSP skill dimensions.

The qualitative data covered a range of participant responses to the question: Do you feel that if you increase the demonstration of job behaviors within identified NASSP skill dimensions your job performance will improve? Why or why not? This question did not address the evaluation of job performance by either superiors or subordinates. This provided the respondents an opportunity to answer truthfully and

give supportive reasons for their answers. The responses covered a range of perceptions by the respondents who chose to answer this question. A small percentage of the responses were negative, that is, the respondents did not perceive that an increase in the demonstration of job behaviors within identified NASSP skill dimensions would improve their job performance. In fact, those respondents felt that the assessment center was of no value to them, and in some cases, expressed that their participation was a waste of time and money. However, most responses were positive and the respondents did perceive that an increase in the demonstration of job behaviors within identified NASSP skill dimensions would improve their job performance. They also felt that the NASSP skill dimensions accurately reflected the skills of a school administrator.

Recommendations For Future Research

The literature on the NASSP Assessment Center model is limited in scope. The use of assessment centers and simulations have enabled school boards and superintendents to make some preliminary judgments for the selection of administrators. NASSP policy does not permit the appraisal of persons already holding a principalship (Hughes, 1986, p. 19). However, Hughes (1986) sees promise in what he calls Assessment Center Technology (ACT) as a tool to diagnose the degree to which relevant job skills are present.

Review of the studies involved with preparation and training programs reveal a lack of concentrated efforts to develop the generic skills identified by NASSP. Internships appear to be the "best" method of instruction for school administrators

and appear to increase the development of the twelve generic NASSP skills (Pantili et al, 1991, p. 11). The Department of Educational Leadership at Western Kentucky University (WKU) established an NASSP Assessment center in January 1988.

Although true to the assessment model developed by NASSP, a critical component of the Western Kentucky Assessment Center (WKAC) is the participation of practicing principals in developmental activities. Thus, the WKU program has extended the assessment process from purely selection to strengthening leadership skills by participating in another NASSP program, Leader 1,2,3. This program was developed by NASSP to provide practicing administrators training in conceptualizing and practicing instructional leadership (Richardson, 1988, p. 6).

The assessment center in Mississippi was originally designed to identify individuals in rural school districts who had administrative potential but who had little or no opportunity to demonstrate their capabilities, and to encourage those persons to become qualified administrators (Boyer, 1978, p. 2).

Other models of assessment have looked at dimensions similar to those in the NASSP Assessment Center model. The ADI model also has 12 dimensions to be analyzed and assessed, including Instructional Leadership. The ADI was established as a joint project of the University of Washington, Washington State University, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Association of Washington School Principals, and the Washington Association of School Administrators (Sirotnik & Durden, 1996, p. 6). ADI measures Human Relations Competence, Judgment, Organizational Ability, Educational Values, Oral Communication, Written

Communication, Problem Analysis, Decisiveness, Creativity, Group Leadership, Resourcefulness and Instructional Leadership. Many of the dimensions are measured in the NASSP Assessment Center model.

Another assessment instrument, the PAL (Profile for the Assessment of School Leaders) that comes out of Decatur, Georgia has shown value as an administrator evaluation tool and a guide for staff development programs. The PAL contains eight leadership competency areas: Relating to Others; Communicating Effectively; Making Decisions; Planning and Organizing; Supervising and Evaluating; Improving Professionally (and providing the staff the opportunity to improve); Protecting Time-on-Task for Teacher and Student; and Holding High Expectations for Students and Teachers (Tucker, Bray, Bouie & Freeman, 1987, p. 8).

This study was of significance in one NASSP Assessment Center in the state of New Jersey. Twelve survey questions were found to be statistically significant within the areas of level of administrator (elementary, middle, secondary, district office or other) and number of years elapsed since participants attended the NASSP Assessment Center—I ask follow-up questions to clarify information; I delegate responsibilities to others and follow up to determine their progress; I have participated in professional development activities related to sensitivity; I have participated in professional development activities related to oral communication; I have participated in professional development activities related to range of interest; I encourage the use of charts and/or visual aids during the discussion; I move to the goals of the organization by supporting, clarifying or restating group decisions; I

weigh the quality of my responses; I use clear, sensitive language when responding to the requests of others for assistance; My writing contains no errors in grammar, syntax or spelling; I demonstrate effective skills, including the writing of memos, letters, notes, etc. for different audiences; and I have participated in professional development activities related to written communication. The NASSP skill dimensions for these survey questions included Judgment, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Sensitivity, Oral Communication, Leadership, Written Communication and Range of Interest. These are eight of the twelve NASSP skill dimensions. Nationally, these findings might provide some fruitful places for further study among NASSP participants. Perhaps surveying respondents within one to two years after their assessment center experience might yield even more statistically significant results and include more of the NASSP skill dimensions. This study points to a strong support for the generic behaviors considered paramount for improved job performance for school administrators.

Fourteen survey questions were statistically indicative of possible trends: I have participated in professional development activities related to organizational ability; I have participated in professional development activities related to decisiveness; I write clearly and concisely; I demonstrate competence in the discussion of educational, political, current events, economic and other topics; I am self-disciplined; I have a well-reasoned educational philosophy; I seek to identify the cause of a problem; I reflect on the overall picture and determine the relative importance of items before taking action; I identify relevant facts and consider them

when making decisions; I encourage the use of charts and/or visual aids during the discussion; I support others who help move the group toward achieving its goal; I have participated in professional development activities related to leadership; I am self-disciplined; and I directly confront personal and professional obstacles. The NASSP skill dimensions for these survey questions included Judgment, Organizational Ability, Decisiveness, Leadership, Written Communication, Range of Interest, Personal Motivation and Educational Values. These are eight of the NASSP skill dimensions. These generic behaviors also merit greater depth of study. They might become statistically significant if the survey is administered within one or two years after participants have been assessed.

The survey questions that addressed participation in professional development activities within each of the identified skill areas received the greatest number of low-end responses—specifically 1 (hardly ever) and 2 (on occasion). In the analysis of qualitative data, professional development was frequently cited as an area of concern. According to Dunn (1999), “If we do not assess prospective principals carefully or continue staff development programs after they are selected, we will be criticized publicly and often about our inability to select or develop successful leaders.” (p. 117). Professional development practices for school administrators should be examined more thoroughly. The results of this study point to a need for district inservice programs to develop the specific skills that are assessed. The sharing of the results of this study with professional organizations such as the New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association can inform future professional development programs.

In addition, the results can direct attention to the improvement of principal preparation programs. As the need for administrators increases across all levels of instruction (elementary, middle and secondary), districts might want to look at potential administrative candidates from their pool of teachers and other staff and develop assessment procedures that are in line with the NASSP skill dimensions. The utility of assessment centers is readily apparent when candidates have little or no opportunity to demonstrate managerial skills on their jobs or when supervisors have little basis for identify potential administrators from among their subordinates (Wendel et al, 1992, p. 90). Districts might also team with institutions of higher learning to identify candidates with potential administrative talents.

This study, although limited to the state of New Jersey, has identified discrete job behaviors within NASSP skill dimensions that school administrators perceive as having an effect on their performance. Several job behaviors identified within the Administrator Assessment Program Survey (AAPS) were found to be statistically significant and worthy of further study. Others, although not statistically significant, were identified as trends to be examined further through more extensive research. NASSP Assessment Centers in other states can conduct this study to corroborate or refute these results.

Future researchers are encouraged to replicate this study and utilize the Administrator Assessment Program Survey to measure the perceptions of school administrators toward NASSP Assessment Center skill dimensions and their job behaviors. Assessment will continue to gain importance and credibility as a tool for

identifying potential candidates for administrative positions. Assessment will also be extended into the areas of professional development and evaluation of administrators. For public education to be more effective, highly qualified leaders must be attracted into the profession and the assessment method is second to none in identifying persons with appropriate skills (Tucker et al, p. 14).

References

Anderson, M. (1991). Principals: How to train, Recruit, Select, Induct, and evaluate leaders for America's schools. Eugene OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. ED337 843.

Baltzell, C. D., & Dentler, R. A. (1983). Selecting American school principals: A sourcebook for educators. Washington, DC: National Institute for Education.

Bass, B. M. (1981). Stogdill's handbook of leadership. (Rev. ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Bley, J. E. (1983). Use of an assessment center for selecting administrators and diagnosing inservice needs. (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University, 1983). UMI Dissertation Services, AAT 8315662

Boyer, R. A. (1978). Use of assessment centers in the selection and training of school administrators. Paper presented at the Canadian School Trustees' Association Congress on Education (Report No. EA 010 951). Toronto, Ontario. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 161 134).

Brockel, R. J. (1989). A study of assessment centers and the skills, proficiencies, and traits viewed as correlates of the on-the-job performance of New Jersey public school principals. (Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University, 1989). UMI Dissertation Services, AAT 8915620

Clark, K. E., & Clark, M. (1996). Choosing to lead. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Clark, S. S. (1995). What leadership skills do principals really need? The School Administrator, 52 (5), 8-11.

Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (2001). Recruitment and hiring. Trends and issues: Training of school administrators. Retrieved November 4, 2001 from the World Wide Web: http://eric.uoregon.edu/trends_issues/training/02.html

Council for Basic Education. (1984). Council for basic education looks at selection of school principals. Press Release. Washington, DC.

Covey, S. (1989). The seven habits of highly effective people. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Doud, J. L., & Keller, E. P. (1988). The K-8 principal in 1998. Principal, 78 (1), 5, 6, 8, 10-12.

Duke, D. L. (1986). The aesthetics of leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22 (1), 7-27.

Duke, D. L., & Iwanicki, E. (1992). Principal assessment and the notion of "Fit." Peabody Journal of Education, 68 (1), 25-36.

Duke, D. L. & Stiggins, R. J. (1985). Evaluating the performance of principals—A descriptive study. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21 (4), 71-98.

Dunn, M. B. (1999). The NASSP Assessment Center: It's still the best. NASSP Bulletin, 83 (603), 117-120.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Some schools work and more can. Social Policy, 17 (5), 17-18.

Educational Testing Service (1996). The ISLLC Standards. Preliminary Candidate Information Bulletin: Principals Licensure Assessment. Under the contract in response to CCSSO (Council of Chief State School Officers) RFP 95-217.

Ford, M. J. (1987). An attitude survey of NASSP principal assessment center candidates. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 1987). UMI Dissertation Services, AAT 8712464

Farmer, N. T., Jr. (1985). An analysis of the effects of participation in the National Association of Secondary School Principals' assessment center in Howard County, Maryland. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland College Park, 1985). UMI Dissertation Services, AAT 8608799

Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1986). The social context of effective schools. American Journal of Education, 94 (3), 329-55.

Hambrick, D. C., & Fukutomi, G. D. S. (1991). The seasons of a CEO's tenure. Academy of Management Review, 16 (4), 719-742.

Helquist, F. J. (1988). A study of principal skills demonstrated by Wisconsin participants in the National Association of Secondary School Principals Administrative Assessment Center. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1988). UMI Dissertation Services, AAT 8813045

Hersey, P. W. (1977). NASSP's assessment center—From concept to practice. NASSP Bulletin, 61 (410), 74-76.

Hersey, P. W. (1982). The NASSP Assessment Center develops leadership talent. Educational Leadership: Journal of the Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development, N.E.A., 39 (5), 370-71.

Hersey, P. W. (1986). Selecting and developing educational leaders. The School Administrator, 43 (3), 16-17.

Hersey, P. W. (1987). How NASSP helps identify, develop superior principals. (1987 Seminar on Innovative Approaches to Assessment of Teaching Staff in the Education Service). Edinburgh: Moray House College of Education and the University of Edinburgh, Scotland.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1998). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Howe, M. L. (1986). Components of good assessor training. NASSP Bulletin, 70 (486), 30-32.

Hoyle, J. R., English, F. W., & Steffy, B. E. (1985). Skills for successful school leaders. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Hughes, L. W. (1986). Applying assessment center technology: A modest proposal to school study councils. Catalyst for Change, 15 (3), 17-20.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. (1996). Standards for school leaders. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. (1996). Standards for school leaders: Adopted by full consortium. Retrieved November 4, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ccsso.org/isllc1.htm>.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. (1999). The portfolio takes shape. Work in Progress, 4 (1), 1-6. Retrieved November 4, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ccsso.org/pdfs/isllc>.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (2000). The work continues on the ISLLC portfolio. Work in Progress, 5 (1), 1-6. Retrieved November 4, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ccsso.org/pdfs/isllc>.

Jeswald, T. A. (1977). A new approach to identifying administrative talent. NASSP Bulletin, 61 (410), 79-82.

Kelley, E., & Wendel, F. (1987). Searching for excellence? Assessment centers provide solutions. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Klauke, A. (1990). Preparing school administrators. ERIC Digest Series Number EA 57. (Report No. EA 022 487). Eugene, OR: (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 326 939).

Lashway, L. (1997). Measuring leadership potential. ERIC Digest 115. Retrieved November 4, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest115.html>

Levrett, L. (2001). Presentation at the New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Conference November 10, 2001: Atlantic City, New Jersey.

Moses, J. L. (1977). Developing an assessment center program for school administrators. NASSP Bulletin 61, (411), 76-78.

Murphy, J., Shipman, N., & Pearlman, M. (1997). Strengthening educational leadership: The ISLLC standards. NAESP Streamlined Seminar 16, (1), 1-4.

Murray, H. A. (1938). Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford University Press.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2002). Development Programs: 21st century school administrator skills. Retrieved June 1, 2002 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.nassp.org/training/programs.htm>

National Association of Secondary School Principals (n.d.). Standards of quality. Reston: VA.

New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association. (1993). Principals Assessment Clears NJ Senate. Capitol Update S93. Trenton, NJ.

New Jersey State Department of Education. (1997). Update on performance assessment requirement for principal candidates. Retrieved June 1, 2002 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.state.nj.us/njded/educators/license/1127.htm>

Pantili, L. et al. (1991). Principal assessment: Effective or not? A meta-analytic model. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (Report No. EA 023 031). Chicago, IL: (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 333 540).

Pokorny, N. G. (1985). Techniques used in the selection of public school principals in the United States (Personnel, hiring). (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder, 1985.) UMI Dissertation Services, AAT 8522694

Richardson, M. D. (1988). The administrative assessment center: An opportunity for service. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Kentucky Association of School Superintendents. (Report No. EA 020 388). Louisville, KY: (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 301 930).

Rost, J. C. (1991). Leadership for the twenty-first century. New York: Wiley.

Schmitt, N. (1980). Validation of the NASSP Assessment Center: An overview and some preliminary findings. NASSP Bulletin, 64 (438), 107-17.

Schmitt, N., & Cohen, S. A. (1990). Criterion-related validity of the assessment center for selection of school administrators. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 4 (2), 203-12.

Sirotnik, K.A. & Durden, P. C. (1996). The validity of administrator performance assessment systems: The ADI as a case-in-point. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32 (4), 539-555.

Steller, A. W. (1984). Chart a course for selecting new principals. Updating School Board Policies, 15 (5), 1-3.

Thomson, S. D. (1983). Introduction. Criterion-related and content validity of the NASSP assessment center. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Tirozzi, G. N. (2001). The artistry of leadership: The evolving role of the secondary school principal. Phi Delta Kappan 82, (6), 434-440.

Tucker, N. A., Bray, S. W., Bouie, Sr., E. L., & Freeman, R. R. (1987). Profile for the assessment of educational leaders. Spectrum: Journal of School Research and Information 5, (4), 7-14.

Walden, D. L. (1985). The effects of the NASSP assessment center process on self-improvement of assesses (administrators). (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder, 1985). UMI Dissertation Services, AAT 8608650

Wendel, F. C., Schmidt, A. H., & Loch, J. (1992). Measurements of personality and leadership: Some relationships. Lincoln: University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Wendel, F. C., & Uerling, D. F (1989). Assessment centers—Contributing to preparation programs for principals. NASSP Bulletin, 73 (515), 74-79.

Witte, R. S., & Witte, J. S. (1997). Statistics (5th ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace.

Williamson, S. A., & Schaalman, M. L. (1980). The assessment of occupation competence. 2. Assessment centers: Theory, practice, and implications for education. (Report No. 40-780028). Washington, DC: (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 191 166).

Yukl, G. (1998). Leadership in Organizations (Rev. ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Appendices

Appendix A

Administrator Assessment Program Survey

ADMINISTRATOR ASSESSMENT PROGRAM SURVEY©
(AAPS)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION—PLEASE CHECK OR COMPLETE

Gender: ___M___F Current Position: Elementary:___Secondary:___Middle:___

District Office: _____ Other, please specify: _____

Years in Education: _____ Years in Current Position: _____ School District: ___Urban___Suburban

Ethnic Background: _White non-Hispanic_Hispanic_African-Amer._Other, please specify_____

WHAT YEAR DID YOU PARTICIPATE IN THE ASSESSMENT CENTER?

1994___1995___1996___1997___1998___1999___2000___2001___2002___

Instructions: Read the definition for each identified skill dimension. Think about your current job behavior and practice as it relates to the skill dimension and its definition. Read the statement under the definition and select the best behavioral response. Then circle the number of your response. At the end of each section there is room to write any comments or observations that you wish to share relevant to the particular skill dimension. Thank you.

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE TO RESPOND TO EACH ITEM BY CIRCLING YOUR RESPONSE

1=hardly ever 2=on occasion 3=sometimes 4=frequently 5=almost always

PROBLEM ANALYSIS: Ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; searching for information with a purpose.

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I look at background information to determine important elements of a situation or problem. (Q1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I ask brief, clear questions to obtain information. (Q2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. When I develop plans, I prioritize the steps. (Q3) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I help others maintain direction in order to complete a task. (Q4) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I assist others in reaching the best decision to solve a problem. (Q5) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I develop a perspective when looking at a problem and attempt to formulate alternate approaches. (Q6) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I have participated in professional development activities related to problem analysis. (Q7) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments: _____

JUDGMENT: Ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information; skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to evaluate critically written communications.

1. I seek to identify the cause of a problem. (Q8)	1	2	3	4	5
2. I ask follow-up questions to clarify information. (Q9)	1	2	3	4	5
3. I develop sound reasons to support my position about a situation or issue. (Q10)	1	2	3	4	5
4. I listen to the reasons of others and weigh them in reaching a final decision. (Q11)	1	2	3	4	5
5. I am willing to move to the group's point of view based on sound reasoning. (Q12)	1	2	3	4	5
6. I exercise caution to avoid premature responses or commitments to unfamiliar people or groups. (Q13)	1	2	3	4	5
7. I have participated in professional development activities related to judgment . (Q14)	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY: Ability to plan schedule, and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on one's time.

1. I develop action plans. (Q15)	1	2	3	4	5
2. I establish timelines, schedules, and deadlines. (Q16)	1	2	3	4	5
3. I delegate responsibilities to others and follow up to determine their progress. (Q17)	1	2	3	4	5
4. I monitor and adjust plans as needed. (Q18)	1	2	3	4	5
5. I efficiently make use of available resources. (Q19)	1	2	3	4	5
6. I reflect on the overall picture and determine the relative importance of items before taking action. (Q20)	1	2	3	4	5
7. I have participated in professional development activities related to organizational ability . (Q21)	1	2	3	4	5

Comments: _____

DECISIVENESS: Ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly.

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I make clear recommendations to implement initiatives to improve the teaching/learning process. (Q22) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I take action to bring issues to closure. (Q23) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I look at short-term and long-term objectives when making decisions. (Q24) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I identify relevant facts and consider them when making decisions. (Q25) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I am able to see the big picture. (Q26) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I have participated in professional development activities related to decisiveness . (Q27) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments: _____

LEADERSHIP: Ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction; to interact with a group effectively and to guide them to the accomplishment of a task.

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I initiate discussion around a problem or issue. (Q28) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I help the group focus by summarizing the main points of the discussion. (Q29) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I discourage inappropriate behaviors that keep the group from moving forward. (Q30) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I encourage the use of charts and/or visual aids during the discussion. (Q31) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I support others who help move the group toward achieving its goal or accomplishing its task. (Q32) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I move to the goals of the organization by supporting, clarifying or restating group decisions. (Q33) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I have participated in professional development activities related to leadership . (Q34) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments: _____

SENSITIVITY: Ability to perceive the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; skill in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I offer verbal and non-verbal recognition of the feelings, concerns and needs of others. (Q35) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I respect people whose backgrounds are different from mine. (Q36) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. In dealing with a controversial issue, I tend to anticipate a negative impact and act to reduce or divert it. (Q37) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I demonstrate support for others by learning and using their names. (Q38) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I weigh the quality of my responses. (Q39) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I handle emotionally stressful situations by calmly responding to others. (Q40) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I use clear, sensitive language when responding to the requests of others for assistance. (Q41) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. I respond to people who contact me. (Q42) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. I have participated in professional development activities related to sensitivity. (Q43) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments: _____

STRESS TOLERANCE: Ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet.

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I am aware of physical signs of stress that my behavior may demonstrate to others. (Q44) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I am aware of emotional signs of stress that my behavior may demonstrate to others. (Q45) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. If I detect signs of stress, I alter my behavior in an effort to reduce or eliminate them. (Q46) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. I demonstrate skill in handling views that are in opposition to mine. (Q47) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I have participated in professional development activities related to stress tolerance . (Q48) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments: _____

ORAL COMMUNICATION: Ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts or ideas.

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I make no errors in grammar and usage when I speak. (Q49) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I present clear thoughts and articulate them appropriately in one-on-one, small and large group situations. (Q50) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I demonstrate effective presentation skills including opening and closing remarks, good eye contact, confidence, rapport and use of supporting aids. (Q51) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I have participated in professional development activities related to oral communication . (Q52) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments: _____

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION: Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences—students, teachers, parents, et al.

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I write clearly and concisely. (Q53) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. My writing contains no errors in grammar, syntax or spelling. (Q54) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I demonstrate effective skills, including the writing of memos, letters, notes, etc. for different audiences. (Q55) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I have participated in professional development activities related to written communication . (Q56) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments: _____

RANGE OF INTEREST: Competence to discuss a variety of subjects---educational, political, current events, economic, etc.: desire to actively participate in events.

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I demonstrate competence in the discussion of educational, political, current events, economic and other topics. (Q57) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I participate in events related to cultural, recreational, academic and non-academic pursuits. (Q58) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I participate in community and service organizations. (Q59) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I have participated in professional development activities related to range of interest . (Q60) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments: _____

PERSONAL MOTIVATION: Need to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing.

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I obtain personal satisfaction in carrying out the duties and responsibilities of my position. (Q61) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. It is important to achieve in all of the activities I attempt. (Q62) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I strive to be a continuous learner. (Q63) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I am self-disciplined. (Q64) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I directly confront personal and professional obstacles. (Q65) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I have participated in professional development activities related to personal motivation . (Q66) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments: _____

EDUCATIONAL VALUES: Possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change.

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I have a well-reasoned educational philosophy. (Q67) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. My educational philosophy guides my leadership vision. (Q68) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I am receptive to new ideas and change. (Q69) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. I encourage others to be receptive to new ideas and change (Q70) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I take advantage of opportunities to articulate my values to the educational community. (Q71) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I am passionate about oral and written communication of my values to staff, students and parents. (Q72) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I have participated in professional development activities related to educational values. (Q73) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comments: _____

PLEASE ANSWER: DO YOU FEEL THAT IF YOU INCREASE THE DEMONSTRATION OF JOB BEHAVIORS WITHIN IDENTIFIED NASSP SKILL DIMENSIONS YOUR JOB PERFORMANCE WILL IMPROVE? WHY OR WHY NOT?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PROMPT, THOUGHTFUL RESPONSE.

DORIAN L. SKEETE ©2001

ADMINISTRATOR ASSESSMENT PROGRAM SURVEY©

OPTIONAL:

Instructions: Fill in the blanks and return with your survey if you would like to receive the results of this study. If not, please return the survey in the stamped envelope.

Thank you.

NAME:

ADDRESS:

Appendix B
Letters of Solicitation

March, 2002

Dr. Ronald Batistoni
Director of National Assessment
and Development Programs
NJPSA
12 Centre Drive
Monroe Township, New Jersey 08831

Dear Dr. Batistoni:

I am a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall University in the Executive Doctoral Program, College of Education and Human Services, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision.

I am engaged in research on the perceptions of elementary, middle and secondary School Administrators who have participated in the NASSP (National Association of Secondary School Principals) Assessment Center Program to obtain principal's licensure in the state of New Jersey. The accompanying survey is part of that research and will provide data for my dissertation. The purpose of the research is to analyze the perceptions of practicing New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators with respect to their participation in the NASSP Assessment Center Program and their job behaviors. The survey will not take more than twenty minutes to complete.

The survey that will be used is an original one. It is the ADMINISTRATOR ASSESSMENT CENTER SURVEY and it is comprised of demographic information and statements about which respondents make judgments using a Likert scale. The scale ratings are from 1 to 5, with 1 indicating "hardly ever" and 5 indicating "almost always." It also contains open-ended questions.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Refusal to participate or a decision to discontinue participation at any time will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to any potential subject.

All information will remain confidential; no individuals, schools, or school districts will be identified by name in the dissertation to preserve anonymity. The survey responses will be locked in a file cabinet under my supervision at home to ensure confidentiality.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached at (973) 275-2974.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Collegially,

Dorian L. Skeete
Doctoral Candidate

Enclosure



April, 2002

Dear NASSP Assessment Center Participant:

I am a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall University in the Executive Doctoral Program, College of Education and Human Services, Department of Educational Administration and Supervision.

I am engaged in research on the perceptions of elementary, middle and secondary School Administrators who have participated in the NASSP (National Association of Secondary School Principals) Assessment Center Program to obtain principal's licensure in the state of New Jersey. The accompanying survey is part of that research and will provide data for my dissertation. The purpose of the research is to analyze the perceptions of practicing New Jersey elementary, middle and secondary school administrators with respect to their participation in the NASSP Assessment Center Program and their job behaviors. The survey will not take more than twenty minutes to complete.

The survey that will be used is an original one. It is the ADMINISTRATOR ASSESSMENT CENTER SURVEY and it is comprised of demographic information and statements about which respondents make judgments using a Likert scale. The scale ratings are from 1 to 5, with 1 indicating "hardly ever" and 5 indicating "almost always." It also contains open-ended questions.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Refusal to participate or a decision to discontinue participation at any time will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

All information will remain confidential; no individuals, schools, or school districts will be identified by name in the dissertation to preserve anonymity. The survey responses will be locked in a file cabinet under my supervision at home to ensure confidentiality. The records will be kept completely confidential and no additional persons will have access to research records. There are no anticipated risks to the individuals who participate in this research. There are no expected benefits from the research.

The principal researcher, Dorian L. Skeete, should be contacted for answers to pertinent questions about the research and participant rights. She may be reached at the Executive Ed.D Program, College of Education and Human Services, Seton Hall University, 400 South Orange Avenue, South Orange, NJ 07079. The phone number is (973) 275-2728.

Your return of these materials constitutes your consent to participate in this study.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The chairperson of the IRB may be reached at (973) 275-2974.

I hope that you will assist me in this important and timely research by completing the survey. **Please mail the materials as soon as possible but no later than Tuesday, April 23, 2002. A stamped, addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience. Thank you in advance for your assistance.**

Collegially,

Dorian L. Skeete
Doctoral Candidate

Enclosure

College of Education and Human Services
Executive Ed.D. Program
Tel. 973.275.2728
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2685

Appendix C

Approval Letter from IRB (Institutional Review Board)



March 4, 2002

Dorian L. Skeete
839F Valley Street
Union, NJ 07083

Dear Ms. Skeete:

The Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board has reviewed the information you have submitted addressing the concerns for your proposal entitled "New Jersey Elementary, Middle and Secondary School Administrators' Perceptions of the Relationship between NASSP Assessment Center Skill Dimensions and Job Behaviors." Your research protocol is hereby approved as amended through expedited review. The IRB reserves the right to recall the proposal at any time for full review. Enclosed for your records is the signed Request for Approval form.

The Institutional Review Board approval of your research is valid for a one-year period from the date of this letter. During this time, any changes to the research protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to their implementation.

According to federal regulations, continuing review of already approved research is mandated to take place at least 12 months after this initial approval. You will receive communication from the IRB Office for this several months before the anniversary date of your initial approval.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mary F. Ruzicka, Ph.D.
Professor
Director, Institutional Review Board

cc: Daniel Gutmore, Ph.D.

Office of Institutional Review Board
Presidents Hall
Tel: 973.275.2974 • Fax: 973.275.2978
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2641

Appendix D

Qualitative Data Comments by NASSP Skill Dimension

QUALITATIVE COMMENTS BY NASSP SKILL DIMENSION

PROBLEM ANALYSIS

I have a natural tendency to be a problem solver. I am aware and always looking for long term systemic solutions that are consistent with short term solutions.

This is a very important part of the principal's job. It is vital to step back, plan, and move ahead objectively.

Professional development activities in (#7), refer to courses taken in grad school.

It took a number of years to develop effective problem-solving strategies—some trial and error was eye-opening.

Not only does this apply to education, but also to my private consulting decisions dealing with total quality management.

This is the second most important skill dimension.

As a doctoral student, I have studied problem analysis and utilize strategies to identify the true problem.

Limitations imposed by time constraints.

The best training I receive in this area was data analysis at the Principal Center for the Garden State and Kepner Tryoe Decision Analysis. One of the NASSP skill dimensions for which I received a high score.

JUDGMENT

I always maintain the right to make the final decision based on formal/legal requirements over group point of view.

#6—Extremely important.

Again experience has taught me to go slowly when making a decision, particularly if it is an issue that is emotionally charged. I also learned quickly that a top-down approach does not work except when all other involved parties do not want to be in the forefront.

I am extremely cautious to move to the group's point of view.

Judgment cannot be taught. It is very instinctual based on experience and humanistic relations. Common sense reigns and without it, good judgment is non-existent.

Time constraints.

College courses at graduate level, developed skills.

ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY

I am new to my position; I am learning a great deal in this area.

This is a tough category. One makes plans, but "life gets in the way."

#7 refers to grad school courses.

I do have issues with delegating responsibilities and this is an area I am working on to salvage sanity.

It is difficult for me to delegate. I know & prefer to do it myself because I do it better & to perfection; however, I work with a team.

That old saying, "If you fail to plan, you plan to fail" is so very true. Planning is one of the most important issues to address when working in administration.

I have to be well-organized.

Time constraints.

Coaching background required these skills.

This is my weakest area. Long day, volumes of paperwork and increased demands on my time affect my organizational ability.

DECISIVENESS

I am very decisive; I sometimes delay my decision for a greater good.

#5—The big picture as far as I know it. There are often other "agenda" than what is put forth in a district.

I try not to make "rash" decisions but I definitely like to bring closure to issues. My main concern is to make decisions that benefit children and the curriculum we are charged to deliver.

Again this is something that is inherent. The big picture has be seen or an individual will absolutely FAIL as an administrator.

Time constraints.

Necessity in coaching success.

One of those areas I scored highest among the NASSP skill dimensions.

LEADERSHIP

I am new and learning a great deal in this area. I have a great deal of raw talent in this area.

#7 refers to grad school courses.

No one appreciates time-wasting meetings—it is important to have a clean agenda for each meeting time to keep the group focused.

Excluding people from your decision-making process is a mistake. Incorporating as many people as possible when making a decision empowers them and you have less opposition which is desirable.

I am a very task oriented individual.

This is the most important skill dimension.

Time constraints.

Background in athletics honed skills as leader.

Another area in which I received a high score.

Problems with leadership occur in education because most educational institutions are run in a dictatorial fashion. Power is kept close, consequently the

struggle for power and identity are ongoing as positions are filled. Strong leadership skills are a threat.

SENSITIVITY

I am appropriately sensitive and very sensitive by nature.

This is so important. It alone can make or break a principalship. People's perceptions are their realities.

Accessibility and credibility aid me when dealing with issues that may be emotionally charged.

If you do not go overboard with sensitivity you'll be perceived as arrogant and uncaring.

Time constraints.

These skills are learned by observing successful educational leaders.

Background in Psychology.

STRESS TOLERANCE

I handle stress very well; I exercise; I have a confidant to talk to.

Another tough one. Stress goes with the job. "Control" of stress is hard.

Having answered the above as I have, it is important to note that often my own physical and emotional well-being is comprised.

Important to survival.

Coaching experience requires stress tolerance & management.

I am aware of the effects of stress on my physical and emotional well-being, but don't take time to take care of myself. The demands of my job and family are far too great.

ORAL COMMUNICATION

I need to work on this. I need to plan and organize better. I frequently do not have adequate time or energy to prepare for presentations.

This is more important than one might think. We are judged by how we speak, dress, write, & act.

I have made several local county and state presentations and formal presentations are always grammatically accurate and well articulated.

In my final presentation at the principal's assessment I was the only one who did not have grammar, speech & spelling errors.

I managed a professional "Speakers Bureau" in my previous employment.

Being in an urban district, I must always, as should the staff, use perfect English—or as perfect as possible—at all times. Broken English on the PA system is completely unacceptable.

Time constraints.

Passion and confidence are critical components of oral communication.
 Teach college courses.
 I taught English for 25 years.
 Speech Theatre degree. I have experience in my previous position as a staff developer & public relations coordinator.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

I am an effective and persuasive writer.
 #4—I was an English major. Perfection in written communication is of major importance to me.

I have written many grants and applications for recognition awards and have met with success. It is important that written communications are accurate and correct. People make judgments regarding written work. Each month I write an article for a PTO newsletter and make sure it is accurate and correct also.

My undergraduate majors were French & English.

After completing the assessment program, I was given the highest marks for my writing and skills

Poor handwriting.

Former English teacher.

One of my degrees is in English/Speech & Theatre.

RANGE OF INTEREST

I have always been involved in my church, my community, coaching, and family commitments.

I read everything—professional books, novels, essays—it keeps me on track personally.

My range of interest tends to revolve around issues of education.

Range of interests is very limited for me @ this time of my life, as you can well imagine.

#3—I spend many hours working with projects related to my position that I don't have a lot of time for community or service org. not related to education.

I have been involved in community activities since college (over 10 years).

My job allows me little time for other interests.

Personal interests and pursuits are difficult to maintain in my job as principal.

PERSONAL MOTIVATION

I prioritize in this order. God/Family/work. When I have competing priorities I become conflicted but always defer to the higher priority.

I take great pride in doing a difficult and rewarding job well.

I am very focused in my job and continue to strive for improvement in all areas.

I will never stop learning.

This is something that I feel is intrinsic for me (professional development)

I set clear goals for myself. I establish the next set of goals before the current ones are complete (always thinking ahead to the next accomplishment).

Grad courses emphasized self-evaluation done on a frequent basis.

EDUCATIONAL VALUES

My vision is current. I am realistic and pragmatic when it comes to change. I always seize the moment to encourage change. I am passionate in practice; I am humble and shy by nature.

#6 Expresses my feelings well!

Change and innovation are essential to improved student achievement. Staff members know that I support risk-taking and the implementation of innovative strategies and techniques that enhance the delivery of instruction. It is imperative for leaders in education to articulate their values. I have made many presentations to share our programs and approaches.

My philosophy is "You only live once & this is not a dress rehearsal."

5 & 6—When there is a need to articulate my values I do. My leadership style is such that staff, students & parents are keenly aware of my educ. values.

Values must be dynamic, constantly evaluated & changed.

This is a strength for me and provides a constant source of motivation and purpose.

Appendix E

**Exhibited Frequencies of Gender, Years in Current Position, Years in Education,
School District and Ethnic Background**

Exhibited Frequencies for Gender**GENDER**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	59	13.0	42.4	42.4
	Female	80	17.7	57.6	100.0
	Total	139	30.7	100.0	
Missing	System	314	69.3		
Total		453	100.0		

Exhibited Frequencies for Years in Current Position**Years in Current Position****Years in Current Position**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	49	10.8	35.5	35.5
	2	1	.2	.7	36.2
	2	42	9.3	30.4	66.7
	3	18	4.0	13.0	79.7
	4	3	.7	2.2	81.9
	5	5	1.1	3.6	85.5
	6	8	1.8	5.8	91.3
	7	5	1.1	3.6	94.9
	8	2	.4	1.4	96.4
	9	1	.2	.7	97.1
	10	1	.2	.7	97.8
	14	1	.2	.7	98.6
	17	1	.2	.7	99.3
	26	1	.2	.7	100.0
	Total		138	30.5	100.0
Missing	System	315	69.5		
Total		453	100.0		

Exhibited Frequencies for Total Years in Education

Years in Education

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	1	.2	.7	.7
	3	2	.4	1.4	2.2
	6	7	1.5	5.0	7.2
	7	7	1.5	5.0	12.2
	8	4	.9	2.9	15.1
	9	7	1.5	5.0	20.1
	10	6	1.3	4.3	24.5
	11	3	.7	2.2	26.6
	12	4	.9	2.9	29.5
	13	9	2.0	6.5	36.0
	14	5	1.1	3.6	39.6
	15	4	.9	2.9	42.4
	16	2	.4	1.4	43.9
	17	5	1.1	3.6	47.5
	18	5	1.1	3.6	51.1
	20	7	1.5	5.0	56.1
	21	4	.9	2.9	59.0
	22	2	.4	1.4	60.4
	23	4	.9	2.9	63.3
	24	3	.7	2.2	65.5
	25	6	1.3	4.3	69.8
	26	7	1.5	5.0	74.8
	27	5	1.1	3.6	78.4
	28	4	.9	2.9	81.3
	29	2	.4	1.4	82.7
	30	7	1.5	5.0	87.8
	31	3	.7	2.2	89.9
	32	1	.2	.7	90.6
	33	4	.9	2.9	93.5
	34	6	1.3	4.3	97.8
	35	2	.4	1.4	99.3
	37	1	.2	.7	100.0
	Total	139	30.7	100.0	
Missing	System	314	69.3		
Total		453	100.0		

Exhibited Frequencies for School District

School District

School District

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Urban	29	6.4	21.2	21.2
	Suburban	103	22.7	75.2	96.4
	Rural	5	1.1	3.6	100.0
	Total	137	30.2	100.0	
Missing	System	316	69.8		
Total		453	100.0		

Exhibited Frequencies for Ethnic Background

Ethnic Background

Ethnic Background

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	White, non-Hispanic	123	27.2	89.8	89.8
	Hispaic	4	.9	2.9	92.7
	Afican-American	9	2.0	6.6	99.3
	Other	1	.2	.7	100.0
	Total	137	30.2	100.0	
Missing	System	316	69.8		
Total		453	100.0		