2000

An Assessment of the Perceived Administrative Effectiveness of Boarding School Principals in the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church

Malcolm E. Hutchinson
Andrews University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations

Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation
https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/462

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.
Thank you for your interest in the

Andrews University Digital Library

of Dissertations and Theses.

Please honor the copyright of this document by not duplicating or distributing additional copies in any form without the author’s express written permission. Thanks for your cooperation.
INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

UMI
800-521-0600

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Andrews University
School of Education

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PERCEIVED ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF BOARDING SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN THE NORTH AMERICAN DIVISION OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH

A Dissertation
Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Malcolm E. Hutchinson, Jr.
May 2000

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PERCEIVED ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF BOARDING SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN THE NORTH AMERICAN DIVISION OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH

A dissertation presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Education

by

Malcolm E. Hutchinson, Jr.

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

Chair: Lyndon G. Furst, Ed.D.

Member: Larry D. Burton, Ph.D

Member: James R. Nash, Ed.D.

External Examiner: Gerald W. Coy, D.I.T.

Dean, School of Education
Karen Graham, Ph.D.

Date approved 4-18-00

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
ABSTRACT

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PERCEIVED ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF BOARDING SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN THE NORTH AMERICAN DIVISION OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH

by

Malcolm E. Hutchinson, Jr.

Chair: Lyndon Furst
Title: AN ASSESSMENT OF THE PERCEIVED ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF BOARDING SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN THE NORTH AMERICAN DIVISION OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH

Name of researcher: Malcolm E. Hutchinson, Jr.

Name and degree of chair: Lyndon Furst, Ed.D.

Date completed: May 2000

The purpose of this study was to examine the views held by those whose duties include the management and day-to-day operations of the secondary boarding schools within the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. This refers specifically to superintendents, principals, and staff members.

The survey method was used to gather the data. Respondents were asked to complete an 84-item questionnaire. The population sample was made up of 320 staff members, 32 principals, and 31 superintendents. The data were analyzed using mean scores, percentile rankings, and ANOVA at an alpha of $p<.05$. 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The major findings in the study were:

1. Principals of Adventist boarding schools are highly effective in managing the day-to-day activities involved in school operation (maintenance construct) and orchestrating all the multifaceted tasks and elements needed to make a long-range school program successful (integration construct).

2. Principals of Adventist boarding schools are only moderately effective in instructional leadership (adaptation construct) and in defining objectives and mobilizing adequate resources (goal attainment construct).

3. When compared to a national norm, principals of Adventist boarding schools are perceived as having higher levels of effectiveness than their public school counterparts. This is especially true of staff members' perceptions.

4. Adventist personnel are quite homogenous in their perceptions of the effectiveness of boarding school principals. There are only minimal differences based on demographic variables.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For more than three decades the Effective School Studies (ESS) research program has fostered the hope that a clear set of skills could be identified that would produce effective schools; thus it would be known which administrative skills constitute effective principalship. Additional research has gone on to show that successful principals are one of the key individuals in those schools who are perceived to be effective (Anderson & Lavid, 1986; Barth & Deal, 1982; Greenfield, 1982b; Persell & Cookson, 1982; Sergiovanni & Starrlet, 1998; Webster, 1994; Yukl, 1982).

The role and function of the principal have changed substantially during the 20th century. In this century’s early years principals were concerned primarily with instructional problems, such as the grade placement of pupils, determination of courses of study, and supervision of instruction (Gilland, 1935). During the 1930s, the employment of a full-time school administrator became common place in this nation. These administrators filled their days with the activities, responsibilities, and techniques necessary to carry out policies established by school boards and district supervisors (Kimbrough, 1983). During the human relations movement, from about 1935-1950, principals emphasized morale, group cohesiveness, collaboration, and organizational
dynamics (Owens, 1987). During the decade of the 1950s, the emphases seemingly shifted once again to the "scientific management" period, it focused on efficiency, attention to detail, job descriptions, and general accountability (Owens, 1987). By the early 1960s the role of the principal had again shifted to making great teaching possible within the schools (Knezevich, 1962). In so doing, the boundaries of the principal were pushed from that of policy enforcer to that of facilitator and leader (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). By the 1980s the principal had emerged as the one who set the focus, direction, philosophy, and tone of effectiveness within his or her school (Georgiades, 1984).

Along with the clarifying of the administrative skills necessary for principal effectiveness have come repeated calls from within the educational system (Candoli, Hack, Ray, & Stoll, 1984), as well as from management in business, industry, and the military (Bennett, 1986) for the ability to effectively measure school principals as leaders. Various organizations, including the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and the National Policy Board of Educational Administrators (NPBEA), have formulated a framework of skills that seemingly clarify the skills of effective principals (Council of Chief State School Officers Publications, 1996). In so doing, they have created, to a reasonable extent, a scale to measure the job performance of the school principal.

Within the context of these changes and emerging clarifications of what constitutes the effective school principal, the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) Church operates 34 boarding schools within the United States and Canada. Thus
the SDA Church has a vested interest in maintaining a highly qualified and effective group of principals to operate and manage those schools. From data provided by the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and other sources, it appears that many of these schools have declining student populations. Enrollments have declined so much for some SDA boarding schools in recent years that closure has been necessary.

While the student population at other SDA schools is rapidly increasing, the total overall population for the Seventh-day Adventist boarding system as a whole is in decline. These data are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1

SENIOR BOARDING ACADEMY OPENING ENROLLMENT BY SELECTED YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Opening Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>7,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>7,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>6,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>6,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>5,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>5,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5,496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Data from Annual Reports, by the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventist, Office of Education, 1979-1995, Adventist Heritage Center, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

While there has been a slight recovery in terms of total enrollment in recent years, the total student population has fallen nearly 30% overall in the 16-year period reviewed in Table 1. This, along with the 1997 ten-year study by the North American Division that
projects an additional 10% decline in total student enrollments by the year 2006 (North American Division of Seventh-day Adventist, 1997), leaves little doubt that for many Adventist boarding schools the future appears bleak. In addition to falling enrollment, Smith (1987) alludes to the fact that Seventh-day Adventist families seemingly have changing societal values as they relate to sending their teenage child away from home for schooling, which may exacerbate the challenges faced by the Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principal. It is in this climate that many Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals function and perform their duties as leaders, and are expected to be effective administrators.

Statement of the Problem

Over the past 30 years much thought and study have been given to what skills constitute administrative effectiveness as it pertains to high-school principalship. Within the past 5 years those skills have been identified, and a number of assessment instruments were developed to measure the perceived effectiveness of school principals. However during this period of time only limited studies have been conducted to measure the overall perceived effectiveness of Adventist principals, as currently understood by society and within the context of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and its system of boarding schools. Three such studies are Jaqua (1967) and White (1980), who focused primarily on academic training and certification; and third, the Ballard (1992) study, which examined teaching and non-teaching principals, and how they were perceived in terms of effectiveness. These studies gave indication of the leadership effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist principals.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions held by superintendents, principals, and staff members of Seventh-day Adventist boarding schools regarding the perceived effectiveness of the administrative skills of boarding school principals employed within nine geographic areas known within the Seventh-day Adventist Church as unions (such as the states of Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Illinois which comprise the Lake Union). These nine unions make up what is known as the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists. This study attempted to determine, in the light of nationally recognized administrative competencies, what the administrative skills of the current site-based principals are as perceived by the professionals who oversee and operate those schools as superintendents, principals, and staff members. While no study has been found on this specific topic, several studies have been conducted on various aspects of the Adventist school principalship.

This study measured the perceived effectiveness of the men and women who currently lead as principals in the Seventh-day Adventist boarding school system. This was accomplished by measuring the perceptions of the three professional groups that have direct and indirect responsibilities for the operation of those schools: superintendents as the superordinate, principals as a peer group, and the staff members as the subordinates.

Significance of the Study

This study assessed the perceived administrative effectiveness skills of the SDA boarding school principals. In the years from 1979-1995 the SDA boarding system lost approximately 30% of its total enrollment (see Table 1). This was verified by the 1997
ten-year longitudinal study conducted by the General Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church which predicts an additional decrease in student enrollment rates (North American Division of Seventh-day Adventist, 1997). These facts indicate the need to transform and possibly redesign the Adventist boarding school system, without which it is unlikely that the network of SDA boarding schools in North America can survive as a viable entity.

Tom Smith (1987) highlighted the dynamics of falling enrollments and the fact that for many SDA boarding schools the traditional homogeneous student body no longer exists. In many of today's SDA boarding academies the student population is a microcosm of our multiethnic society (p.45), while the teaching and administrative teams remain overwhelmingly Caucasian. Smith (1987) further adds that many North American Adventist families want their high-school-age child at home, and that one of parents' highest priorities is improvement in the perceived level of academic excellence. They also want to increase the number of advanced placement courses offered by the Adventist high school system. All this is in the Seventh-day Adventist cultural context of Ellen White's (1903) statement that "our ideas of education take too narrow and too low a view" (p. 46).

From the earliest stages in the development of the Seventh-day Adventist Church a high priority has been placed on education and the holistic training of the child, commonly referred to within the culture of Adventism as head, hand, and heart. This can be seen historically in the book *Education* (White, 1903) which establishes the mind-set for Adventist education. Secondly this is supported by the percentage of budgetary
allocations for education of many church entities known as conferences in the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Conferences are groups of churches in a localized region often comprised of one or more states, such as the Michigan Conference of Seventh-day Adventists which encompasses the State of Michigan. For many of these conferences, educational expenses are second only to pastoral salaries in total percentage of monies allocated (North American Division of Seventh-day Adventist, 1997).

In the past 15 years the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church has been closing and combining boarding schools within its system. One such closure (which has since re-opened) was that of Dakota Academy. Lundy and Seibold (1987) give insight on just how painful this process can be for children and adults alike:

After the vote [to close] students stood in clumps. . . . Most of the students interviewed said they would go to Maplewood Academy . . . but lives were being messed up. . . . The conference tithe base is around $2.5 million, and Brown [conference treasurer] estimates that the conference has put close to $500,000 per year into the "Academy." Registering amazement he added, "Conferences with a tithe base two to three times ours don't put that much into an academy." (p. 51)

While the above quote highlights both the personal trauma and the financial dilemma of school closure, the main objective of this study has been to gain insights into the perceptions of SDA boarding school principal effectiveness. Further, how do those perceptions reflect the nationally recognized norms needed by all principals to lead schools?

Shipman one of the contributing authors in the Council of Chief State School Officers document (1996) had this insight on the national norms which relate to both
public and non-public school systems.

Formal leadership in schools and school districts is a complex, multi-faceted task. The ISLLC (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium) standards honor that reality. At the same time, they acknowledge that effective leaders often espouse different patterns of beliefs and act differently from the norm in the profession. Effective school leaders are strong educators anchoring their work on central issues of learning and teaching and school improvement. They are moral agents and social advocates for the children and the communities they serve. (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996, p. 5)

It is with this rationale and understanding that this study was undertaken. It is to give the best insight possible to help strengthen a system of education that many see as vital to the continued development of the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

The reality of change is now upon the Adventist educational boarding school system. Declining enrollments and student diversity are only two of many factors that demand administrative excellence. Only with highly trained and effective school administrators can the Seventh-day Adventist Church in North America expect to continue to provide excellence in education that educates students to connect with and profoundly impact the world in which they live and work. The Seventh-day Adventist boarding school system provides a total lifestyle model of living for the student, during the extremely important formative teen years. These students live on closed campus for weeks at a time in highly structured environments. This study gives added insights into what has constituted and what currently constitutes Adventist school leadership effectiveness as defined by current nationally accepted norms.
Research Questions

This study addresses the following questions:

1. How effective are the administrative skills of SDA boarding school principals as perceived by superintendents, principals, and staff members?

2. How does the perceived effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals compare with national norms?

3. Based on the age, educational level, gender, and years of teaching experience of the responding staff members, is there significant difference in their responses?

Delimitation of the Study

This study surveyed superintendents, principals, and staff members whose duties include the management and the day-to-day operations of North America Seventh-day Adventist boarding schools. This study has importance in light of the fact that a declining pattern of student population has been documented over the past 16 years. This decline possibly places in jeopardy the current boarding school system of the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church as it is currently configured and managed.

While several groups of potential respondents could have been surveyed the three following groups were selected for this study. These groups are: the superintendents (superordinate), principals (peer group), and staff members (subordinate). As a result the outcomes, perceptions, and conclusions of this research are limited to the perceptions of these three groups.
Basic Assumptions

1. The populations surveyed were as accurate as possible in answering the survey/questionnaire.

2. The Diagnostic Assessment School and Principal Effectiveness survey of the United School Administrators of Kansas measures and represents national norms for effective school administrators. Further, it is assumed that these norms can be extrapolated to fit the uniqueness of the Seventh-day Adventist boarding school system.

3. All SDA boarding school principals are spiritually committed to the faith of Christianity as taught and practiced by the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Definition of Terms

Effective School Studies (ESS): An ongoing series of federally funded studies to help facilitate a clear understanding of what constitutes effectiveness in K-12 education.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC): A national group that represents K-12 education and its mother organization The Council of Chief State School Officers. This organization works directly with professional organizations, federal and state governments, state universities, Congress, and the public to provide leadership and a national forum on major educational issues.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP): A national professional organization for secondary-school principals dedicated to professional growth and development through research and support programs.

National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP): An
organization dedicated to the professional growth and development of elementary-school administrators.

**National Policy Board of Educational Administration (NPBEA):** A non-profit organization of university and college professors who work in conjunction with state boards of education directors to help formulate national policies and educational administration training programs and standards.

**Administrators:** Refers to principals.

**Staff:** All members of the staff who are under contract to provide direct and indirect student services.

**Organization of the Study**

Chapter 1 of the study presents an introduction to the study; the statement of the problem; purpose of the study; importance of the study; delimitation of the study; and basic questions that guided the research.

Chapter 2 examines studies of educational administration and the nationally recognized competencies for successful school administration. It also covers a broad scope of literature on the topic of educational leadership and administration as it relates to successful schools, and a review of literature in the subject area of the evaluation of SDA principal.

Chapter 3 describes the populations surveyed, the research design, data collection, methodology, data analysis, and hypotheses tested. The tools used in the study are included.

Chapter 4 describes the data and reports on the results of the data analysis.
Chapter 5 summarizes the study, introduction, conclusions, methodology, population, implications, summary of findings, and recommendations for possible further research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides an overview of the literature pertaining to the study of effective school administration. In doing so it covers six specific areas: (1) the role of the principal in the educational system; (2) perceived characteristics of an effective principal; (3) the principal as an instructional leader; (4) the development of national standards; (5) the process used in the evaluation of principals; and (6) selected studies focusing on Seventh-day Adventist schools and principals in boarding and non-boarding settings.

The Role of the Principal

The origin of the word “principal” comes from the Latin word principalis, denoting the concept of head teacher. In 18th-century America the role of the principal included teaching and carrying out the extra duties of school management (English, 1987). As our nation grew in population, schools grew in numbers; the simple tasks of management gave way to much more complex tasks that included the assessment of new students, their proper placement into the correct grade levels, and course of study (p. 37). Over the course of time, the principal/head teacher found him or herself removed from teaching and the classroom, and more and more involved in the management of the school.
as a whole (Gilland, 1935). During the 20th century several periods of social change have characterized the principal's role in many ways, including school manager, group leader, on-site policy enforcer, leader, and facilitator (Kimbrough, 1983; Knezevich, 1962; Owens, 1987). Currently the principal is perceived as the central person in those schools which are considered most effective (Daresh & Playko, 1997; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration [NCEEA], 1987, Steller, 1988).

Effective school research defines effective schools as those in which student learning exceeds the predicted levels of the student population (Cornett, 1983). Four major components were revealed by the research: (1) The principal is an effective communicator and gives directed leadership; (2) the school's climate is characterized as safe, orderly, and peaceful; (3) high expectations exist for both staff and students; and (4) the instructional goals are measurable and achievable with the available resources (Shoemaker & Fraser, 1981). Additionally, there seems to be a consistent relationship between expectations and achievement. A high correlation exists between principals in schools of both low and high socioeconomic status, who had high expectations for students and the levels of academic achievement reached by the students (Wright, 1987). Expectations and atmosphere seemingly have a direct impact upon pupil performance (Edmonds, 1979; Rowan, 1987; Weller, 1985). The principal is the person who must institute and maintain the focus in order to create and maintain an effective school where student achievement meets or exceeds expectations (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Dwyer, 1984; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987).

The preponderance of research concludes that the principal is the pivotal figure in
effective schools (Lyons, 1987; National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985a; Pugh, 1987; Shilling, 1986; Strother, 1983; Terry, 1999 Vandenberghe, 1987). Strother (1983) brings clarity to the issue in the following way: The principal is often the ‘person in the middle’, caught between the central office and the school board on the one hand, and between the teachers and parents on the other. How a principal handles this position depends not only on his or her personal strengths, weaknesses, and training, but also on popular opinion about what an effective principal should do. Georgiades (1984) stated,

Whereas in many Western European societies the school is responsible for none other than academic functions, in the United States responsibilities range from counseling . . . to athletics, to a myriad of societal concerns. Indeed, American schools are expected to be all things to all people. (p. 4)

Georgiades (1984) gives additional insight to this by describing the American school principalship as possibly the single most complex position in the whole makeup of the American educational system. He or she is expected to provide leadership in curriculum, money management, counseling, and mentoring. Indeed, principals have a significant role in bringing about the success of schools (Georgiades, 1984). It is seldom that one finds an effective school that has an ineffective principal (ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1987). There is not only the science of effectiveness, but also the art of principalship, the two blending together seemingly creates the intrinsic ability to lead schools (Peterson & Finn, 1985).

Dwyer’s (1986) ethnographic of the role of the principal concluded that successful principals act with objectives and goals in mind, but routine behaviors vary so
as to meet the needs of an ever-changing school climate and society. Finn (1987) observed that effective principals were able to state with clarity the goals, objectives, and outcomes they expected from the students and staff. They were active, performance-oriented visionaries.

The motivating influence that a principal has on teachers is a complex phenomenon. For principals to effectively administer, they must be able to function well in a variety of roles, including managerial, instructional, political, and social aspects of performance. Further, a principal cannot be fully effective unless he or she correctly perceives the relationship between the principal and the school curriculum. Principals must understand the enacted curriculum process, not just the official curriculum, and work with teachers to negotiate curriculum meaning (Kanpol & Weisz, p. 15: 1990, see also Schmieder & Cairns, 1996). Thus, principals must possess several skills to be effective. These skills include, but are not limited to, problem solving, decision making, goal setting, and human resource management skills. Furthermore, principals must have strong ability in the areas of interpersonal communication, conflict management, motivation, and mentoring (Hutchinson, 1988).

Cox (1987) found that one of the most important characteristics of effective school leadership is the ability to effect school change in the direction of improvement. Thus, the principal needs to be aware of all factors that have the potential to either obstruct or facilitate change, as well as being cognizant that principals are only one in a group of players who produce effective change. Clark (1995) observed that the principal “as all-knowing patriarch and problem-solver is passé. Today’s principals must be team
builders who can inspire a diverse group of professionals to cooperate” (p. 9). Thus, principals must have a leadership vision and they must possess strategic planning skills.

Webster (1994) conducted a 3-year study of 150 highly effective high-school principals in 23 states and seven countries in which he concluded that no single “model” of effectiveness could be detected. Most managed their schools based on past experience. They were innately able to correctly assess student needs and social expectations, and then translate those perceived expectations into workable school goals and objectives. This innate principal effectiveness is seen by others as a process rather than a one-time event. Most effective leaders enter situations without preconceived notions and adapt their leadership approaches accordingly (Batsis, 1987; Gantner, Daresh, Dunlap, & Newsom, 1999; Goodlad, 1984; Lightfoot, 1983; Rogus & Drury, 1988).

Ambiguity as to their roles can be seen among many principals, no doubt due in part to the diversity of the expectations placed on them, such as: budget manager, curriculum expert, public relations, disciplinarian, planner, instructional leader, visionary, and forecaster. Currently the role of the principal is seen as one that requires flexibility if one is to be perceived as effective. Pugh described that flexibility as “reflection in action” (Pugh, 1987). The principal’s role is paramount and vital to academic and social success (Lyons, 1987; Vandenberghe, 1987). “A strong link exists among cultural characteristics of communities, contents of schooling, and leadership styles of the school administrators, particularly principals” (Burlingame, 1986, p. 67).

In recent years various federal and state governments have tried to pass legislation to improve educational outcomes. While good government is vital and legislated school
support helpful, the ability of government to legislate quality education is doubtful. Howe (1987) states it this way:

I doubt that educational excellence can truly be legislated. Instead, I believe that excellence has to be patiently grown in schools that are given the resources to nurture that process. Some of the most significant building blocks of excellence in schools certainly cannot be legislated, and they may be destroyed or diminished by the kind of legislation we have already seen. These building blocks are teacher morale, student motivation, parental interest, and a humane school climate supportive of learning. Such intangible but significant aspects of any educational institution are absolutely essential to both equity and excellence. (Howe, 1987, p. 200)

One study that focused on the concept of government trying to legislate educational success was a study of American and Japanese principals in which the authors found that “effective schools” in both countries possess a positive climate, clear goals, and high student expectations irrespective of governmental mandates (Bartell & Willis, 1987; Willis & Bartell, 1990). Wilmore (1988) reasoned that certain characteristics are crucial to effective principal performance. They are:

1. The ability to work closely with others.
2. The ability to manage conflict and ambiguity.
3. The ability to integrate successfully a cluster of demands at the same time.
4. The ability to anticipate and adapt to rapidly changing demands and settings.
5. The ability to think and exercise discretion in formulation and carrying out plans of action.
6. The ability to assess and evaluate effective schooling in terms of management, goals, and objectives.
7. The ability to correctly allocate resources (Wilmore, 1988, p. 28).
Characteristics of the Effective Principal

Numerous books and journal articles attempting to discover identifiable characteristics of effective principals and excellent schools have focused on the central role of the principal as the leader of the school (Pugh, 1987; Shilling, 1986; Strother, 1983; Terry, 1999). In addition to the educational models of effectiveness, other researchers have referred to key aspects from the business world and its practices in defining the effective principal (Alvy & Robbins, 1998; Peters, 1988; Peters & Waterman, 1982). Nilsson (1987) cites similarities in the effective management of schools and of private business. His study focuses on the importance of forming a vision, creating an environment to foster success, coaching, role modeling, getting people to work together, setting high standards and expectations, and problem solving. Effective school and business leaders rely less on external controls and more on the dynamic process that takes place on site, with an eye on the overall goals of the larger organization. They emphasize cultural linkages that function as bonds to provide the necessary energy for connection and success (Sergiovanni, 1987).

These leaders possess a common set of characteristics that sets them apart from others in educational leadership. That is not to say, however, that they are alike in style, personality, or practice. A wide variety of styles, personalities, and practices have been observed; yet common markers appear along the way or within their styles (Croghan & Lake, 1984; Fletcher, 1986; Manasse, 1982; Rallis & Highsmith, 1987; Webster, 1994). The key seems to be the ability of the leader to remain focused on excellence and the ability to motivate others regardless of the diversity that lies within the community that
makes up his or her school (Cunningham, 1985).

The traditional model of principal performance states that the principal should focus on discipline and administrative tasks, while not interfering with teacher activities. Research has found, however, that a principal who is an effective instructional leader is crucial for the provision of support to teachers and the facilitation of the long-range impact that teachers have on students. Marshall (1993) held that a central characteristic of effective instructional leadership by a principal is obtaining the resources that make teachers’ work with children easier and more effective. Such resources include supplies and materials, computers for classrooms, and reliable substitute teachers. Additionally, an effective principal must ensure that the school environment is orderly, safe, and clean. The principal also must assure access to social workers for problem students. Marshall (1993) also noted that an effective principal develops a school-wide focus on basic skills and learning outcomes. In addition, according to Marshall (1993), for a school to be successful, the principal must ensure that a set of shared beliefs is developed to create a constant drive for improvement. Within this context, there must be a pervasive belief among all teachers that all children can and will learn.

In the late 1980s and into the mid-1990s outcome-based education was one of the catch phrases used in part to describe educational and academic excellence and the primary process by which many schools during that period managed and measured mastery learning. Outcome-based education, however, poses additional problems for the principal. Opposition to the concept of outcome-based education is not centered so much in objections to mastery learning as it is in the specifications of what is to be learned.
Thus, a mathematics learning objective within the context of the capability to apply a specific procedure to solve a specific problem likely would encounter little opposition. The specification of a social studies learning objective that required a student to emphasize multiethnic contributions to the early development of the American republic, however, would be challenged by vocal and organized groups of parents and conservative interest groups (Towers, 1994). "If outcome-based education is the darling of the educational reformers, it is the devil to conservative parents, taxpayer groups, and legislators who oppose it" (Zlatos, 1993, p. 13).

Disagreements arise when the character and specificity of standards are considered. Competency-based education and mastery learning are not generally rejected at a conceptual level. The central issue on which outcome-based education tends to be attacked is the focus on psychological and ideological orientations as opposed to academic performance (Schwartz & Cavener, 1994).

Another problem with the implementation of outcome-based educational programs lies in evaluation. Proponents of outcome-based education contend that results on performance tasks may be interpreted only within the context of the instruction or guidance provided to students before or during the administration of performance tests (Marzano, 1994). Critics question the validity and reliability of such an approach, preferring as an alternative the objective measurement of performance on clearly defined skills tests. Advocates of outcome-based education, however, prefer to use such devices as performance contracts with students that provide different learning outcomes for each student based upon different rates of progression (McGhan, 1994). Not surprisingly,
critics of outcome-based education suggest that such an approach will not lead to uniformly high standards (O'Neil, 1994).

In order to learn, students must feel that a safe environment exists for the single purpose of their safety and education. Therefore, all staff members must deal quickly and firmly with any threat, internal or external, to the school. Students must perceive that adults care about them, which means that adults are understanding, culturally sensitive, and available to get involved in students’ lives beyond academics. Students need to feel that they are part of a community, which means there must be meaningful events and other symbolic ways to pull students and teachers together. Further, students need to see their own culture and heritage celebrated and respected in school-wide activities (Marshall, 1993; O’Neil, 1994).

While variations as to what constitutes above-average principal effectiveness exist, the following list comprises what seems to be the core skills for above-average and highly effective principals:

1. High commitment to academic goals and vision
2. Clear, effective, and inspiring communication skills
3. Organizational skills and control
4. Forceful and dynamic leadership skills and ability to manage conflict
5. Excellent use of time and the ability to delegate
6. One on one and group people skills
7. High visibility
8. Excellent resource manager
9. Multiple task management (Drummond & Snyder, 1984; Greenfield, 1982a; Persell & Cookson, 1982; Schmieder & Cairns, 1996; Sergiovanni, 1984; Terry, 1999).

Additionally, effective principals are informed and take an interest in student achievement beyond the classroom, teacher’s personal growth, parent/community attitudes toward school, and the ongoing commitment to personal growth and development (Clark, Lotto, & McCarthy, 1980; Lemley, 1997).

**The Principal as the Instructional Leader**

The principal’s instructional role is critical in the development and maintenance of an effective school (Boyd, 1996; Brown, 1985; Hunt & Buser, 1977; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998; Shoemaker & Fraser, 1981). An ongoing awareness was seen among researchers in regard to the need to give future support and training to principals on how to become better at instructional leadership (Astuto & Clark, 1985; Johnson & Snyder, 1986; Stimac, 1986; Terry, 1996). Anderson and Pigford (1987) stated: “Principals can and should develop strategies that will enable them to provide instructional leadership despite increased demands from other tasks” (p. 69). Again, several studies point to the importance of strong administrative leadership as it relates to instructional leadership (Chase & Kane, 1983). It is the principal who can foster and implement clear and precise instructional goals (Mendez, 1986).

Direct involvement of the principal in curriculum development and delivery is a must for the effective school and the effective principal (Boyer, 1986; Fullan, 1981;
Glatthorn, 1997). While many often define and limit this to pre- and post-classroom observations, it goes beyond that into long-range curriculum planning. At times, this planning may disrupt the day-to-day operations and short-term goals of the school, as well as impact budgets, staffing, and current policies (Litchfield, 1986). As early as 1973 links between effective principals and their ability to successfully manage their day-to-day interpersonal encounters were noted (Wolcott, 1973). Those principals who were able to handle routine organizational demands and to allocate more time and effort to improving organizational performance through curriculum planning tended to be more successful in terms of academic outcomes of students (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980; Sergiovanni, 1984; Wolcott, 1973). This balance between day-to-day needs and curriculum planning blended together the teachers and administration creating “curricular unity” and effective outcomes in terms of student progress (English, 1987).

Instructional impact along with successful management of the day-to-day operations is how Behling (1984) viewed the effective principal in his study on instructional leadership by principals (Behling, 1984). Survey results from a 1985 principals survey showed that teacher performance and long-range curricular development go hand and hand in making quality educational programs that move beyond a crisis management style (Gresso, Burkett, & Smith, 1993; Mangieri & Arnn, 1985).

When school staff viewed the principal as supportive in instructional supervision, there was a higher perception of intimacy among staff, more perceived group decision-making, and a perception of less decision-making by the individual classroom teacher (Brady, 1985). The effective principal is able to work with staff to develop orderly,
sequential, and authentic learning experiences for students by ensuring that there is consistency among goals, classroom objectives, instructional content, and evaluations of the students (DuFour, 1985; Manasse, 1982). In addition to the classroom environment, effective principals are able to manage the school environment in the context of peace, safety, and uninterrupted learning blocks that enable students and staff alike to focus on learning rather than social issues and other day-to-day functions of running an organization such as a school (Huddle, 1984; Persell & Cookson, 1982; Petersen & Beekley, 1997). Duke (1982) described rather clearly the science of effective instructional leadership given by principals in the following:

Many assumptions support the concept of leadership functions that are tied to or in concert with instructional effectiveness. There is no one right set of skills yet there is a broad set of competencies or repertoire of leadership skills that effective principals display in the carrying out of their duties. These skills can be learned and are not as some would lead us to believe birthed into a principal.

The structure of the school organization shapes and influences the behavior of the principals; principals, in turn influence the instruction of the school organization. Likewise teachers affect the instruction and their behavior molds the effectiveness and character of the school. These factors along with others make it very difficult to draw clear lines of cause and effect in instructional effectiveness. Instructional effectiveness suggests that teachers are able to accomplish without undue expenditure the goals and objectives of the course content, and students are able to reach high levels of academic achievement as measured by standardized tests and desired social outcomes. (Duke, 1982, p. 2)

To evaluate the effectiveness of such complex organizations as schools exclusively on the basis of a percentile rank is little better than judging a car’s quality solely on the basis of its gas mileage or a meal entirely by its cost. Schools deemed to be effective or ineffective must be evaluated from many aspects, and not just their academic outcomes as measured by a national test score and a national percentile ranking (Cuban, 1984; Hipp &
Bredeson, 1995; Iannaccone & Jamgochian, 1985). Effective principals provide coherent broad-based educational experiences that go beyond the narrow focus of academic achievement and include education in values and morals in addition to the academics (Blome & James, 1985).

There is little question that increased instructional supervision and leadership by the principal are critical in effective schools. This is particularly true if students are to be productive and effective in the American work force, and as global citizens in our broader society (Dwyer, 1986).

While the studies cited above have different names and different titles for what is considered principal effectiveness, instructional leadership can be synthesized into the following core attributes:

1. Quality faculty in-service and orientation programs
2. Organization of faculty into teams for support and camaraderie
3. Proper allocation of resources
4. Professional and supportive classroom visits
5. Formal and informal evaluations of the entire educational system
6. Learning as a life-long event
7. Integrated curriculum
8. Teaching of values and morals (Glines, 1988; Moses & Thomas, 1986).
The Development of National Standards

Along with the call for greater success in American schools comes the desire to identify effectiveness in American schools and how one achieves it or fosters its growth (Ebmeier, 1990a). For example, the “Effective Schools” literature follows two trains of thought: (1) the effective school is one that has measurable academic gains on standardized student test scores; and (2) the effective school is known for its positive socializing effect on children (Cuban, 1984; Ebmier, 1990b; Glickman, 1991;).

In 1975 the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), with technical assistance from a special committee of industrial psychologists and the American Psychological Association, formulated a plan to assist school districts in identifying and developing highly skilled school leaders. This was called the Association’s Assessment Center project (Hersey, 1986). From 1975 to 1981 this project grew over 500% in size and complexity (Hersey, 1986) and in so doing became one of the foremost influences in shaping what is considered one of the highest standards for principal effectiveness. Though there has been and continues to be a redefining of effectiveness as it relates to principals, the goal of the assessment center remains to simulate the principles of rehearsal, modeling, and reinforcement which can lead to rapid skill development and effective transfer of skill to on-the-job performance. Evaluation of the process has provided solid evidence supporting the effectiveness of the program and as a predictor of success on the job (Schmitt, Meritt, Fitzgerald, & Noe, 1982).

The skills identified in the NASSP assessment centers represent the objectives of NASSP and are believed to be critical for effective principals (National Association of
Secondary School Principals, 1985b). Following skills as common to the effective principal:

1. **Decisiveness**: The ability to recognize when a decision is required. The ability to act quickly when required.

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

3. **Leadership**: The ability to get others involved in solving problems; the ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to interact with a group effectively; and to guide them in the accomplishment of a task.

4. **Oral Communication**: The ability to make clear oral presentation of facts or ideas.

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

6. **Problem Analysis**: The ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; and the searching for information with a purpose.

7. **Sensitivity**: The ability to perceive the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; the skill in resolving conflicts, and tact in dealing with people from different backgrounds; and the ability to know what information to communicate and to whom.

8. **Stress Tolerance**: The ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; the ability to think on one's feet.

9. **Written Communication**: The ability to express ideas/concepts clearly in writing; the ability to write appropriately for different audiences—students, teachers, parents, etcetera.

10. **Educational Values**: The possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; the receptiveness to new ideas and change.
11. **Personal Motivation:** The need to achieve in all activities attempted; the evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; the ability to be self-policing.

12. **Range of Interests:** The competence to discuss a variety of subjects—educational, political, current events, economic, etcetera; and the desire to actively participate in events. (Willmore, 1988, p. 65)

From this list of perceived needed skills and competencies a host of other researchers followed suit, with no fewer than 75 colleges and universities preparing their own lists (Hoyle, 1983). Several instruments to assist in the identification of a principal’s perceived strengths and needed areas of professional growth were also developed (Bolton, 1980; Ebmeier, 1992a; ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1987; Hoyle, 1985; Knoop & Common, 1985). As this movement continued to gain momentum a desire for unity also arose and from it the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) came to the forefront. By the early 1990s the NPBEA had consolidated the numerous lists and skills into a single document known today as the “Principals For Our Changing Schools” notebook (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 1993). Currently 21 major skills are outlined as essential traits of effective school principals (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 1993). Also during the late 1980s and early 1990s the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) adopted the (NPBEA) work as a national standard, though in a somewhat different format (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996).

The standards in law and medicine appear to have application to principalship licensure. For entry into both professions law and medicine, one must complete specified courses of graduate study. This is true of principals as well (Hoyle, 1988). Both must be
licensed by state boards of some kind. Principals also must be certified by the state in which they work (Peters & Bagenstos, 1988). Both lawyers and doctors must take entry examinations after the completion of their course work, and there has been considerable discussion in regard to the appropriateness of professional testing of educators (Hoyle, 1987). At this point in time many states do require an entry-level examination for principal certification (Ebmeier, 1992a; Peters & Bagenstos, 1988; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998); however, most educators do not take any kind of preparatory study course to prepare for it (Lareau, 1985).

The Evaluation of Principals

The evaluation of principal effectiveness must distinguish between essential and peripheral functions and activities. Research suggests that five essential categories describe the array of behaviors in which an effective principal engages. The categories are: (1) defining mission; (2) managing curriculum and instruction; (3) supervising teaching; (4) monitoring student progress; and (5) promoting an effective instructional climate (Duke & Stiggins, 1985; Hager & Scarr, 1983; Krug, 1993; Murphy, Hallinger, & Peterson 1985).

Most school districts reward principals for following the district rules. In such districts, according to Murphy and Pimentel (1996), competence is defined by a checklist filled out by a central office manager after brief annual visits to schools. Thus, the best principals and the worst principals are paid at the same level regardless of the effectiveness of their schools in educating students. Few incentives encourage risk-taking, improved
schooling, or high academic outcomes for students (Murphy & Pimentel, 1996).

Murphy and Pimentel (1996) recommend that the evaluation of principal effectiveness be accomplished through the process of management by exception. Under such a system of evaluation, as long as principals produce good results (i.e., strong academic scores and good social behaviors), they will be rewarded and left alone, and allowed the flexibility they feel they need to be effective as site-based administrators. For principals who do not produce good results, however, improvement or dismissal will be the order of the day in a rather expeditious manner.

One North Carolina school district has adopted management-by-exception protocol to evaluate principal effectiveness. The evaluation system replaced a linear system that relied on the opinions of school district administrators to assess principal effectiveness. The evaluation tool, according to Murphy and Pimentel (1996), was a checklist of processes, administrative details, and personality traits. This was replaced with a management-by-exception evaluation system that assesses principal effectiveness within the contexts of (1) creating a safe, orderly, and inviting place to teach and learn; (2) working effectively with teachers, students, and parents; (3) managing time efficiently; (4) making efficient use of facilities; (5) managing resources responsibly; and (6) achieving desirable student academic outcomes (Murphy & Pimentel, 1996). The program measures the extent to which (1) academic benchmark goals are achieved; (2) parents, students, and the community are satisfied; (3) optimal conditions for learning are created; and (4) standards of responsible and ethical administrative practice are met.

The management-by-exception system thus evaluates principal effectiveness on the
basis of results as opposed to process (Murphy & Pimentel, 1996). The principal evaluation instrument incorporates a calibrated point system. Data on academic outcomes and results from teacher, parent, and student surveys regarding the principal’s performance account for most of the points. The better the results, the more points the principal earns. The evaluation system places a heavy emphasis on student progress and the extent to which school benchmark goals are met. Facility reports, financial and program audits, data on personnel management, and other information collected at the central office level are factored into the evaluation (Murphy & Pimentel, 1996).

Additional points, called site-specific points, are available for the superintendent to award in whole or in part to principals who engage in sound practice in the face of unusual obstacles or pressures (Murphy & Pimentel, 1996). The underlying assumption upon which the site-based points are founded upon is that a principal who arouses no opposition is probably not doing his or her job properly. A poor showing on the teacher survey, for example, may be the result of having had to push through reforms with faculty members who were used to being left to their own devices. The principal is put on notice by the results, but not penalized (Murphy & Pimentel, 1996).

To be rated “above standard” or higher, principals must both earn a specified point total and ensure that at least 50% of the points available in each of the benchmark goal and survey areas are earned. These minimum point totals for each area ensure that a principal cannot court client groups and fail to attend to student achievement or attend to student achievement to the exclusion of client groups (Murphy & Pimentel, 1996). Principals who receive either a “stellar” or an “above-standard” rating are exempt from
evaluation the next year, as long as they maintain their benchmark goals within 10%. Principals rated "at standard" or below are required to develop plans for improvement under direct supervision from the superintendent and to undergo training designed specifically to address their low-rated performance areas. Principals rated "below standard" must improve in 1 year or face reassignment (Murphy & Pimentel, 1996).

Effective-schools research has determined that successful schools are always led by a principal who is recognized as an instructional leader (Terry, 1996). Thus, more school districts are attempting to evaluate the effectiveness of principals as instructional leaders. Hipp and Bredeson (1995) conducted a study at the middle-school level wherein principal effectiveness was assessed on the basis of data collected from a sample of 280 teachers. The study found that principal effectiveness was related significantly to both general teaching effectiveness in the school and to teaching effectiveness of teachers.

Johnson and Licata (1993) collected data from 3,067 teachers to evaluate the effectiveness of 73 principals at all levels from primary through high school. The study found that the most important factors involved in principal effectiveness were the ability to motivate teachers and an ability to instill confidence within teachers. Thus, more school districts are attempting to evaluate the effectiveness of principals as instructional leaders.

Ebmeier's Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument was developed during the 2-year period of 1988-1990. It was designed both for the evaluation of principals within the State of Kansas and also for formal research. The State of Kansas uses the instrument on a regular and ongoing basis, yet seldom does it publish their findings as they are used primarily in local school settings and not for formal
research. Following are three studies that have used it for formal research in the ranking and rating of principals as it relates to their perceived effectiveness.

Snyder and Ebmeier (1993) examined the causal relationships among principals as perceived by teachers, parents, and students in 30 school districts as they pertain to principal behaviors covering 24 variables in a non-experimental, empirical study. The 24 variables were divided into four constructs: (1) morale; (2) job satisfaction; (3) commitment, and (4) teacher perception of innovation.

The data were analyzed using Pearson’s $r$ correlation and multiple regression analysis. In the results of the study the authors state: “Evidence from this study indicated that principals can and should, be evaluated in terms of teacher outcomes and teacher perceptions of school functioning” (p. 102). Snyder and Ebmeier (1993) went on to say: “It is unclear if the principal affects the processes or rather if the processes affect the principal. Yet clearly principals have an important influence on all four . . . school processes—maintenance, goal attainment, integration, and adaptation” (p. 102). While strong coefficients indicated that principals directly affect teacher performance, strong linkage was not found to be the case in academic student outcomes.

Jantzi and Leithwood (1995) in a 5-year study of policy implementation in a British Columbia school district examined teachers’ overall perceptions of their principals’ leadership performance in six individual leadership dimensions: (1) identifying and articulating a vision; (2) fostering the acceptance of group goals; (3) providing individualized support; (4) providing intellectual stimulation; (5) serving as an exemplary model; and (6) demonstrating expectations for high performance. Ebmeier’s Diagnostic
Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument was used in the data collection and an assessment process during the 2nd and 3rd years of the study with a total of 770 teachers in the 2nd year and 757 teachers in the 3rd year. Three types of analysis were conducted (Pearson-product correlations; hierarchical multiple regression; and standard multiple regression). Findings indicate that in-school conditions most powerfully influenced teachers' perceptions of their leadership behavior. These conditions included the school's mission, vision, goals, culture, programs (both academic and non-academic), policies, general organization, decision-making structures, and resources. The gender of the principal was also an important variable of teachers' perceptions. Women principals were perceived as more transformational than male counterparts.

Sanders (1995) used both Ebmeier's Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument and Hillman's Principal Efficacy Survey instrument to examine interpersonal and organizational factors that contribute to a principal’s sense of self-efficacy and subsequent willingness to implement change. Data for this study were collected from 439 staff members to assess the effectiveness of 22 principals at the secondary-school level. The study found that when a principal adopts or initiates innovation, it becomes more likely for teachers to perceive the principal’s activities as fragmented and non-directed.

Ebmeier’s Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument is compatible with other management-by-exception approaches to the evaluation of principal effectiveness. The instrument provides for the evaluation of principal effectiveness from multiple perspectives such as administrators, principals, teachers,
parents, and students all in relation to multiple measures of performance outcomes. Multiple perspectives and measures of performance outcomes also are the cornerstones of the management-by-exception approach to the evaluation of principal effectiveness.

Thus, Ebmeier's instrument appears to be relevant in the evaluation of principal effectiveness in the evolving educational environment, and therefore can be seen as relevant for use in the study of the perceived effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist principals.

The evaluation of principals is effective only if the principals being evaluated and the people evaluating them understand the components of the evaluation process (Ebmeier, 1990a; Harrison & Peterson, 1988; Howell, 1981; Lawton, 1986; Rosenberg, 1973; Snyder, 1992). Evaluation often includes four phases or stages: (1) allocating tasks; (2) setting evaluation criteria; (3) sampling performances and outcomes; and (4) assessing the performances and outcomes against expected and stated standards and policy codes (Look & Manatt, 1984). In order for principals to perform successfully they must clearly understand their superiors' expectations. Therefore superintendents must make their expectations for performance clear to facilitate understanding of the tasks they expect their principals to perform (Harrison & Peterson, 1988).

From the early 1970s a heightened interest has arisen in the area of effective schools and the importance that the principal plays in that process. Concurrent with this interest has been an increase in teacher and school administration evaluations and the process taken in administrating for effectiveness. In 1974 only nine states required administrators to be formally evaluated. By 1984 the number had risen to 27 states (ERIC
Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1987) and by 1998 every state had some form of required evaluation process for its administrators (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1998). Although the frequency of administration evaluations has markedly increased, the quality of the assessments does not appear to have greatly improved (Bolton, 1980; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). Too often the typical administrative evaluation can be seen as a process in which an evaluator checks factors on a rating scale whose categories are often a conglomeration of criterion-and-norm-referenced items, which are not necessarily based on hard data and do not provide much helpful guidance for improvement (Bolton, 1980; Ebmeier, 1990a; Hackman & Price 1995). Although there is a substantial body of knowledge and information regarding effective administrative practices, the usefulness of that information does not seem to be well incorporated into evaluation instruments (Ebmeier, 1990a; Manasse, 1982).

An additional challenge with administrator evaluations is their typical reliance upon a single source, that being the superordinate as the evaluator (Ebmeier, 1990a). In 1985 an Educational Research Service (ERS) survey (1985) showed that peer evaluation of principals was used in only 4.9% of school districts; teacher option was employed by 10% of the school districts responding to the survey; and student input was solicited 8.3% of the time. In contrast, 85.7% of the returned surveys indicated that the superintendent was the only one to conduct the evaluation of the school principal under his or her jurisdiction (Ebmeier, 1990a). This top-down style of evaluation continues to be by far the most common method of principal evaluation whereas the professional research and literature support the use of “client centered” evaluation (Kienapfel, 1984; Licata, 1980).
While the superordinate may be a better judge of certain management skills in which they interact with the principal, students, parents, and the school's staff are in better positions to evaluate such concepts as vision, communication of school goals and other dimensions often characterized as attributes of effective administrators. (Ebmeier, 1990a, p. 3)

Ebmeier (1990a) continues by stating:

Existing administrative evaluation procedures . . . tend to be designed for summative use. While summative decisions are an obviously necessary characteristic . . . it is difficult for individual administrators to identify specific behaviors or practices that need improvement. A similar problem exists with the goal-based evaluation systems. Although it is useful for principals to identify areas in which they can strive for improvement, frequently the goals are selected without any systematic diagnostic efforts and tend to only reinforce existing strengths and to avoid weaknesses. Lastly, the validity of the majority of administrator evaluation instruments whether formative (diagnostic) or summative are simply unknown. (Ebmeier, 1990a, p. 3)

Along with the call for greater success in American schools came the desire to identify and define effectiveness in American schools and how one achieves it or fosters its growth (Ebmeier, 1990a). For example, the “Effective Schools” literature follows two trains of thought: (1) the effective school is one that has measurable academic gains on standardized student test scores; and (2) the effective school is known for its positive socializing effect on children (Coutts et al., 1997; Cuban, 1984; Ebmeier, 1990b; Glickman, 1987). Thus while the principal, on a daily basis, is informally evaluated by all those with whom he or she interacts, the task still facing administrators is to create an effective principal performance based evaluation system (Herman, 1988).

Selected Studies Focusing on Seventh-day Adventist Schools and Principals

Perhaps the first major research study focusing exclusively on Seventh-day Adventist Principals was Jaqua's (1967) research of the professional training and
experience of Seventh-day Adventist principals. The purpose of his study was to identify the status of professional training and certification of Seventh-day Adventist principals. He reviewed 72 principals in the North American Division, utilizing statistical procedures including central tendencies, frequencies, percentages, and means. Among Jaqua's (1967) findings was that the academic and professional preparation of the typical Seventh-day Adventist principal exceeded that of the public school principal of the time. Yet he went on to recommend the following: (1) broaden the academic scope of training; (2) that Seventh-day Adventist principals be given more opportunity to become active participants in professional organizations; (3) a common code for governance boards and principal duties be developed; (4) better job descriptions be written; (5) and the development of national or division-wide standards for principal certification (Jaqua, 1967).

White (1980) replicated the Jaqua (1967) study using a slightly larger population of principals (80) from both day (39) and boarding (41) academies. White (1980) came to the conclusion that in the period from 1967 to 1980 Seventh-day Adventist principals were better educated as to the number holding advanced degrees and certifications. However, he found that fewer were holding those degrees in Educational Administration or had Seventh-day Adventist denominational certification. He also noted that the turnover rate of principals as it related to length of stay at any one SDA school had decreased during the period of time under review. White (1980), in replicating the Jaqua (1967) study, also relied on the same statistical methods of central tendencies, frequencies, percentages, and means (White, 1980).

The rate of principal turnover and its impact on the educational process was picked
up in a study by Lawson (1984) in which he reviewed the length of service for principals in 92 Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools, both day and boarding from 1948-1983. Utilizing mean scores, t-test and Pearson product-moment, Lawson (1984) came to the following conclusions: (1) SDA academy principals are not making the principalship a lifelong career; (2) the average stay of a principal in an academy is too brief to provide continuous effective administrative leadership for the school; (3) the term of service of a principal is greater in larger academies than smaller academies; (4) day academy principals tend to stay longer than boarding academy principals; (5) geographic location affects length of stay; (6) since 1970, the term of service for the principal in SDA academies appears to be decreasing; (7) the academy principalship appears to be a stepping-stone to other educational positions in the Adventist educational system; (8) and since the middle of the 1960s the number of boarding schools has been decreasing, while the number of day academies has been increasing. Lawson (1984) found that the overall rate of change varied greatly from year to year but principals averaged a yearly move rate of nearly 25%, with some years as low as 8% and others as high as 40% (Lawson, 1984).

Kacelenga (1983) undertook a regional study of 10 principals in the Lake Region (Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin) of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in which his focus was the interpersonal relationships of principals as perceived by teachers. Using descriptive analysis he came to five primary conclusions: (1) teachers differ slightly in their perceptions of principal effectiveness as it relates to interpersonal skills; (2) the principals were seen as spiritually effective; (3) principals were strong in the management aspects of the day-to-day operations of the schools; (4) teachers perceived the principals to be
somewhat weak in school-community relations; (5) and teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience perceived the principals to be least effective in issues related to curriculum and instruction. Kacelenga (1983) relied on the statistical procedures of central tendencies, frequencies, percentages, and means when reviewing the responses of the 10 principals and the responses of about 125 teachers (Kacelenga, 1983).

Hansen (1983) undertook the study of Seventh-day Adventist boarding academy principals regarding time-on-task expectations from both faculty and principal perspectives. He focused on 15 specific tasks on a ranking from greatest to least important. Among his findings was that (1) principals perceived themselves to be overall more effective on the 15 tasks than their faculties perceived them to be; (2) of the 15 tasks principals spend the least amount of time in classroom instruction; (3) spiritual leadership was the top-ranked task by both groups; (4) instructional supervision was the task ranked as least important by both groups; (5) the greatest amount of time on task each week was desk work; (6) principals averaged less than 5 years at their current positions; and (7) that the principal averaged 58.32 hours a week on all 15 tasks (Hansen, 1983).

Nash (1992) focused on the challenges of accountability and planning. He studied 78 day and boarding academy principals and 75 board chairs. In his findings he listed 149 items across four major groupings as they related to the needs of accountability and planning. Nash (1992) found significant differences between the principals and board chairs across many of the 149 survey/question items. He concluded that a data procurement and organization system was needed that relates to board members, department heads, and faculties, thus creating a top to bottom system of accountability.
Ballard (1992) undertook a study to investigate the perceived effectiveness of teaching and non-teaching principals from both day and boarding schools within the Seventh-day Adventist system. Her study included a total of 66 principals and 840 teachers using a principal effectiveness survey developed by Jerry W. Valentine, and analyzed the data with one-way and two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Among Ballard’s (1992) findings were: (1) there were no significant differences in teaching and non-teaching principals as they relate to organizational development and organizational environment; (2) and male teachers perceived non-teaching principals to be more effective in relation to educational program development (Ballard, 1992).

Brown (1996) studied aspects of stress and burnout among Seventh-day Adventist principals at all levels of administration, from elementary to high school, in both day and boarding schools operated by the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the North American Division. He used a non-experimental research design utilizing two assessment instruments: (1) The Administrative Stress Index (ASI); and (2) The Maslach Burnout Inventory. He surveyed 260 principals and superintendents, applying multivariate analysis of variance, discriminate analysis, and Pearson correlations to analyze the data. Brown (1996) found significant differences between the principals and the superintendents as they relate to stressors on the ASI index in which principals rated themselves as having a higher stress level than did the superintendents. The multivariate analysis also revealed significant differences among the administrative groups in terms of exhaustion and burnout levels in which principals once again rated themselves higher in terms of exhaustion and
burnout than did the superintendents. Among Brown's conclusions were: (1) task-based stressors appeared to contribute most to feelings of job-related burnout; and (2) superintendents perceived that the level of principal stress and burnout was less than the principal perceived it to be as it related to themselves (Brown, 1996).

Rutabuka (1996) investigated Seventh-day Adventist teacher satisfaction levels in a regional study that focused on the four Midwest states of Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan surveying 261 teachers in 116 schools. Among his findings were: (1) SDA teachers are generally satisfied with their work; (2) commitment to the teaching profession was highly related to job satisfaction among male teachers; whereas commitment to the church organization was highly related to job satisfaction among female teachers; (3) personal significance as it relates to quality and purpose of life was more highly related to teachers' job satisfaction than any other work condition factor, especially among female teachers; and (4) faith dimension was the most important work condition factor related to commitment to the church organization, whereas personal significance was related to commitment to the teaching profession (Rutabuka, 1996).

In all, several research studies have focused on the needs, professional training, teaching skills, faith, and health factors of Seventh-day Adventist principals. This gives added insight to the life and skills of the men and women who choose to be administrators within the Seventh-day Adventist Church.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Overview of the Methodology

The purpose of this study was to examine the views and perceptions held by superintendents, principals, and staff members of Seventh-day Adventist boarding schools regarding the administrative skills of the principals of those schools. All individuals involved were asked to complete a survey questionnaire. The population studied was limited to Seventh-day Adventist boarding schools within the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists.

Three questionnaire/surveys were used, each developed by Kansas State University and the University of Kansas under the direction of Dr. Howard Ebmeier. They are specially designed to assist with school evaluations for the North Central Accreditation Association for Schools and Colleges.

The group surveyed represents the population of superintendents, principals, and staff members whose duties include the operations of SDA boarding schools. The data were analyzed by using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results from the analyzed data exhibit the views of superintendents, principals, and staff members as to their perceptions of the administrative skills of the school principals. The study was guided
by the following questions:

1. How effective are the administrative skills of SDA boarding school principals as perceived by superintendents, principals, and staff members?

2. How does the perceived effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals compare with national norms?

3. Based on the age, educational level, gender, and years of teaching experience of the responding staff members, is there significant difference in their responses?

**Population**

An important question is: Who should judge the administrative effectiveness skills of the school principal? Parents, students, governance boards, staff, principals, superintendents, and principals themselves, each are a viable group and could have been utilized. This study was limited to the superordinate (superintendent), the principals (peer group), and subordinate (staff members). It is these three groups that are professionally trained to carry out the duties and functions of the school, thus creating a line of progression, responsibility, and accountability.

During the 1997-1998 school year, the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church operated 34 boarding schools throughout the United States and Canada. Thirty-two (the 2 not surveyed have non-traditional boarding school settings in which the students live in faculty or community homes and the total student population was below 50) of the schools received one principal instrument and 10 staff instruments to be distributed by the principal. The instructions instructed the principal to complete the
instrument designed for him or her and to coordinate a time when the staff under the
direction of someone other than the principal could lead in the staff completing their
instrument. Instructions asked that the principal select one staff member to lead in the data
collection of the staff. Each school received two return mailers: one for the principal’s
data instrument and one for the staff’s. A cover letter and data instrument were mailed
separately to the superintendents at their place of employment for completion, and
included a return envelope. Cover letter instructions for all groups included a statement of
confidentiality and security of data.

Instrumentation

The data-collection instrument for this study was the Diagnostic Assessment of
School and Principal Effectiveness which contains a battery of five different instruments.
These surveys are sold and managed by the office of United School Administrators of
Kansas located in Topeka, Kansas. For this study, three of the five batteries were used,
one each for the three groups: superintendents, principals, and staff members. The two
not used were the student and parent versions of the instrument. The instruments have
been in use since 1988 and have undergone several revisions. Each of the instruments
measures several factors, which research has indicated are related to principals’
administrative effectiveness. The superintendent and staff instrument has 84 questions and
the principal version of the instrument has 83. The additional question for the
superintendents and staff members was: “To what extent does the principal participate in
community groups?” Each question has a score ranging from a low of 1 to a high of 6.
The questions are then grouped into four constructs (see Tables 4-8 in chapter 4 for breakdown of questions in each construct) for the purpose of assessing principal effectiveness. In order to arrive at a percentile ranking of the perceived effectiveness, Ebmeier uses the following method: Mean score by group (i.e., superintendent, principal, staff member) times the number of questions within the construct. As an example, the maintenance construct has 11 questions. One would find the mean score of the maintenance group and multiply it by 11 thus creating a Raw Score. Then using the Raw Score conversion tables provided by Ebmeier (1992b) the percentile ranking of the principal’s perceived performance in the maintenance construct is identified as compared with the national sample. This method is followed for each of the four constructs.

The four constructs are as follows: (1) Principal Maintenance Behavior Scale, which is composed of 11 survey questions; (2) Principal Adaptation Behavior Scale, which is composed of 28 survey questions; (3) Principal Goal Attainment Behavior Scale, which is composed of 21 survey questions; and (4) Principal Integration Behavior Scale, which is composed of 24 survey questions.

Ebmeier (1992b) defines each of the constructs in the following manner:

1. Principal Maintenance Behaviors Scale. This scale measures the perceived degree to which the principal actively engages in specific behaviors that help create and maintain the school’s motivational and value structure. These activities include, but are not limited to, the principal’s ability to successfully manage the day-to-day activities of school operations such as class schedules, personal interest of staff, teacher loads, and student academic and non-academic activities. This is reflected in the questionnaire by
questions such as: The principal recognizes the needs and concerns of students (Q 52); The principal maintains a high visibility in the building (Q 61); The principal supports the staff with personal and professional concerns (Q 72); and, The principal arranges the school to promote employee job satisfaction (Q 83). Short-term management skills and the ability to create and maintain a safe and enjoyable learning environment for all who are part of the internal world of a school are at the heart of this construct.

2. Principal Adaptation Behavior Scale. This scale measures the perceived degree to which the principal actively engages in specific behaviors that help the school deal successfully with the parents, the community, and external change. These activities include, but are not limited to, the principal’s ability to integrate the needs of the school with the expectations of the community in which that school is located, while at the same time recognizing the ever changing world in which one educates students. This is reflected in the questionnaire by questions such as: The principal keeps abreast of current technology (Q 2); The principal effectively deals with political changes that “impact” the building (Q 5); and, The principal anticipates and reacts to community problems as they influence the school (Q 30). Mid-range management skills and the ability to create and maintain an up-to-date approach to learning while holding on to the valued traditions of the school and the community are at the heart of this construct.

3. Principal Goal Attainment Behavior Scale. This scale measures the perceived degree to which the principal actively engages in specific behaviors that help the school to define objectives, mobilize resources, and achieve desired ends. These activities include, but are not limited to, the principal’s ability to create measurable outcomes such as high
student academic achievements, resource acquisition, and perceived quality in all of the school’s academic and non-academic programs. This is reflected in the questionnaire by questions such as: The principal effectively diagnoses and prioritizes needs to achieve goals (Q 6); The principal protects the instructional time from interruptions (Q 33); and, The principal schedules appropriate and meaningful meetings (Q 51). Long-range management skills and the ability to create and maintain high levels of success for students, teachers, and support staff, as well as community commitment, are at the heart of this construct.

4. Principal Integration Behavior Scale. This scale measures the perceived degree to which the principal actively engages in specific behaviors that help the school to organize, coordinate, and unify the various school tasks necessary for achievement. These activities include, but are not limited to, the principal’s ability to orchestrate all the multifaceted tasks and elements that make a school successful. This is reflected in the questionnaire by such questions as: The principal’s ability to provide sound internal communications (Q 4): The principal’s ability to display a detailed understanding of the instructional program in your school (Q 54); and, The principal’s ability to emphasize the importance of each part of the school organization (Q 60). Multi-ranged management skills and the ability to create, communicate, and integrate a holistic view of the myriad of academic and non-academic activities, that make up education are at the heart of this construct.

The supervisor, principal, and staff versions of the instrument are nearly identical except for minor changes in wording necessary to tailor the instrument to each
respondent. All three versions are divided into three parts. Section A, Background Information, gathers basic background information about the respondent and school. Due to the specific nature required to meet the needs of a public school system, and more specifically the State of Kansas, this portion of the survey was not used, but a separate demographic survey sheet was used that meets the needs of this research and was included in sufficient quantities to allow each surveyor to complete a demographic survey sheet.

Section B, School Effectiveness, assesses the level of adaptation, goal attainment, maintenance, and integration thought to be present in the school as a whole. As this section focuses on an entire school system, this portion of the instrument was not used. (As a minor variation, the supervisor’s version contains an additional scale called District Integration which measures the degree to which the principal successfully works and communicates with the entire district.)

Section C, Principal Behavior, assesses the extent to which the principal is viewed as engaging in behaviors or routines that contribute to effectiveness, as measured by the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument. This section of the instrument was used in its entirety for the collection of the data.

This paragraph details the process Ebmeier used to isolate effective principal behaviors (Ebmeier, 1992b). A literature search was undertaken to identify traits, characteristics, behaviors, and attitudes that were thought to be important for administrative effectiveness as they pertain to a principal’s leadership of a school. A procedure identified by Karis and Watters (1983) was employed to search over 32 databases using 36 descriptors for articles that might be of relevance. In addition, through
personal contact across the United States, several hundred additional non-referenced articles were obtained; thus, the total set of documents examined by Ebmeier for this study exceeded 1,500. After the documents were obtained, graduate students, college professors, and a practicing school administrator were employed to read subsets of the total material. This procedure was used to isolate attitudes, behaviors, and skills that were identified in the published work. Each article was read by two reviewers and a third person if agreement concerning the desirable characteristics could not be reached. A matrix-type analysis system was then employed to identify commonalities and differences across recommendations, and the list was condensed based on a commonality analysis.

The remaining competencies ($N=150$) were then reviewed, modified, and validated by state and national experts who were representative of teachers, principals, superintendents, and college faculty teaching the “principalship” course. Finally, a sample of practicing Kansas administrators was asked, through a structured questionnaire, to identify skills, behaviors, and attitudes that they thought were essential and those that were desirable but not critical. From that analysis of data, plus information compiled from prior consensus groups, a list of 60 basic competencies and sub-descriptors was developed (Ebmeier, 1992b). The identified competencies were then classified in terms of the effectiveness goal(s) they best achieve (adaptation, goal attainment, integration, and maintenance).

Reliability estimates for the three instruments were calculated on the basis of teacher ($N=423$), principal ($N=23$), and supervisor ($N=16$) and the responses from 23 pilot schools. Cronbach alpha reliabilities and the estimates were good and ranged from a low
of 0.76 on the staff satisfaction scale to a high of 0.97 on the staff's report of principal behaviors in maintenance, adaptation, goal attainment, and integration behaviors.

Predictive validity of the principal behavior scales was assessed in two ways. First, scale scores on these dimensions were collected from five schools which were known to be implementing a 'site-based' management system, but which were not part of the original field study. These scores were then compared to the averages obtained from the field study. Given that the five schools were experiencing major internal changes, if the instrument had good predictive validity then scores on the principal behavior-adaptation, principal behavior-goal attainment, and principal behavior-integration would increase while scores on the principal behavior-maintenance would decrease. From examination of the mean scores, the hypothesis was supported, thus lending support to the validity claims of these scales. Not all groups assess all aspects of the principal, thus giving gaps in the summary as seen in the scale. One will also note that there are missing values within the table; the survey instrument does not attempt to measure all aspects of principal effectiveness from each group. For example, only the superintendent is asked to evaluate principal effectiveness as it relates to District Integration. This is because the other groups are not in a very favorable position to make an accurate evaluation in this area. These data are summarized in Table 2.

A second validity check was conducted to assess scale sensitivity in detecting differences among schools/principals. A series of ANOVA tests were conducted, one for each of the scales on the staff instrument at each organizational level, to test the impact of the school (independent variable) on the eight scale scores (maintenance, integration, goal
The results from a comparison of mean scale scores (ANOVA) indicated that the scales on the staff instrument (and presumably those of the principal and supervisor) were successfully able to detect differences, and thus are presumed to have excellent criterion validity (Ebmeier, 1992b, p. 19). Documentation of the second validity check as it relates to the statistical findings is not provided in the reference manual.

Collection of Data

Cover letters and survey sheets were sent to 32 of the 34 SDA boarding schools within the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and to conference headquarters which house the offices of the superintendents of education who manage the selected boarding schools (the 2 not surveyed have non-traditional boarding school settings in which the students live in faculty or community homes and the total student population was below 50). The questionnaires were provided in quantities sufficient to complete the site-based data collection for each group, based on a formula of one for each principal, 10 per school for the staff, and one for each superintendent. The staff instructions for the principal were to select one staff member to lead in the collection of the data and that the principal be absent. A maximum of 10 staff members from each school was to be selected at random by the principal to complete the survey. Cover letters to each of the principals, staff members, and superintendents were included explaining the study and the process they were to follow.
### TABLE 2

**SUMMARY OF SCALE RELIABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Attainment</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Integration</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Integration</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Morale</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Commitment</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Satisfaction</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student School Norms</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Academic Futility</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Self Concept</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Self Reliance</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Motivation</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Principal Behavior</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Behavior-Maintenance</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Behavior-Adaptation</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Behavior-Goal Attainment</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Behavior-Integration</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Data from *Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness Reference Manual* (p. 16), by Howard Ebmeier, 1990, Topeka, KS: KanLEAD Educational Consortium Technical Assistance Center.*
A letter of support from Dr. Richard Osborn, Vice-President of Education for the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists, was included encouraging each educational professional to take part in this North American Division-wide study. I made phone and e-mail contact with the principals and superintendents (as needed) to solicit their support and to collect the maximum amount of data possible for a representative sample. The packets sent included postage-paid return mailers. The same type of packets, with appropriate materials, was mailed directly to the superintendents for their participation in the study. Twenty-three of the schools that received survey packets responded to the survey with a total of 201 staff members, 23 principals, and 17 superintendents correctly completing the survey/questionnaire. These data are summarized in Table 3.

### TABLE 3
SURVEY RESPONSE RATE BY GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Surveys Mailed</th>
<th>Surveys Returned</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Members</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variables

The independent variables in this study are the responses of each of the superintendents, principals, and staff members who responded to the questions contained within each survey.

The dependent variables are: (1) Principal Behavior-Maintenance; (2) Principal Behavior-Adaptation; (3) Behavior-Goal Attainment; and (4) Principal Behavior-Integration. The staff and superintendent surveys have 84 questions, and the principal survey has 83 questions. The difference of one additional question was: To what extent does the principal participate in community groups?

Hypotheses and Research Questions

The research questions that guided this study were:

Question 1: How effective are the administrative skills of SDA boarding school principals as perceived by superintendents, principals and staff members?

Question 2: How does the perceived effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals compare with national norms?

Question 3: Based on the age, educational level, gender, and years of teaching experience of the responding staff members, is there significant difference in their responses?

The four following hypotheses as presented in question 3 above were tested:

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the age of the respondent.
Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the educational level of the respondent.

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the gender of the respondent.

Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the years of teaching experience of the respondent.

Analysis of Data

For the purpose of this study there were three research questions and four null hypotheses.

Question 1: How effective are the administrative skills of SDA boarding school principals as perceived by superintendents, principals, and staff members?

This was determined by having each respondent complete Section C: "Principal Behavior" of the data instrument known as the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness. This instrument measures principal effectiveness within the context of four constructs: (1) maintenance, (2) adaptation, (3) goal attainment, and (4) integration. Therefore, the primary research question was investigated within the context of these four constructs, and was analyzed by using mean scores on a 6-point Likert-type scale with low effectiveness being 1-2.66; moderate effectiveness being 2.67-4.33; and high effectiveness being 4.34-6.00. Low, moderate, and high effectiveness classifications were arbitrary decisions of the researcher.

Question 2: How does the perceived effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist...
boarding school principals compare with national norms?

This was done by using the mean raw score of each of the four constructs and then converting them to a percentile rank based on Ebmeier’s 1992 reference manual conversion charts for the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness (at the time of the field study the 1992 reference manual was the most current one available). When mean raw scores exceed Ebmeier’s 1992 conversion tables, I used extrapolation to estimate the percentile ranking.

Question 3: Based on the age, educational level, gender, and years of teaching experience of the responding staff members, is there significant difference in their responses? This was done by testing four hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1 analyzed the differences among the responses based on age. For the purpose of this study, age was divided into the following groups of respondents—20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60+—as they pertain to each of the four constructs: (1) maintenance, (2) adaptation, (3) goal attainment, and (4) integration. To test this hypothesis, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied at an alpha of .05.

Hypothesis 2 analyzed the differences among the responses based on the educational level. For the purpose of this study, educational level was divided into two groups (BA and MA) of the respondents as they pertain to each of the four constructs: (1) maintenance, (2) adaptation, (3) goal attainment, and (4) integration. To test this hypothesis, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied at an alpha of .05.

Hypothesis 3 analyzed the differences among the responses based on the gender of the respondents as they pertain to each of the four constructs: (1) maintenance, (2)
adaptation, (3) goal attainment, and (4) integration. To test this hypothesis, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied at an alpha of .05.

Hypothesis 4 analyzed the differences among the responses based on the years of teaching experience. For the purpose of this study, years of teaching experience were divided into four groups of respondents—1-5, 6-10, 11-20, 21+—as they pertain to each of the four constructs: (1) maintenance, (2) adaptation, (3) goal attainment, and (4) integration. To test this hypothesis, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied at an alpha of .05.

I chose to use the ANOVA statistical process rather than t-test for Hypothesis 3 (gender) even though a t-test could have been used. This was done to allow for a uniformity of process in all four of the hypotheses.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited by the use of Ebmeier's 1992 version of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness survey. This survey was validated using widely differing N's: staff (N=423), principal (N=23), and supervisor (N=16). This is often true for principal surveys, due in part to the fact that a number of teachers work under one principal and several principals under one superintendent. Although Ebmeier went to great lengths to validate the questions used with both internal and external measures (see section instrumentation section of dissertation) with the use of N's less than 30, questions may arise about their validity.

This study has a similar limitation due in part to the fact that the Seventh-day
Adventist Church operated only 34 boarding academies in its North American Division during the 1997-1998 school year. This created widely unequal N’s as well: staff (N=201), principal (N=23), and superintendent (N=17).

In the decision to use an instrument created to measure public school principals, three additional limitations occurred as here listed:

1. Finance—While the public school principal has an interest in the overall financial aspects of the school’s operations, this responsibility is left primarily to a financial officer whose full-time duties are the management and watch care of the school’s finances.

2. Direct working relationship with the board of trustees—In the public school sector this is the duty of the superintendent, yet the same is a direct duty of the Seventh-day Adventist principal. At no time in the public sector is that an expectation or duty.

3. Spiritual life leadership—For the Seventh-day Adventist principal this is a major expectation; however, at no time is this an expectation or duty within the public sector.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the views held by superintendents, principals, and staff members in the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church (SDA) boarding school system regarding the perceived administrative effectiveness of the SDA boarding school principal. This study attempted to determine, in the light of nationally recognized norms, what the administrative skills of the current site-based principals were as perceived by the three professional groups identified above. I found no study that directly assessed the overall administrative effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist principals.

This current study measured the perceived administrative skills of the men and women who currently lead as principals in the Seventh-day Adventist boarding school system. This was accomplished by measuring the perceptions of the three professional groups (superintendents, principals, and staff members) that have the direct and indirect responsibility in the operation of those schools: Superintendents as the superordinate, principals as a peer group, and the staff members as the subordinate to the principal. The study was guided by the following questions and hypotheses.
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Question 1: How effective are the administrative skills of SDA boarding school principals as perceived by superintendents, principals, and staff members?

Question 2: How does the perceived effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals compare with national norms?

Question 3: Based on the age, educational level, gender, and years of teaching experience of the responding staff members, is there significant difference in their responses?

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the age of the respondent across the four constructs of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Hypothesis 2: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the educational level of the respondent across the four constructs of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Hypothesis 3: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the gender of the respondent across the four constructs of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Hypothesis 4: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the years of teaching experience of the respondent across the four constructs of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

The sample was drawn from the respondents whose duties include the direct or indirect management of 32 Seventh-day Adventist boarding schools located throughout the United States and Canada. This was accomplished by sending out prepared packets...
with sufficient materials for one principal and 10 staff members to complete the field survey for each school chosen. Of the 32 principals chosen, 23 completed the survey, giving the study a response rate of 71.8% for principals. Of the 31 superintendents (1 superintendent was supervisor over 2 of the principals), 17 returned a completed survey, giving the study a response rate of 54.8% for superintendents. Of the 32 schools that were sent surveys, 23 schools had one or more of the staff successfully complete the survey and return it; thus of the 320 staff surveys sent, 201 valid completed surveys were received from the staff. This gives the study a return rate of 62.8% on staff surveys (see Table 3 above). In all, 17 superintendents, 23 principals, and 201 staff members responded with usable surveys. Yet not all respondents chose to answer all questions within the survey, thus giving varying N quantities throughout the statistical data presentations.

Research Question 1

The first research question investigated in this study was: How effective are the administrative skills of SDA boarding school principals as perceived by superintendents, principals, and staff members? This was determined by having each respondent complete Section C, "Principal Behavior," of the data instrument known as the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness. This instrument measures principal effectiveness within the context of four constructs: (1) maintenance, (2) adaptation, (3) goal attainment, and (4) integration. Therefore, the primary research question was investigated within the context of these four constructs, and was analyzed by using mean
scores on a 6-point Likert-type scale with low effectiveness being 1-2.66; moderate effectiveness being 2.67-4.33; and high effectiveness being 4.34-6.00. Low, moderate, and high effectiveness classifications were an arbitrary decision of the researcher.

**Maintenance Construct**

The maintenance construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument represents the combined effects of the perceptions of respondents in relation to 11 administrative skills variables. Perceptions of the respondents were measured for each of these 11 variables on a Likert-type 1-6 response scale. Although the mean perceived effectiveness levels on the maintenance construct for all three respondent groups varied—(1) superintendent (4.82), (2) principal (4.83), and (3) staff members (4.52)—the grand mean perception score on the maintenance construct for all three groups combined was 4.58 on the Likert-type 1-6 response scale. This places the overall perceived effectiveness level for the maintenance construct in the "high effectiveness" classification.

Thus, the answer to the first research question is that SDA boarding school principals were perceived by the total research sample and all three sub-groups for this study to be highly effective, with a mean effectiveness perception score of 4.58 out of a possible mean score of 6.00. These data are summarized in Tables 4 and 5.
### TABLE 4

PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS MAINTENANCE CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.8846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.5392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Staff</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.9374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.9032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5

QUESTIONS THAT COMPRISE MAINTENANCE CONSTRUCT IN DESCENDING ORDER BY MEAN SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q80 staff loyalty to school</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q66 support of staff</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52 concerns of students</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q73 ethnic background</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q81 symbol of school</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q72 assist staff</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q79 employee orientation</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q74 help staff achieve goals</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q78 social leadership</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q83 employee satisfaction</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q61 high visibility</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Adaptation Construct

The adaptation construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument represents the combined effects of the perceptions of respondents in relation to 28 administrative skills variables. Perceptions of the respondents were measured for each of these 28 variables on a Likert-type 1-6 response scale. Although the mean perceived effectiveness levels on the adaptation construct for all three respondent groups varied—(1) superintendent (4.26), (2) principal (4.23), and (3) staff members (4.20)—the grand mean perception score on the adaptation construct for all three groups combined was 4.21 on the Likert-type 1-6 response scale. This places the overall perceived effectiveness level for the adaptation construct in the "moderate effectiveness" classification.

Thus, the answer to the first research question is that Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals were perceived by the total research sample for this study to be moderately effective, with a grand mean effectiveness perception score of 4.21 out of a possible mean score of 6.00. These data are summarized in Tables 6 and 7.

TABLE 6

PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS ADAPTATION CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.9173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.4753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Staff</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.7956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.7759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q77 sound leadership</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q  9 accessible to others</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q  7 concerns of parents</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q  2 current technology</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 effectively cope</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 support new projects</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48 select quality teachers</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q  1 understand staff desires</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 professional/community group</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q  5 deal with political changes</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21 encourage staff in new</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49 deal with societal changes</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 good public relations</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 cooperate with community</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 promote discussions of issues</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 provide development</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 articulate school mission</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q  8 promote staff development</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25 staff different techniques</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30 anticipate community problems</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37 acquire outside funding</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18 community resources</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q71 non-conventional activities</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 involve the community</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q84 participate in community</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28 engage in coaching teachers</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q  3 peer improvement groups</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29 model different techniques</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Goal Attainment Construct**

The goal attainment construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument represents the combined effects of the perceptions of respondents in relation to 21 administrative skills variables. Perceptions of the respondents were measured for each of these 21 variables on a Likert-type 1-6 response scale. Although the mean perceived effectiveness levels on the goal attainment construct for all three respondent groups varied—(1) superintendent (4.49), (2) principal (4.53), and (3) staff members (4.29)—the grand mean perceived effectiveness level on the goal attainment construct for all three groups combined was 4.33 on the Likert-type 1-6 response scale. This places the overall perceived effectiveness level for the goal attainment construct in the "moderate effectiveness" classification. However, two of the three groups placed the principals in the "high effectiveness" classification.

Thus, the answer to the first research question is that SDA boarding school principals were perceived by the total research sample for this study to be moderately effective, with a mean effectiveness perception score of 4.33 out of a possible mean score of 6.00. These data are summarized in Tables 8 and 9.

**Integration Construct**

The integration construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument represents the combined effects of the perceptions of respondents in relation to 24 administrative skills variables. Perceptions of the respondents were measured for each of these 24 variables on a Likert-type 1-6 response scale. Although the
mean perceived effectiveness levels on the integration construct for all three respondent groups varied—(1) superintendent (4.76), (2) principal (4.86), and (3) staff members (4.54)—the grand mean perceived effectiveness level on the integration construct for all three respondent groups combined was 4.59 on the Likert-type 1-6 response scale. This places the overall perceived effectiveness level for the integration construct in the "high effectiveness" classification.

Thus, the answer to the first research question is that SDA boarding school principals were perceived by the total research sample for this study to be highly effective, with a mean effectiveness perception score of 4.59 out of a possible mean score of 6.00. These data are summarized in Tables 10 and 11.

TABLE 8
PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS GOAL ATTAINMENT CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.0433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.4745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Staff</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.8583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.8583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 9

**QUESTIONS THAT COMPRISE GOAL ATTAINMENT CONSTRUCT IN DESCENDING ORDER BY MEAN SCORE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q56 support high standards</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q63 high student achievement</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q42 performance standards</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55 provide appropriate structure</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q68 gettings things done</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q64 make decisions based on info</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q62 understand school problems</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q76 positive reinforcement</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 effectively use skill of staff</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q65 student emotional development</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 effectively diagnose needs</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q75 student social development</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 school's mission staff/students</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32 allocate time and resources</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33 protect instructional time</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q57 set improvement goals</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q58 systematically evaluate program</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47 provide useful feedback</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41 individualized methods</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43 conduct effective evaluations</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46 conduct frequent evaluations</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10

**PRINCIPAL EFFECTIVENESS INTEGRATION CONSTRUCT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.8489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.4321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Staff</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.9191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.8783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q38 respect employee rights</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q44 consideration of students/staff</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q59 encourage cooperation staff</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36 efficiently use school facilities</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26 entrust and support others</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27 understand informal structure</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45 promote school spirit</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31 consider how decisions affect</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q67 write concisely and correctly</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q69 skill in decision making</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q70 effective oral communication</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q82 assign staff most comfortable</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q60 emphasize each part of school</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35 school staff in decision making</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51 schedule meaningful meeting</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50 share decision making</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 promote staff cohesion</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34 delegate responsibility</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q40 distribute workloads</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q54 understand instructional</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53 coordinate curricular program</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 sound internal communications</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23 resolve conflicts among staff</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39 staff place in program</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2

The second research question of this study was: How does the perceived effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals compare with national norms? The maintenance construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument represents the combined effects of the perceptions of respondents in relation to 11 administrative skills variables. In order to arrive at a percentile ranking of the perceived effectiveness, Ebmeier uses the following method: mean score by group (i.e., superintendent, principal, staff member) times the number of questions within the construct (Ebmeier, 1992b).

Maintenance Construct

The percentile rank on the maintenance construct for all three respondent groups varied independently. The highest rankings in relation to the maintenance construct were provided by school staff perceptions (89th percentile), while the principals' perceptions placed their effectiveness level at the 69th percentile, and the perceptions of the superintendents placed the effectiveness of the principals at the 44th percentile. Thus the answer to the second question is that SDA boarding school principals perceived effectiveness decreases as the hierarchical level of the assessor group increases. While the staff had the lowest mean score (4.52), they had the highest percentile ranking based on Ebmeier’s 1992 conversion charts (Superintendent A-4, Principals A-2, and Staff A-8, found in Appendix E of this dissertation). These data are summarized in Table 12.
TABLE 12
PERCENTILE RANK MAINTENANCE CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Percentile Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.02</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>.8846</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.09</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.5392</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>49.71</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.9374</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.9032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adaptation Construct

The percentile rank on the adaptation construct for all three respondent groups varied independently. The adaptation construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument represents the combined effects of the perceptions of respondents in relation to 28 administrative skills variables. The highest ranking in relation to the adaptation construct was provided by school staff perceptions (84th percentile), while the principals' perceptions placed their effectiveness level at the 59th percentile, and the perceptions of the superintendents placed the effectiveness of the principals at the 53th percentile. Thus the answer to the second question is that SDA boarding school principals perceived effectiveness decreases as the hierarchical level of the assessor group increases. Although the staff had the lowest mean score (4.20) they had the highest percentile ranking based on Ebmeier's 1992 conversion charts (Superintendent A-4, Principals A-2, and Staff A-8, found in Appendix E of this dissertation). These data are summarized in Table 13.
TABLE 13

PERCENTILE RANK ADAPTATION CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Percentile Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>119.41</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.9173</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>118.51</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.4753</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>117.60</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.7756</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.7756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal Attainment Construct

The percentile rank on the goal attainment construct for all three respondent groups varied independently. The goal attainment construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument represents the combined effects of the perceptions of respondents in relation to 21 administrative skills variables. The highest ranking in relation to the maintenance construct was provided by school staff perceptions (82th percentile), while the principals' perceptions placed their effectiveness level at the 60th percentile, and the perceptions of the superintendents placed the effectiveness of the principals at the 48th percentile. Thus, the answer to the second question is that SDA boarding school principals perceived effectiveness decreases as the hierarchical level of the assessor group increases. Whereas the staff had the lowest mean score (4.29), they had the highest percentile ranking based on Ebmeier's 1992 conversion charts (Superintendent A-4, Principals A-2, and Staff A-8, found in Appendix E of this dissertation). These data are summarized in Table 14.
TABLE 14
PERCENTILE RANK GOAL ATTAINMENT CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Percentile Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94.36</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.0433</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.05</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.4745</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>90.16</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.8772</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.8583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integration Construct

The percentile rank on the integration construct for all three respondent groups varied independently. The integration construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument represents the combined effects of the perceptions of respondents in relation to 24 administrative skills variables. The highest ranking in relation to the maintenance construct was provided by school staff perceptions (97th percentile), while the principals' perceptions placed their effectiveness level at the 94th percentile, and the perceptions of the superintendents placed the effectiveness of the principals at the 83rd percentile. Thus, the answer to the second question is that SDA boarding school principals perceived effectiveness decreases as the hierarchical level of the assessor group increases. Although the staff had the lowest mean score (4.28), they had the highest percentile ranking based on Ebmeier’s 1992 conversion charts (Superintendent A-4, Principals A-2, and Staff A-8, found in Appendix E of this dissertation). These data are summarized in Table 15.
TABLE 15
PERCENTILE RANK INTEGRATION CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Percentile Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>114.35</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.8489</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>116.70</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.4321</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>108.91</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.9191</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.8783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3

Based on the age, educational level, gender, and years of teaching experience of the responding staff members, is there significant difference in their responses? In seeking answers to this question the four following hypotheses were tested.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1a: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the age of the respondents (20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60+) across the maintenance construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

While slight differences were found among each of the age groups, with the age group 30-39 having the highest mean score (4.60) and the 40-49 age group having the lowest (4.43), no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group (20-29, 4.54), (30-39, 4.60), (40-49, 4.43), (50-59, 4.55), and (60+, 4.53). The analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of 0.2077 with 4 degrees of freedom and a probability of .9339. This indicates a high level of agreement among respondents irrespective of age. Therefore, hypothesis 1a was retained. These data are
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Hypothesis 1b: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the age of the respondents (20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60+) across the adaptation construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

While slight differences were found among each of the age groups with the age group 50-59 having the highest mean score (4.34) and the 60+ age group having the lowest (4.15), no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group (20-29, 4.30), (30-39, 4.10), (40-49, 4.18), (50-59, 4.34), and (60+, 4.15). The analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of 0.5565 with 4 degrees of freedom and a probability of .6946. This indicates a high level of agreement among respondents irrespective of age. Therefore, hypothesis 1b was retained. These data are summarized in Tables 18 and 19.

**TABLE 16**

AGE OF RESPONDENT MAINTENANCE CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.0746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.8315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.8427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.0120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.9444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 17

**AGE OF RESPONDENT MAINTENANCE CONSTRUCT: ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F * Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7552</td>
<td>0.1888</td>
<td>0.2077</td>
<td>.9339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>147 2890</td>
<td>0.9092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>148.0443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 18

**AGE OF RESPONDENT ADAPTATION CONSTRUCT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.8341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.8052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.7170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.9411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.5260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.8023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 19

AGE OF RESPONDENT ADAPTATION CONSTRUCT: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4485</td>
<td>0.3621</td>
<td>0.5565</td>
<td>6946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>104.1134</td>
<td>0.6507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>105.5616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 1c: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the age of the respondents (20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60+) across the goal attainment construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Although slight differences were found among each of the age groups, with the age group 20-29 having the highest mean score (4.35) and the 40-49 age group having the lowest (4.28), no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group (20-29, 4.35), (30-39, 4.30), (40-49, 4.28), (50-59, 4.29), and (60+, 4.30). The analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of 0.0211 with 4 degrees of freedom and a probability of .9991. This indicates a high level of agreement among respondents irrespective of age. Therefore, hypothesis 1c was retained. These data are summarized in Tables 20 and 21.
TABLE 20

AGE OF RESPONDENT GOAL ATTAINMENT CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.9739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.8331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.7745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.0322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.0046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.8855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 21

AGE OF RESPONDENT GOAL ATTAINMENT CONSTRUCT: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0678</td>
<td>0.0170</td>
<td>0.0211</td>
<td>.9991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>129.3245</td>
<td>0.8033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>129.3923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 1d: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the age of the respondents (20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60+) across the integration construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Although slight differences were found among each of the age groups, with the age group 20-29 having the highest mean score (4.64) and the 40-49 age group having the lowest (4.50), no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group (20-29, 4.64), (30-39, 4.59), (40-49, 4.50), (50-59, 4.56), and (60+, 4.52). The analysis of variance yielded an $F$ ratio of 0.1029 with 4 degrees of freedom and a probability of .9814. This indicates a high level of agreement among respondents irrespective of age. Therefore, hypothesis 1d was retained. These data are summarized in Tables 22 and 23.

Therefore, all four sub-hypotheses related to the ages of the respondents were retained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.9889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.8190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.8635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.0390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.0885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.9194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 23

AGE OF RESPONDENT INTEGRATION CONSTRUCT: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>$F$ Ratio</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3526</td>
<td>0.0881</td>
<td>0.1029</td>
<td>9814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>138.7760</td>
<td>0.8566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>139.1286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2a: There are no significant differences between the responses based on the educational level of the respondents (B.A., M.A.+) across the maintenance construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Although slight differences were found between the two groups, with the B.A. group having the highest mean score (4.57) and M.A. having the lowest (4.54), no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group. The analysis of variance yielded an $F$ ratio of 0.1236 with 1 degree of freedom and a probability of 0.7257. This indicates a high level of agreement among respondents irrespective of educational level. Therefore, hypothesis 2a was retained. These data are summarized in Tables 24 and 25.
TABLE 24
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT MAINTENANCE CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.9577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA+</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.8947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.9224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 25
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT MAINTENANCE CONSTRUCT: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1058</td>
<td>0.1058</td>
<td>0.1236</td>
<td>.7257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>118.1627</td>
<td>0.8563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>118.2685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2b: There are no significant differences between the responses based on the educational level of the respondents (B.A., M.A.+ ) across the adaptation construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Although slight differences were found between the two groups, with the B.A. group having the highest mean score (4.26) and the M.A.+ group having the lowest (4.16), no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group. The analysis of variance yielded an $F$ ratio of 0.5048 with 1 degree of freedom and a probability of .4786. This indicates a high level of agreement among respondents irrespective of educational level. Therefore hypothesis 2b was retained. These data are summarized in Tables 26 and 27.

### TABLE 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.7669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA+</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.8025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.7839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 27
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT ADAPTATION
CONSTRUCT: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3113</td>
<td>0.3113</td>
<td>0.5048</td>
<td>47866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>84.4868</td>
<td>0.6167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>84.7981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2c: There are no significant differences between the responses based on the educational level of the respondents (B.A., M.A.+ ) across the goal attainment construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Although slight differences were found between the two groups, with the B.A. group having the highest mean score of 4.39 and the M.A.+ group having the lowest of 4.23, no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group. The analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of 1.2891 with 1 degree of freedom and a probability of .2582. This indicates a high level of agreement among respondents irrespective of educational level. Therefore hypothesis 2c was retained. These data are summarized in Tables 28 and 29.

Hypothesis 2d: There are no significant differences between the responses based on the educational level of the respondents (B.A., M.A.+ ) across the integration construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument. Although slight differences were found between the two groups, with the B.A. group having the highest mean score (4.63) and the M.A.+ group having the lowest (4.52), no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean
### TABLE 28

**EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT GOAL ATTAINMENT CONSTRUCT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.8318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA+</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.8656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.8504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 29

**EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT GOAL ATTAINMENT CONSTRUCT: ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9304</td>
<td>0.9304</td>
<td>1.2891</td>
<td>.2582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>99.6017</td>
<td>0.7218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100.5322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
score of each group. The analysis of variance yielded an $F$ ratio of .5230 with 1 degree of freedom and a probability of .4708. This indicates a high level of agreement among respondents irrespective of educational level. Therefore, hypothesis 2d was retained. These data are summarized in Tables 30 and 31.

Therefore, all four sub-hypotheses related to the educational levels of the respondents were retained.

**Hypothesis 3**

Hypothesis 3a: There are no significant differences between the responses based on the gender of the respondents across the maintenance construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Although slight differences were found between the two groups, with the males having the highest mean score (4.57) and females the lowest (4.47), no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group. The analysis of variance yielded an $F$ ratio of .4805 with 1 degree of freedom and a probability of .4892. This indicates a high level of agreement between respondents irrespective of gender. Therefore hypothesis 3a was retained. These data are summarized in Tables 32 and 33. Hypothesis 3b: There are no significant differences between the responses based on the gender of the respondents across the adaptation construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Although slight differences were found between the two groups, with the males having the highest mean score (4.25) and females the lowest (4.16), no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group. The
analysis of variance yielded an $F$ ratio of .4983 with 1 degree of freedom and a probability of .4813. This indicates a high level of agreement between respondents irrespective of gender. Therefore, hypothesis 3b was retained. These data are summarized in Tables 34 and 35.

TABLE 30

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT INTEGRATION CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.8950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA+</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.9076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.9000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 31

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT
INTEGRATION CONSTRUCT: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4252</td>
<td>0.4252</td>
<td>0.5230</td>
<td>.4708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>112.1764</td>
<td>0.8129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>112.6016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 32

GENDER OF RESPONDENT MAINTENANCE
CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.9298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.9590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.9444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 33

**GENDER OF RESPONDENT MAINTENANCE CONSTRUCT: ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4299</td>
<td>0.4299</td>
<td>0.4805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>147.6143</td>
<td>0.8946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>148.0443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 34

**GENDER OF RESPONDENT ADAPTATION CONSTRUCT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.7669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.8328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.8023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 3c: There are no significant differences between the responses based on the gender of the respondents across the goal attainment construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Although slight differences were found between the two groups, with the males having the highest mean score (4.35) and females the lowest (4.23), no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group. The analysis of variance yielded an $F$ ratio of 0.8212 with 1 degree of freedom and a probability of 0.3662. This indicates a high level of agreement between respondents irrespective of gender. Therefore, hypothesis 3c was retained. These data are summarized in Table 36 and 37.

Hypothesis 3d: There are no significant differences between the responses based on the gender of the respondents across the integration construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.
## TABLE 36

**GENDER OF RESPONDENT GOAL ATTAINMENT CONSTRUCT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.8863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.8858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.8855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TABLE 37

**GENDER OF RESPONDENT GOAL ATTAINMENT CONSTRUCT: ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6447</td>
<td>0.6447</td>
<td>0.8212</td>
<td>.3662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>128.7476</td>
<td>0.7850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>129.3923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although slight differences were found between the two groups, with the males having the highest mean score (4.60) and females the lowest (4.51), no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group. The analysis of variance yielded an $F$ ratio of .4373 with 1 degree of freedom and a probability of .5093. This indicates a high level of agreement between respondents irrespective of gender. Therefore, hypothesis 3d was retained. These data are summarized in Table 38 and 39.

Therefore, all four sub-hypotheses related to the gender of the respondent were retained.

<p>| TABLE 38 |
| GENDER OF RESPONDENT INTEGRATION CONSTRUCT |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.9216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.9132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.9155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 39
GENDER OF RESPONDENT INTEGRATION
CONSTRUCT: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3678</td>
<td>0.3678</td>
<td>0.4373</td>
<td>.5093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>138.7608</td>
<td>0.8410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>139.1286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 4**

Hypothesis 4a: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the years of teaching experience of the respondents (1-5, 6-10, 11-20, 21+) across the maintenance construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Although slight differences were found among each of the four groups, with the group having 6-10 years of teaching experience having the highest mean score (4.37) and the 11-20 year group having the lowest mean score (4.41), no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group (1-5, 4.51), (6-10, 4.37), (11-20, 4.41), and (21+, 4.73). The analysis of variance yielded an $F$ ratio of 1.2181 with 3 degrees of freedom and a probability of .3050. Thus, while there are slight differences among mean scores of the groups as they relate to years of teaching, none were found to be statistically significant. This indicates a high level of agreement among respondents irrespective of the years of teaching experience. Therefore, hypothesis 4a was retained. These data are summarized in Tables 40 and 41.
Hypothesis 4b: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the years of teaching experience of the respondents (1-5, 6-10, 11-20, 21+) across the adaptation construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Although slight differences were found among each of the four groups, with the group having 21+ years of teaching experience having the highest mean score (4.43) and the 11-20 year group having the lowest mean score (4.03), no statistically significant variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group (1-5, 4.28), (6-10, 4.05), (11-20, 4.03), and (21+, 4.43). The analysis of variance yielded an F-ratio of 2.4803 with 3 degrees of freedom and a probability of .0631. Thus, while there are slight differences among mean scores of the groups as they relate to years of teaching, none were found to be statistically significant. This indicates a high level of agreement among respondents irrespective of the years of teaching experience. Therefore, hypothesis 4b was retained. These data are summarized in Tables 42 and 43.

Hypothesis 4c: There are no significant differences among the responses based on the years of teaching experience of the respondents (1-5, 6-10, 11-20, 21+) across the goal attainment construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument.

Although slight differences were found among each of the four groups, with the group having 21+ years of teaching experience having the highest mean score (4.46) and the 11-20 year group having the lowest mean score (4.12), no statistically significant variations
### TABLE 40

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE MAINTENANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.0791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.8809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.8591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.9457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.9457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### TABLE 41

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE MAINTENANCE CONSTRUCT: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2555</td>
<td>1.0852</td>
<td>1.2181</td>
<td>.3050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>142.5335</td>
<td>0.8908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>145.7890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 42

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE
ADAPTATION CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.8510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.7689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.7638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.7861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.8033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 43

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE ADAPTATION
CONSTRUCT: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>$F$ Ratio</th>
<th>$F$ Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6723</td>
<td>1.5574</td>
<td>2.4803</td>
<td>.0631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>99.2111</td>
<td>0.6279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>103.8833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group (1-5, 4.37), (6-10, 4.20),
(11-20, 4.12), and (21+, 4.46). The analysis of variance yielded an $F$ ratio of 1.3771 with
3 degrees of freedom and a probability of .2518. Thus, while there are slight differences
among mean scores of the groups as they relate to years of teaching, none were found to
be statistically significant. This indicates a high level of agreement among respondents
irrespective of the years of teaching experience. Therefore, hypothesis 4c was retained.
These data are summarized in Tables 44 and 45.

Hypothesis 4d: There are no significant differences among the responses based on
the years of teaching experience of the respondents (1-5, 6-10, 11-20, 21+) across the
integration construct of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness
instrument.

Although slight differences were found among each of the four groups, with the
group having 21+ years of teaching experience having the highest mean score (4.81) and
the 11-20 year group having the lowest mean score (4.37), no statistically significant
variations were found. This was reflected in the mean score of each group (1-5, 4.59), (6-
10, 4.40), (11-20, 4.37), and (21+, 4.81). The analysis of variance yielded an $F$ ratio of
2.1936 with 3 degrees of freedom and a probability of .0909. Thus, while there are slight
differences among mean scores of the groups as they relate to years of teaching, none
were found to be statistically significant. This indicates a high level of agreement among
respondents irrespective of the years of teaching experience. Therefore, hypothesis 4d was
retained. These data are summarized in Tables 46 and 47.
### TABLE 44

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE GOAL ATTAINMENT CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.9718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.8133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.8455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.8946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.8869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 45

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE GOAL ATTAINMENT CONSTRUCT: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>$F$ Ratio</th>
<th>$F$ Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2272</td>
<td>1.1413</td>
<td>1.4483</td>
<td>.2308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>124.2077</td>
<td>0.7880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>127.4350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 46
YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE
INTEGRATION CONSTRUCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.0055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.9492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.8208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.8699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.9180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 47
YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE INTEGRATION CONSTRUCT: ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4265</td>
<td>1.8088</td>
<td>2.1936</td>
<td>.0909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>131.9392</td>
<td>0.8246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>137.3657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions held by superintendents, principals, and staff members of Seventh-day Adventist boarding schools regarding the perceived effectiveness of the administrative skills of boarding school principals employed within the educational system of the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists. This chapter summarizes the research performed to identify those findings and conclusions drawn by the researcher. Recommendations of this study are also presented.

Summary

During the 20th century the role of the principal has undergone several periods of social change and professional expectations. These roles included school manager, group leader, on-site policy enforcer, academic leader, and facilitator. This ongoing evolution continues and is not likely to stop (Gilland, 1935; Kimbrough, 1983; Knezevich, 1962; Owens, 1987; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). Currently the principal is perceived as the central person in those schools which are considered most effective (Daresh & Playko, 1997; National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration [NCEEA], 1987, Steller, 1988). The preponderance of research concludes that the principal is the
pivotal figure in effective schools (Lyons, 1987; National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985a; Pugh, 1987; Shilling, 1986; Strother, 1983; Terry, 1999; Vandenberghe, 1987). Strother (1983) brings clarity to the issue in the following way:

The principal is often the 'person in the middle,' caught between the central office and the school board on the one hand, and between the teachers and parents on the other. How a principal handles this position depends not only on his or her personal strengths, weaknesses, and training, but also on popular opinion about what an effective principal should do. Georgiades (1984) stated.

Whereas in many Western European societies the school is responsible for none other than academic functions, in the United States responsibilities range from counseling . . . to athletics, to a myriad of societal concerns. Indeed, American schools are expected to be all things to all people. (Georgiades, 1984, p.4)

It is seldom that one finds an effective school that has an ineffective principal (ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1987). There is not only the science of effectiveness, but also the art of principalship; the two blending together seemingly creates the intrinsic ability to lead schools (Peterson & Finn, 1985).

In the 1980s the call for greater success in American schools came with the desire to identify effectiveness in those schools and how one achieves and fosters its growth (Ebmeier, 1990b). For example, the “Effective Schools” literature tends to follow two trains of thought: (1) the effective school is one that has measurable academic gains on standardized student test scores; and (2) the effective school is known for its positive socializing effect on children (Cuban, 1984; Ebmeier, 1990a; Glickman, 1987).

Marshall (1993) holds that a central characteristic of effective instructional
leadership by a principal is obtaining the resources that make teachers' work with children easier and more effective. Such resources include supplies and materials, computers for classrooms, and reliable substitute teachers. Within this context, there must be a pervasive belief among all teachers that all children can and will learn, thus creating the basis for outcome-based education. In other words for Marshall (1993), the academic outcomes are of primary importance.

Dwyer's (1986) ethnographic of the role of the principal concluded that successful principals act with objectives and goals in mind, but routine behaviors vary so as to meet the needs of an ever-changing school climate and society. Finn (1987) observed that effective principals were able to state with clarity the goals, objectives, and outcomes they expected from the students and staff. They were active, performance-oriented visionaries. Thus for Dwyer (1986) and Finn (1987), socialization is of no less an issue as it relates to effective schools than is academic outcomes.

Snyder and Ebmeier (1993) contend that it is not an “either/or” choice but an effective principal leads his or her school in academic and social excellence as defined by the community in which he or she works.

Disagreements arise when the character and specificity of what standards are considered in the measurement of effectiveness. Competency-based or what is often referred to as outcome-based education and mastery learning are not generally rejected at a conceptual level. The central issue on which outcome-based education tends to be attacked is the focus on psychological and ideological orientations as opposed to academic performance (Schwartz & Cavener, 1994).
Direct involvement of the principal in curriculum development and delivery is a must for the effective school and the effective principal (Boyer, 1986; Fullan, 1981; Glatthorn, 1997). Thus the evaluation or determination of principal effectiveness must then distinguish between essential and peripheral functions and activities. Research suggests that five essential categories describe the array of behaviors in which an effective principal engages. The categories are: (1) defining mission; (2) managing curriculum and instruction; (3) supervising teaching; (4) monitoring student progress; and (5) promoting an effective instructional climate (Duke, 1982; Hager & Scarr, 1983; Krug, 1993).

Most school districts reward principals for following the district rules. In such districts, according to Murphy and Pimentel (1996), competence is defined by a checklist filled out by a central office manager after brief annual visits to schools. Thus, the best principals and the worst principals are paid at the same level regardless of the effectiveness of their schools in educating students. Few incentives encourage risk-taking, improved schooling, or high academic outcomes for students (Murphy & Pimentel, 1996).

Murphy and Pimentel (1996) recommend that the evaluation of principal effectiveness be accomplished through the process of management by exception. Under such a system of evaluation, as long as principals produce good results (i.e., strong academic scores and good social behaviors), they will be rewarded and left alone, and allowed the flexibility they feel they need to be effective as site-based administrators. For principals who do not produce good results, however, improvement or dismissal will be the order of the day in a rather expeditious manner.

In the mix of the public school educational system of the United States and Canada...
several private school systems operate, one of which is the Seventh-day Adventist system. The Seventh-day Adventist educational system began in the late 1800s as primarily a college system. Over time it grew into a K-17 educational system, so that by the 1920s the church had a network of boarding high schools across the two nations. Research studies started focusing on it as a system and its principals in specific by the mid-to-late 1960s, giving the educational leaders of that system insights to its strengths and developmental needs.

Perhaps the first major research study focusing exclusively on Seventh-day Adventist Principals was Jaqua’s (1967) research of the professional training and experience of Seventh-day Adventist principals. The purpose of his study was to identify the status of professional training and certification of Seventh-day Adventist principals. He reviewed 72 principals in the North American Division, utilizing statistical procedures including central tendencies, frequencies, percentages, and means. Among Jaqua’s (1967) findings was that the academic and professional preparation of the typical Seventh-day Adventist principal exceeded that of the public school principal of the time. Yet he went on to recommend the following: (1) broaden the academic scope of training; (2) that Seventh-day Adventist principals be given more opportunity to become active participants in professional organizations; (3) a common code for governance boards and principal duties be developed; (4) better job descriptions be written; (5) and the development of national or division-wide standards for principal certification (Jaqua, 1967).

White (1980) replicated the Jaqua (1967) study using a slightly larger population of principals (80) from both day (39) and boarding (41) academies. White (1980) came
to the conclusion that in the period from 1967 to 1980 Seventh-day Adventist principals were better educated as to the number holding advanced degrees and certifications than when Jaqua (1967) undertook his study. However, he found that fewer were holding those degrees in Educational Administration or had Seventh-day Adventist denominational certification. He also noted that the turnover rate of principals as it related to length of stay at any one SDA school had decreased. White (1980), in replicating the Jaqua (1967) study, also relied on the same statistical methods of central tendencies, frequencies, percentages, and means (White, 1980).

Several additional studies have been conducted in the years following these studies with a focus toward Seventh-day Adventist principals, but none regarding the overall effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals.

**Methodology**

An important question is: Who should judge the administrative effectiveness skills of the school principal? Parents, students, governance boards, staff, principals, superintendents, and principals themselves all are viable groups and could have been utilized. This study was delimited to the superordinate (superintendent), the principals (peer group), and subordinate (staff members). It is these three groups that are professionally trained to carry out the duties and functions of the school, thus creating a line of progression, responsibility, and accountability.

During the 1997-1998 school year, the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church operated 34 boarding schools throughout the United States and
Canada. Thirty-two (the 2 not surveyed have non-traditional boarding school settings in which the students live in faculty or community homes and the total student population was below 50) of these schools received one principal instrument and 10 staff instruments to be distributed by the principal. The principal was instructed to complete the instrument designed for him or her and to coordinate a time when the staff, under the direction of someone other than the principal, could complete their instrument. Instructions directed the principal to select one staff member to lead in the data collection of the staff. Each school received two return mailers, one for the principal's data instrument and one for the staff's. A cover letter and data instrument were mailed separately to the superintendents at their places of employment for completion and included return envelopes. Cover letter instructions for all groups included a statement of confidentiality and security of data.

Three questionnaire/surveys were used, each developed by Kansas State University and the University of Kansas under the direction of Dr. Howard Ebmeier, entitled: The Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness (Ebmeier, 1992b). Each of the instruments was specially designed to assist with school evaluations in the State of Kansas and has been indorsed by the North Central Accreditation Association for Schools and Colleges (Ebmeier, 1992b). The instruments employ four major constructs to assess principal effectiveness: (1) maintenance, (2) adaptation, (3) goal attainment, and (4) integration.

The data were analyzed by using means, percentile rank, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results from the analyzed data exhibit the views of superintendents, principals, and staff members as to their perceptions of the administrative
skills of the school principals. The study was guided by the following questions:

1. How effective are the administrative skills of SDA boarding school principals as perceived by superintendents, principals, and staff members?

2. How does the perceived effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals compare with national norms?

3. Based on the age, educational level, gender, and years of teaching experience of the responding staff members, is there significant difference in their responses?

Findings

This study undertook to answer three research questions.

Research Question 1

How effective are the administrative skills of Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals as perceived by superintendents, principals, and staff members? This was determined by having each respondent complete Section C, “Principal Behavior,” of the data instrument known as the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness (Ebmeier, 1992b). This instrument measures principal effectiveness within the context of four constructs: (1) maintenance, (2) adaptation, (3) goal attainment, and (4) integration. The first research question was investigated within the context of these four constructs, and was analyzed by using mean scores on a 6-point Likert-type scale with low effectiveness being 1-2.66; moderate effectiveness being 2.67-4.33; and high effectiveness being 4.34-6.00. Low, moderate, and high effectiveness classifications were arbitrary decisions of the researcher.
**Maintenance construct.** While all three respondent groups varied, (1) superintendent (4.82), (2) principal (4.83), and (3) staff members (4.52), the grand mean perception score on the maintenance construct for all three groups combined was 4.58 on the Likert-type 1-6 response scale. The principal maintenance construct focuses on the degree to which the principal actively engages in specific behaviors that help create and maintain the school’s motivational and value structure (Ebmeier, 1992b).

These activities include, but are not limited to, the principal’s ability to successfully manage the day-to-day activities of school operations, such as class schedules, personal interest of staff, teacher loads, and both academic and non-academic student activities. The ability to create and maintain a safe and enjoyable learning environment for all who are part of the internal world of a school is at the heart of this construct. Scoring within the highly effective range one can conclude that Seventh-day Adventist principals are highly effective in their abilities to successfully manage the multifaceted tasks involved in the day-to-day operational duties of life in the ‘hot seat’.

Seventh-day Adventist principals received some of their highest scores within the construct in the following three questions: staff loyalty (Q80, 5.27), support of staff (Q66, 4.94), and student needs and concerns (Q52, 4.77). One can conclude that in such a perceived aura of principal support the Seventh-day Adventist boarding high school is a good place in which to work as a staff member and in which to learn as a student. The maintenance construct can be seen as the short-term ‘now’ of management duties. Thus, either by professional training or by personal experience, Seventh-day Adventist principals show an highly effective ability to run the day-to-day activities of the schools in their care.
This is seen not only in the high mean scores but also in the very narrow range of mean scores within the construct (5.27-4.26), thus creating a strong school environment. The only question in the entire maintenance construct that was scored as moderately effective by the respondents was: The principal maintains high visibility in the building (Q61, 4.26). One needs to note, however, that while being in the moderately effective classification the score is so only by mere hundredths of a percentage point, and that Seventh-day Adventist principals must cover much more ground than their typical public school counterparts. This is because they are responsible for an entire campus and not just one or two buildings, as are most of the public school principals.

**Adaptation construct.** While the mean perceived effectiveness levels on the adaptation construct for all three respondent groups varied, (1) superintendent (4.26), (2) principal (4.23), and (3) staff members (4.20), the grand mean perception score on the adaptation construct for all three groups combined was 4.21 on the Likert-type 1-6 response scale. All three groups combined were 4.21 on the Likert-type 1-6 response scale. The principal adaptation construct is the degree to which the principal actively engages in specific behaviors that help the school deal successfully with the parents, the community, and external change (Ebmeier, 1992b).

These activities include, but are not limited to, the principal’s ability to integrate the needs of the school to the expectations of the community in which that school is located, as well as to recognize the ever-changing world in which one educates students. The ability to create and maintain an up-to-date approach to learning while holding on to
the valued traditions of the school and the community is at the heart of this construct.
The adaptation construct can be seen as the mid-range of management duties that comprise decisions that affect change ranging from a few weeks to an entire school year. Thus, either by professional training or by personal experience, Seventh-day Adventist principals show a moderately effective ability to manage the mid-range activities of the schools in their care as seen in the wide range of mean scores within the construct (4.83-2.83). Inasmuch as all three groups rated the principals as “moderately effective,” greater focus should be given to how Seventh-day Adventist principals can become more effective in the areas of community relations, effective change, innovation, and improving instruction. In scoring in the moderate range one can also conclude that Seventh-day Adventist principals have room for professional growth and development in this area. It is of interest to note, however, that while the public school principal deals with a constituency that is close at hand, the SDA principal finds himself or herself needing to communicate with a constituency often spread over several hundred miles. While the maintenance construct deals with the here and now, the adaptation construct deals primarily with mid-range management skills, ranging from a few weeks to a full school year. It is here where Seventh-day Adventist principals scored the lowest grand mean (4.21), and is the only time within the study that all three groups surveyed rated the SDA principal moderately effective.

It is within the adaptation construct that a church-based school system may well find its highest degree of diversity of opinion as it relates to the goals of the boarding school in terms of academics, religious faith practices, social values, and social practices.
While society as a whole agonizes over academic values vs. ethical/moral values, so to a greater degree does the more closed system of a church-based school system. This may no doubt enter into the assessment given to the Seventh-day Adventist principal as it relates to adaptation of ‘new’ things while holding on to the valued traditions of the past.

Seventh-day Adventist principals received their highest scores within the construct in the following three questions: the principal provides sound leadership (Q77 4.83); is accessible to others (Q9 4.76); and recognizes needs (Q7 4.75). Seventh-day Adventist principals, in scoring highly effective in these areas, show that while they are less than highly effective within the adaptation construct, they are highly effective in these three areas.

The overall lowest mean score of the entire survey instrument was found within the adaptation construct, that being the question: The principal models different instructional techniques (Q29, 2.83). The next two lowest mean scores within the construct are also closely related: The principal works to establish peer improvement groups (Q3, 3.42), and the principal engages in coaching of teachers (Q28, 3.49). This gives credence to the fact that Seventh-day Adventist principals are seen as less than highly effective when it comes to providing strong instructional leadership while being perceived as overall highly effective educational leaders. For 16 of 28 questions that make up the adaptation construct, Seventh-day Adventist principals scored within the moderate range, and more than half of all moderate scores for the entire survey instrument are within this one construct.

When one looks at the content of the 16 questions they tend to come under two
main areas: (1) instructional/staff development and (2) community/public relations issues. It is within these two areas of expertise that Seventh-day Adventist principals need to develop additional skills and participate in professional in-service activities. This could be accomplished by seeking professional training at schools and universities that offer specialized training in those areas or by attending focused workshops and seminars.

**Goal attainment construct.** While the mean perceived effectiveness levels on the goal attainment construct for all three respondent groups varied, (1) superintendent (4.49), (2) principal (4.53), and (3) staff members (4.29), the grand mean perceived effectiveness level on the goal attainment construct for all three groups combined was 4.33 on the Likert-type 1-6 response scale, which placed the overall perceived effectiveness level for the goal attainment construct in the "moderate effectiveness" classification. The principal goal attainment construct is the degree to which the principal actively engages in specific behaviors that help the school to define objectives, mobilize resources, and achieve desired ends (Ebmeier, 1992b). These activities include, but are not limited to, the principal’s ability to create measurable outcomes such as high student academic achievements, resource acquisition, and perceived quality in all of the school’s academic and non-academic programs. The ability to create and maintain high levels of success for students, teachers, and support staff, as well as community commitment is at the heart of this construct. The goal attainment construct can be seen as long-term management duties ranging from 1 year to several years.

Thus, either by professional training or by personal experience, Seventh-day
Adventist principals show a moderately effective ability to carry out the long-range activities of the schools in their care. This is seen in the wide range of mean scores within the construct (5.09-2.83), this being the widest range of all the constructs.

It is of interest to note that both superintendents (N=17) and principals (N=23) rated the principal in the “highly effective” classification, whereas the staff members (N=201) saw the principal as only “moderately effective,” and with the staff having the overwhelming sample size they were able to sway the overall grand mean score and place the principals within the moderately effective classification. This is also the only time within the study that the three assessor groups differed in their overall perception of the level of effectiveness of the Seventh-day Adventist principal. One might conclude that within the goal attainment construct, Seventh-day Adventist principals could improve staff perceptions by including direct staff planning in ongoing activities. The principal should provide effective and direct communication about the ongoing activities that may not immediately or directly impact the duties of staff members but may affect them in the future as educational professionals.

The goal attainment construct is comprised of many activities and duties for the SDA principal that tend to be more abstract and long term in nature than either the maintenance or adaptation constructs. How does one person such as the principal create high academic achievement or community commitment? Often staff members and parents alike see only short-term need and how it will affect them as staff members or students’ parents, whereas the leader must correctly anticipate the future and how the actions and decisions of today affect all the tomorrows of the school.
One must note that, unlike public school communities where community leaders and parents are close by, the Seventh-day Adventist principals’ communities are often spread over a rather large geographic area. This no doubt adds to the challenge of effectiveness when trying to communicate and implement such activities that make up the goal attainment construct. Even as the maintenance construct is short term and the adaptation construct mid-range, the goal attainment construct can be seen as long-range planning and implementation activities which take effect over extended periods of time.

One must have an understanding of how SDA principals function within the larger picture of the Adventist Church system. It is in this area, perhaps more than in any other, that he or she performs more like a public school superintendent and public relations director than that of principal. The SDA principal finds himself or herself needing to deal with the educational goals, financial plans, and overall vision and mission of the Seventh-day Adventist conference in which he or she works, as well as the school he or she leads. This at times create direct and indirect conflicts of interest, primarily as they relate to financial allocations.

Seventh-day Adventist principals received their highest scores within the goal attainment construct in the following three questions: The principal supports high professional standards (Q56, 5.01), places a high priority on student academic achievement (Q63, 4.94), and holds high performance expectations (Q42 4.82). It can clearly be seen by these high scores that Seventh-day Adventist principals are perceived to have high concern for academic standards. However, the contrasting lowest scores within the construct all relate to teacher evaluations and instructional improvements for the
betterment of improved instruction. This is seen in the three lowest mean scores: The
principal conducts frequent evaluations (Q46 2.89), conducts effective evaluations (Q43
3.34), and uses different techniques and methods when working with individual staff
members (Q 41 3.54). Therefore, while Seventh-day Adventist principals have high
expectations in regard to academic outcomes, they seem to have a corresponding
weakness in the ability to effectively evaluate the overall instructional program and to
model a variety of effective techniques.

Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals should seek additional
professional training and development in the area of effective evaluation techniques and
supervision of instruction. This could be accomplished by seeking professional training at
schools and universities that offer specialized training in those areas, or by attending
focused workshops and seminars on instructional improvement and supervision of
instruction where applied skills are stressed, practiced, and coached.

Integration construct. While the mean perceived effectiveness levels on the
integration construct for all three respondent groups varied, (1) superintendent (4.76),
(2) principal (4.86), and (3) staff members (4.54), the grand mean perceived effectiveness
level on the integration construct for all three respondent groups combined was 4.59 on
the Likert-type 1-6 response scale. This placed the overall perceived effectiveness level for
the integration construct in the "highly effective" classification. The integration construct
is the respondents' perception of the degree to which the principal actively engages in
specific behaviors that help the school to organize, coordinate, and unify the various
school tasks necessary for achievement (Ebmeier, 1992b).

These activities include, but are not limited to, the principal's ability to create, communicate, and integrate a holistic view of the myriad of activities, academic and non-academic, that make up the school is at the heart of this construct. In scoring well within the highly effective range one might conclude that Seventh-day Adventist principals are highly effective in their abilities to visualize and manage the holistic and often competing activities of the entire boarding school program.

It is within this construct that the entire job of the principalship comes into focus. This is much like the difference between one's ability to correctly identify all the parts of a car, as opposed to the ability to drive a car. So the question remains: Can in fact SDA principals oversee the entire operation of a Seventh-day Adventist boarding school effectively? Each of the three groups says yes, they have the ability with high effectiveness to administrate the schools which have been intrusted to their care.

Seventh-day Adventist principals received their highest mark in this construct on the question: The principal understands and respects employee rights (Q38, 5.06), and, closely related to that question, The principal shows consideration for the students and staff (Q44, 5.01). Only four times in the entire survey instrument was a mean score of 5 or greater given, and two of those four are in this one construct. Seventh-day Adventist principals are clearly seen as highly effective in the area of respect and care for staff and students as perceived by the respondents.

However, four of the constructs’ questions fell within the moderate classification by small margins. They were as follows: The principal provides sound internal
communications (Q4, 4.20); The principal resolves difficult conflicts among the staff (Q23, 4.17); The principal explains to the staff why each part of the school organization is important and how they work together (Q39, 4.09); and the principal actively coordinates the curricular program (Q53, 4.24). Seventh-day Adventist principals need to continue to seek ways and methods to improve their effectiveness in those areas that can foster greater commitment within the school family. Communication breakdowns often lead to misunderstandings and decreased levels of trust.

Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals should seek additional professional training and development in the areas of internal communications and conflict resolution. There are schools and universities that offer specialized training in focused developmental seminars in these areas.

It is possible that the interplay of job satisfaction, religious faith conviction, and personal professional satisfaction has fostered the overall rather high levels of scores that the Seventh-day Adventist principals received throughout this study. Rutabuka (1996) found strong indicators that one’s personal faith practice can impact overall job satisfaction, and as one’s personal job satisfaction level increases so does one’s tendency to increase the level of satisfaction as it relates to the evaluation of his or her supervisor. The question, therefore, is whether the evaluations given in this study are reflective of the true levels of effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist principals; or are the high levels a reflection of the personal satisfaction among the respondents regardless of their position within the Seventh-day Adventist boarding school system?

No less possible is the fact that Seventh-day Adventist principals tend to find high
levels of satisfaction in their own personal and professional lives, thus creating an atmosphere of success and trust which may translate to happy successful staff members. The fly in the ointment, so to speak, seems to be Lawson’s study (Lawson, 1984), in which he found a relocation rate of all Seventh-day Adventist principals of nearly 25% per year over a 36-year period. Since the 1970s the length of stay at any one school has decreased and more so at Seventh-day Adventist boarding schools than at their day academies (1984). While a number of factors could lead one to relocate, one must at least consider the fact that dissatisfaction is one of them.

There seem to be no easy answers to the high turnover rates and overall falling enrollments at Seventh-day Adventist boarding schools, yet from the perspective of the three groups surveyed it is most likely not due to the lack of administrative and leadership skills of the men and women whose duty it is to lead in those schools as principals.

One must conclude that if the Ebmeier instrument is valid and truly representative of a national sample of principals and their abilities to successfully run schools, and the respondents selected for this study represent a valid population sample, then Seventh-day Adventist principals are overall highly effective, and the Seventh-day Adventist boarding school system enjoys the professional services of a highly effective group of educational leaders.

Research Question 2

How does the perceived effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals compare with national norms? This question was answered by using the mean
raw score of each of the four constructs (1) maintenance, (2) adaptation, (3) goal attainment, and (4) integration, and then converting them to a percentile rank based on Ebmeier's 1992 reference manual conversion charts for the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness. (At the time of the field study the 1992 reference manual was the most current one available to the researcher.)

For the maintenance construct, the highest rankings were provided by school staff perceptions 89th percentile, while the principals' perceptions placed their effectiveness level at the 69th percentile, and the perceptions of the superintendents placed the effectiveness of the principals at the 44th percentile.

For the adaptation construct, the highest rankings were provided by school staff perceptions 84th percentile, while the principals' perceptions placed their effectiveness level at the 59th percentile, and the perceptions of the superintendents placed the effectiveness of the principals at the 53th percentile.

For the goal attainment construct, the highest rankings were provided by school staff perceptions 82th percentile, while the principals' perceptions placed their effectiveness level at the 60th percentile, and the perceptions of the superintendents placed the effectiveness of the principals at the 48th percentile.

For the integration construct, the highest rankings were provided by school staff perceptions 97th percentile, while the principals' perceptions placed their effectiveness level at the 94th percentile, and the perceptions of the superintendents placed the effectiveness of the principals at the 83th percentile.

In each of the four constructs the percentile ranking decreases as the hierarchical
level of the assessor group increases. This creates an interesting evaluation; it is likely that none of the groups surveyed have spent much time directly working with or relating to their public school counterparts, yet in perception they hold the Seventh-day Adventist principals at about the same level of effectiveness to well above average as compared with the level of effectiveness that public school principals are perceived to have scored on the Ebmeier instrument.

Seventh-day Adventist staff members who are most directly affected by the principal based on percentile ranking hold the highest regard for the principal as it pertains to effectiveness of the three groups surveyed. They ranked their principals from the 83rd to the 97th percentile. This is interesting in light of the fact that principals tend to become the scapegoat for all that does not go well at any school and perhaps much more so in a closed societal setting such as a boarding school campus.

In direct contrast to the high ranking of the staff, superintendents always rated the principals lowest as related to percentile ranking from 44 to the 83. One might speculate that for the most part superintendents were former principals themselves, and they may perceive that their skills to run schools are or were greater than those of the principals currently under their care, giving explanation to the lowest of all the rankings of the three groups. Of further interest is that in the maintenance construct they were 25 percentile ranking points below the principals and 45 percentile points below the staff members. As leaders grow in their experience (which one could conclude a superintendent has done) they might discover additional skills and abilities needed to be highly effective as a principal, thus leading to the lower percentile rankings. Superintendents in the Seventh-
day Adventist educational system tend to see the boarding school principal on an infrequent basis and often at meetings off campus, and thus do not have nearly the same level of professional relationship with the boarding school principal as do the staff. The high level of staff ratings seems only to add to the credibility of the Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principal’s effectiveness.

The principals themselves saw their effectiveness somewhat greater than the superintendent and somewhat lower than the staff ranking. The principal ranking ranged from the 59th to 94th percentile. This seems to indicate that they were balanced in their personal evaluations as they pertain to the instrument used.

The integration construct rankings were extremely high with both the principals and staff members ranking the Seventh-day Adventist principal off the conversion chart, thus creating the need to extrapolate the percentile rankings. I estimated the rankings to be 94% and 97% respectively, leading me to believe that when asked to reflect on the skills and effectiveness of the Seventh-day Adventist principal both the principals themselves and their professional colleagues with whom they work on a day-to-day basis hold the Seventh-day Adventist principal in very high regard.

Thus, in relationship to the public school counterparts, Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals tend to be as effective or more effective as is indicated by the Ebmeier instrument. This has positive implications for the Seventh-day Adventist boarding school system as it pertains to academic, social, ethical, and moral outcomes as desired by that system. Yet it is the boarding schools that seem to be in the most trouble within the SDA educational system. Consequently this is not due primarily to the
perceived administrative skills of the principals that run those schools, but other factors
not identified within the scope of this study.

Research Question 3

Based on the age, educational level, gender, and years of teaching experience of
the responding staff members, is there significant difference in their responses? To answer
this question each of the four following hypotheses were tested by applying, one-way
analysis of variance (ANOVA) at an alpha of .05.

Hypothesis 1

There are no significant differences among the responses based on the age of the
respondents across the four constructs of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and
Principal Effectiveness instrument. Small differences or deviations were detected in the
five age groups (20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-69), yet at no time were any of the age
groups statistically significantly different. This indicates a high degree of agreement exists
regarding principal effectiveness among the respondents regardless of age, as does the
level of effectiveness in each of the four constructs. Seventh-day Adventist principals
enjoy strong consensus regarding their perceived effectiveness across all age levels.
Therefore, hypothesis 1 was retained.

Hypothesis 2

There are no significant differences among the responses based on the
educational level of the respondents across the four constructs of the Diagnostic
Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument. Small differences or
deviations were detected in the two groups (B.A. M.A.+), yet at no time were there
statistically significant differences within the four sub-hypotheses, indicating that a high degree of agreement regarding principal effectiveness exists among the respondents, regardless of educational level. Therefore, Seventh-day Adventist principals enjoy strong consensus for their effectiveness across all educational levels of the staff with which they interact on a daily basis. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was retained.

Hypothesis 3

There are no significant differences among the responses based on the gender of the respondents across the four constructs of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument. Small differences or deviations were detected in the two groups (female/male), yet at no time were they statistically significant within the four sub-hypotheses, indicating that a high degree of agreement regarding principal effectiveness exists among the respondents regardless of gender. Therefore, Seventh-day Adventist principals enjoy strong censuses for their effectiveness across both genders. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was retained.

Hypothesis 4

There are no statistically significant differences among the responses based on the years of teaching experience of the respondents (1-5, 6-10, 11-20, 21+) across the four constructs of the Diagnostic Assessment of School and Principal Effectiveness instrument. Small differences or deviations were detected in the four groups, yet at no time were they statistically significant, indicating that a high degree of agreement regarding principal effectiveness exists among the respondents regardless of years of
teaching experience. Therefore, hypothesis 4 was retained.

In each of the four hypotheses Seventh-day Adventist principals enjoy an extremely high level of agreement among the staff. This should allow SDA principals to function with high levels of confidence when making decisions that directly and indirectly affect the boarding schools in which they operate.

Areas of Improvement

The study found areas of weakness primarily within the goal attainment and adaptation constructs. Of the four constructs the adaptation construct is made up of the highest number of questions (28), which reflects the complexity of the construct itself. Six of 10 and 12 of the 20 lowest mean scores given on the individual questions within the study were found in this construct alone. The other four lowest mean scores were in the goal attainment construct and were closely related in nature to the weaknesses found in the adaptation construct. This clearly indicates that additional focus needs to be given within the following areas:

1. Instructional Improvement Teacher Evaluations
   a. Role model different instructional techniques
   b. Establish peer improvement groups
   c. Engage in coaching of teachers for improve teaching skills
   d. Actively encourage the staff to use different instructional techniques
   e. Engage in activities to promote staff development
f. Provide development opportunities for others

g. Promote discussions of issues, problems, and recommendations pertaining to education

h. Support unconventional activities that foster and promote desired academic, social, and faith practice outcomes

i. Conduct frequent evaluations

j. Conduct effective evaluations

k. Use different techniques and methods when working with individual staff members to help them improve their instruction

l. Provide useful feedback that can be used to improve instruction

2. Public Community Relations

   a. Cooperate with community agencies

   b. Participate in community groups

   c. Involve the community in school activities

3. Funding Philanthropic Development

   a. Garner resources from the community

   b. Acquire outside funding to support innovative projects

   c. Anticipate and react to community problems as they influence the school.

It is of no small interest that 10 of the lowest mean scores are focused in two areas: (1) academic improvement and (2) community relations, and that 17 of the 20 lowest mean scores focus on the same two areas. This gives clarity to the fact that these
two components of Seventh-day Adventist principal effectiveness need to be addressed in order to increase the professional effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist principals. This can be done in focused field workshops as well as included in specific core class objectives in undergraduate and graduate classes for principals.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are my thoughts and insights as gained by researching the perceived effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals.

1. Principals of Adventist boarding schools are highly effective in managing the day-to-day activities involved in school operation (maintenance construct). They are also effective in orchestrating all the multifaceted tasks and elements needed to make a long-range school program successful (integration construct).

2. Principals of Adventist boarding schools are only moderately effective in instructional leadership (adaptation construct) and in defining objectives and mobilizing adequate resources (goal attainment construct).

3. When compared to a national norm, principals of Adventist boarding schools are perceived as having higher levels of effectiveness than their public school counterparts. This is especially true for staff members' perceptions.

4. Adventist personnel are quite homogenous in their perceptions of the effectiveness of boarding school principals. The demographic variables cause very slight differences.
Recommendations for Further Studies

It is recommended that further study be carried out in the area of the Seventh-day Adventist educational boarding system as follows:

1. Although this study has found high levels of agreement among the respondent groups, additional respondent groups such as students, parents, and board members should be surveyed as to their perceptions of the effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals.

2. Study should be given to the sociological changes occurring within Seventh-day Adventist families that seem to indicate a major shift in how they perceive the importance of Seventh-day Adventist education.

3. Study should be given to the boarding school structure and the economic support of that system as it relates to affordability for the Seventh-day Adventist family.

4. Study should be given to the causes behind rapidly changing student populations at Seventh-day Adventist boarding academies. This should be done both in terms of decline and annual fluctuation.

5. Study should be given to the financial ability and effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals.

6. Study should be given to the Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principal’s leadership effectiveness of the governance board.

7. Study should be given to the spiritual leadership effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist boarding school principals.
8. Study should be given to the concept of regional Seventh-day Adventist boarding schools where several conferences give support to one regional boarding school.

9. Study should be given to the effects of an overwhelmingly Caucasian staff, teaching and role modeling for highly multicultural student bodies.
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LETTERS
February 17, 1998

Dear Educational Leader:

We want to encourage you to participate in the study being undertaken by Mic Hutchinson, a doctoral student at Andrews University.

We feel that the study he is undertaking of the major duties and responsibilities of the high school principal at the boarding academy level in our division will be very valuable for further improving this very important job. I know that this is a busy time for many of you, but only you can give this doctoral student the information needed to analyze this very important topic.

We hope you will take the time to return this survey. As a former academy principal, I know that it is easy to put these kinds of research instruments aside for a later time. Please put yourself in our candidate's place and realize that you would want to have strong support in helping you complete the necessary research. We plan to use the results in the North American Division.

Cordially yours,

[Signature]

Richard C. Osborn
Vice President for Education

RCO:ef
March 10, 1998

Booker T. Rice  
Central States Conference 
3301 Parallel Parkway  
Kansas City, MO. 66104  

Greetings Mr. Booker;  

I know that the spring of the year is most challenging for superintendents with, budgets, staffing, transfers, board meetings, endless travel and who knows what else needing to be done. I send you this request in hopes that you will be part of a field study on: what constitutes an effective Seventh-day Adventist Boarding School principal? Please complete the enclosed survey and return it to me by May 10,1998.  

All responses will be kept in strict confidence and stored in a locked file at my home. I will be tracking answers by region (such as Northwest, Southeast) in no case will I be matching principals, superintendent and teachers answers from any one school or conference. My interest in this study has been years in the making as I have personally watched the decline of many of our boarding schools over the years and have a great personal love for the ministry that each school and staff member in SDA boarding schools provide. I am a graduate of Pioneer Valley Academy one of several Academies that has closed its doors due to change and finances. The study I am undertaking covers all boarding schools within the North American Division.  

Again thank-you for caring for this in as quick and timely as possible, as I will be unable to complete this study without you. I am most grateful for your insight and help. If you are unable to complete the survey please enclose all materials in the mailer and return it to me.  

In some cases you may have more than one boarding school in your conference. If that is the case please complete one questionnaire for each principal. In some cases an associate may have the direct duty of the boarding academy in your conference if that is the case please let him or her complete the questionnaire. In all cases I will be most grateful for a quick response.  

In Christ service;  

Malcolm (Mic) Hutchinson
Malcolm E. Hutchinson  
9387 south U.S. 31 #97  
Berrien Springs, MI 49103  
E-mail mehutch@juno.com

April 8, 1998

Principal  
Seventh-day Adventist Academy  
USA

Greetings Principal:

I know that the spring of the year is most challenging for principals with budgets, staffing, discipline, tours, and who knows what else. I send you this request in hopes that you will be part of a field study on: what constitutes an effective Seventh-day Adventist Boarding School principal. I need you to do two things and all I can give you for your part is a big heart felt thanks, for without your help I will be unable to finish this study and thus my Doctorate in Educational Administration.

1. Complete the inclosed principal questionnaire and return to me both the answer sheet and the questionnaire.

2. Select 10 staff members of your choice to complete the staff survey. One of these ten will lead out in assisting the staff in filling out their questionnaire and will return all the answer sheets and questionnaires to me in the postage paid mailer provided.

All responses will be kept in strict confidence and stored in a locked file at my home. In no case will I be matching superintendent, principals, and teachers answers from anyone school. Interest for me in this study has been fostered by watching the steady decline of many or our boarding schools and my personal love of the mission our boarding schools provide. I am a graduate of Pioneer Valley Academy one of several Academies that has closed it doors over the recent years due in part to change and finances. This study I am undertaking will cover all boarding schools within the North American Division.

Again Thank-you for caring for this in as quick and timely a manner as possible. As I said before I will be unable to complete this study without you. I am most grateful for your insight and help in this matter. If you are unable or unwilling to complete the two request made above please enclose all materials in the postage paid mailer provided and return it to me at once. If at all possible return the completed surveys and questionnaires to me by May 15, 1998.

In Christ’s Service,

Malcolm (Mic) Hutchinson
March 15, 1998

Dear Dedicated Teacher:

You are truly a front line minister in the educational gospel of the Seventh-day Adventist church. Having served for 20 years as a pastor, administrator and teacher, I look back on my years of service, especially teaching, with the fondest of memories. Though I must admit that there were days when I had had more than enough of those dear children.

I am currently finishing a Doctorate in Educational Administration and need your help (fact is I cannot finish without you). Before you is a data collection instrument that I request you to complete on my behalf. It includes a one page demographic profile and a multi-page staff version of a questionnaire. All answers will be kept confidential and in a secure file. I am classifying the data as to the region of the country from which it came which is why each answer sheet has a code on the back.

The questionnaire is designed for the public school system and therefore does not totally fit the Seventh-day Adventist school system. Because of this, the following definitions are needed to complete the questionnaire.

1. Do not complete Part A: This has been replaced by the Demographics sheet that you have.
2. Part B: Directions: Talk about “Principal’s Building” that means your school.
   Part B: Question #23 “district-wide” equals Conference wide in our system.
   Part B: Question #31 “district staff” equals Conference wide in our system.
   Part B: Question #48 ends with the words “their goals” this means the Principal’s goals.
   Part B: Question #59 “district-wide committees” equals conference wide in our system.
   Part C: Question #38 “teacher-board contract. Relates to the K-12 policies within your Conference and Union as to your employee rights.

With these few definitions in mind you should be able to complete the survey with little trouble. One teacher should have been asked by the principal to administrate this survey with the principal not present. When all teachers selected have completed the survey please enclose the answer sheets and survey instruments in the envelope provided and mail to me as soon as possible.

Once again I thank-you for taking part in this study.

In Christ’s Service,

Malcolm (Mic) Hutchinson
APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTION SHEET
Staff
Instruction Sheet

1. Use #2 Lead Pencil included in packet to fill in answer sheets.

*Use answer sheet for all answers do not write in question booklets.*

2. Complete Demographics sheet

3. Complete Section “C”

*Do not complete sections “A” or “B”*

Return answer sheets and question booklets in postage paid return envelope provided (Green and White 1st class mailer)

Thank-you for your support
APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE SHEET
Demographic profile

1. Gender:  __Female  __Male

2. Race/Ethnicity:  __African-American  __Asian/Pacific Islander  __Hispanic  __Native American  __White/Caucasian  __Other

3. Age:  __20-29  __30-39  __40-49  __50-59  __60-69  __70+

4. Highest Level of education:

   __Some College  __A.S.  __B.A.  __M.A.  __EdS  __Doctorate  __Other

5. I am currently serving as a:  (check appropriate one; for the purpose of this study please check the teacher option unless you are currently serving as principal or superintendent)

   __Teacher  __Principal  __Superintendent

6. Current Certification:  __Provisional  __Basic  __Standard  __Professional  __Other

7. (Teachers only) How many years have you served in your current school? ______

8. (Teachers only) Total years teaching experience: ________

9. (Teachers only) How many years have you served under the current principal? _____

10. (Principals only) How many years have you served in your current school? ______

11. (Principals only) How many years experience as a principal? _____

12. (Superintendents only) How many years experience as a superintendent? _____

13. (Superintendents only) How many years experience in your current conference? _____
## PART C: PRINCIPAL BEHAVIOR QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>OFTEN</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
<th>TRUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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students and preventing them before they become major problems.

84. The goals of this school are not clearly spelled out and communicated to all parties.

85. The staff at this school are well informed about educational issues that could affect their work.

86. Teachers sometimes are not sure what this school expects -- one time the administration says one thing, the next time a different goal is emphasized.

87. When changes are made at this school, the faculty adjusts quickly.

88. Teachers in this school are given the freedom to make professional decisions.

89. Teachers in this school actively seek grants and other resources.

90. Teachers in this school are flexible and can change easily when necessary.

91. Teachers are expected to grow as professional staff members in this school.

92. Teachers in this school stay abreast of current technology in the classroom.

93. In this school, attention is focused on improvement of instruction.

94. Teachers in this school are unwilling to share ideas and techniques.

95. Professional development in this school is designed to meet the needs of the community.

96. Teachers in this school work harmoniously with community health and social agencies.

97. Teachers in this school encourage each other to try new techniques and strategies.

98. Teachers in this school provide training for other teachers when they have a successful program to share.

99. Teachers in this school have difficulty getting the necessary resources to successfully implement new programs.

100. Professional development activities in this school are oriented toward meeting future needs of the school.

Part C. Principal Behavior

Directions: Please read each question then blacken your response on the separate computer answer sheet. Please use a pencil. There are no correct or more desirable answers.

A - Never  
B - Almost never  
C - Sometimes  
D - Often  
E - Almost Always  
F - Always

To what extent do you...

1. demonstrate understanding of the staff’s desires.

2. keep abreast of current technology.

3. work to establish peer improvement groups.

4. provide sound internal communications.

5. effectively deal with political changes that impact the building.

6. effectively diagnose and prioritize needs to achieve goals.

7. recognize the needs and concerns of parents.

8. engage in activities to promote staff development.

9. make yourself accessible to others.

10. provide continuous development opportunities for others.

11. participate in professional associations and community groups.

12. promote discussions of issues, problems, and recommendations pertaining to education.

13. articulate the school’s mission to the community.

14. describe the school’s mission to the school’s staff and students.
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15. cooperate with community agencies.
16. involve the community in school affairs.
17. maintain a good public relations program.
18. garner resources from the community.
19. effectively cope with disruptions in the normal school routine.
20. support new and innovative projects.
21. encourage the staff to assume new role and responsibilities.
22. effectively utilize the existing skills of the staff.
23. alleviate difficult conflicts among the staff.
24. promote staff cohesion.
25. actively encourage the staff to use different institutional techniques.
26. entrust and support others.
27. understand how the school really works.
28. engage in coaching of teachers.
29. model different instructional techniques for the staff.
30. anticipate and react to community problems as they influence the school.
31. consider how your decisions might affect the school as a whole.
32. appropriately allocate time and resources.
33. protect the instructional time from interruptions.
34. appropriately delegate responsibility.
35. urge group involvement in decision making.
36. efficiently use the school facilities.
37. acquire outside funding to support innovative projects.
38. understand and respect employee rights typically found in the teacher-board contract.
39. explain to the staff why each part of the school organization is important and how they work together.
40. distribute workloads appropriately.
41. use different techniques and methods when working with individual staff members to help them improve their instruction.
42. hold high performance expectations for the staff.
43. conduct effective evaluation conferences.
44. show consideration for the students and staff.
45. actively promote school spirit and moral.
46. conduct frequent evaluation conferences.
47. provide useful feedback that can be used to improve instruction.
48. select quality new teachers to fill vacancies.
49. effectively deal with societal changes that impact the building.
50. share decision making with others.
51. schedule appropriate and meaningful meetings.
52. recognize the needs and concerns of students.
53. actively coordinate the curricular program.
54. display a detailed understanding of the instructional program in your school.
55. provide appropriate structure within the school organization.
56. support high professional standards.
57. set improvement goals.
58. systematically evaluate the educational program.
59. encourage cooperation rather than competition among the staff.
60. emphasize the importance of each part of the school organization.
61. maintain a high visibility in the building.
62. clearly understand what are important school problems.

63. place a high priority on student academic achievement.

64. make decisions based on information rather than personal opinion.

65. place a high priority on student emotional development.

66. support the staff.

67. write concisely and correctly.

68. emphasize production and getting things done on time.

69. demonstrate skill in problem resolution and decision making.

70. use effective oral communication skills.

71. support non-conventional activities.

72. assist the staff with personal and professional concerns.

73. understand diverse ethnic and multi-cultural backgrounds of staff and students.

74. actively help the staff achieve their goals.

75. place a high priority on student social development.

76. provide positive reinforcement to students and the staff.

77. provide sound leadership.

78. provide social leadership within the building.

79. show an employee centered orientation.

80. expect staff loyalty to the school.

81. serve as a symbol of the building.

82. assign staff to positions in which they are most comfortable.

83. arrange the school to promote employee job satisfaction.
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66. This principal's school seems to be more innovative than other schools.

67. Teachers feel that others in this principal's school value their ideas and suggestions.

68. Few teachers at this principal's school are actively experimenting with new teaching methods or curriculum material.

69. Administrators and teachers in this principal's school work together to make the school run effectively.

70. There is a systematic effort in this principal's school for teachers to share new curriculum material.

71. The climate at this principal's school is poor.

72. This principal demonstrates that he/she has confidence in decisions and programs that originated at the central office level.

73. The staff of this principal's school can easily handle unusual or non-routine problems that may come up.

74. The communications in this principal's school are good.

75. This principal has firm control of building financial affairs.

76. The staff of this principal's school is very supportive of each other in their attempts to try new techniques or methods.

77. The staff at this principal's school is very interested in trying new teaching techniques or curriculum material.

78. This principal relates positively to his/her colleagues.

79. The staff at this principal's school is not very interested in promoting their own professional development.

80. The staff at this principal's school engage in peer observations and peer study groups to improve their own instruction and try new techniques.

81. This principal's school is especially good in efficiently organizing students into groups that maximize learning.

82. Supplies and equipment are rarely available when needed at this principal's school.

83. This principal's school is especially good at anticipating problems with parents or students and preventing them before they become major problems.

84. The goals of this principal's school are not clearly spelled out and communicated to all parties.

85. The staff at this principal's school are well informed about educational issues that could affect their work.

86. Teachers sometimes are not sure what this principal expects --one time he/she says one thing, the next time a different goal is emphasized.

87. When changes are made at this principal's school, the faculty adjusts very slowly.

---

**Part C. Principal Behavior**

**Directions:** Please read each question then blacken your response on Section C of the separate computer answer sheet. Please use a pencil. There are no correct or more desirable answers.

A-Never  
B-Almost never  
C-Sometimes  
D-Often  
E-Almost Always  
F-Always

To what extent does this principal...

1. demonstrate understanding of the staff's desires.
2. keep abreast of current technology.
3. work to establish peer improvement groups.
4. provide sound internal communications.
5. effectively deal with political changes that "impact" the building.
6. effectively diagnose and prioritize needs to achieve goals.
7. recognize the needs and concerns of parents.
8. engage in activities to promote staff development.
9. make himself/herself accessible to others.
10. provide continuous development opportunities for others.
11. participate in professional associations.
12. promote discussions of issues, problems, and recommendations pertaining to education.
13. articulate the school's mission to the community.
14. describe the school's mission to the school's staff and students.
15. cooperate with community agencies.
16. involve the community in school affairs.
17. maintain a good public relations program.
18. garner resources from the community.
19. effectively cope with disruptions in the normal school routine.
20. support new and innovative projects.
21. encourage the staff to assume new roles and responsibilities.
22. effectively utilize the existing skills of the staff.
23. resolve difficult conflicts among the staff.
24. promote staff cohesion.
25. actively encourage the staff to use different instructional techniques.
26. entrust and support others.
27. understand the informal structure and operation of the school.
28. engage in coaching of teachers.
29. model different instructional techniques for the staff.
30. anticipate and react to community problems as they influence the school.
31. consider how his/her decisions might affect the school as a whole.
32. appropriately allocate time and resources.
33. protect the instructional time from interruptions.
34. appropriately delegate responsibility.
35. involve the school staff in decision making.
36. efficiently use the school facilities.
37. acquire outside funding to support innovative projects.
38. understand and respect employee rights typically found in the teacher-board contract.
39. explain to the staff why each part of the school organization is important and how they work together.
40. distribute workloads appropriately.
41. use individualized techniques and methods when working with different staff members to help them improve their instruction.
42. hold high performance expectations for the staff.
43. conduct effective evaluation conferences.
44. show consideration for the students and staff.
45. actively promote school spirit and morale.
46. conduct frequent evaluation conferences.
47. provide useful feedback that can be used to improve instruction.
48. select quality new teachers to fill vacancies.
49. effectively deal with societal changes that "impact" the building.
50. share decision making with others.
51. schedule appropriate and meaningful meetings.
52. recognize the needs and concerns of students.
53. actively coordinate the curricular program.
54. display a detailed understanding of the instructional program in his/her school.
55. provide appropriate structure within the school organization.
56. support high professional standards.
57. set improvement goals.
58. systematically evaluate the educational program.
59. encourage cooperation rather than competition among the staff.
60. emphasize the importance of each part of the school organization.
61. maintain high visibility in the building.
62. clearly understand what are important school problems.
63. place a high priority on student academic achievement.
64. make decisions based on information rather than personal opinion.
65. place a high priority on student emotional development.
66. support the staff.
67. write concisely and correctly.
68. emphasize production and getting things done on time.
69. demonstrate skill in problem resolution and decision making.
70. use effective oral communication skills.
71. support unconventional activities.
72. assist the staff with personal and professional concerns.
73. understand diverse ethnic and multi-cultural backgrounds of staff and students.
74. actively help the staff achieve their goals.
75. place a high priority on student social development.
76. provide positive reinforcement to students and the staff.
77. provide sound leadership.
78. provide social leadership within the building.
79. show an employee-centered orientation.
80. expect staff loyalty to the school.
81. serve as a symbol of the building.
82. assign staff to positions in which they are most comfortable.
83. arrange the school to promote employee job satisfaction.
84. participate in community groups.
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96. Teachers in this school work harmoniously with community health and social agencies.

97. Teachers in this school encourage each other to try new techniques and strategies.

98. Teachers in this school provide training for other teachers when they have a successful program to share.

99. Teachers in this school have difficulty getting the necessary resources to successfully implement new programs.

100. Professional development activities in this school are oriented toward meeting future needs of the school.

PART C. Principal Behavior

Directions: Please read each question then blacken your response on Section C of the separate computer answer sheet. Please use a pencil. There are no correct or more desirable answers.

A-Never
B-Almost never
C-Sometimes
D-Often
E-Almost Always
F-Always

To what extent does your principal...

1. demonstrate understanding of the staff's desires.
2. keep abreast of current technology.
3. work to establish peer improvement groups.
4. provide sound internal communications.
5. effectively deal with political changes that "impact" the building.
6. effectively diagnose and prioritize needs to achieve goals.
7. recognize the needs and concerns of parents.
8. engage in activities to promote your development.
9. make himself/herself accessible to others.
10. provide continuous development opportunities for others.
11. participate in professional associations.
12. promote discussions of issues, problems, and recommendations pertaining to education.
13. articulate the school's mission to the community.
14. describe the school's mission to the school's staff and students.
15. cooperate with community agencies.
16. involve the community in school affairs.
17. maintain a good public relations program.
18. garner resources from the community.
19. effectively cope with disruptions in the normal school routine.
20. support new and innovative projects.
21. encourage the staff to assume new roles and responsibilities.
22. effectively utilize the existing skills of the staff.
23. resolve difficult conflicts among the staff.
24. promote staff cohesion.
25. actively encourage the staff to use different instructional techniques.
26. entrust and support others.
27. understand the informal structure and operations of the school.
28. engage in coaching of teachers.
29. model different instructional techniques for the staff.
30. anticipate and react to community problems as they influence the school.
31. consider how his/her decisions might affect the school as a whole.
32. appropriately allocate time and resources.
33. protect the instructional time from interruptions.
34. appropriately delegate responsibility.
35. involve the school staff in decision making.
36. efficiently use the school facilities.
37. acquire outside funding to support innovative projects.
38. understand and respect employee rights typically found in the teacher-board contract.
39. explain to the staff why each part of the school organization is important and how they work together.

40. distribute workloads appropriately.

41. use individualized techniques and methods when working with different staff members to help them improve their instruction.

42. hold high performance expectations for the staff.

43. conduct effective evaluation conferences.

44. show consideration for the students and staff.

45. actively promote school spirit and morale.

46. conduct frequent evaluation conferences.

47. provide useful feedback that can be used to improve instruction.

48. select quality new teachers to fill vacancies.

49. effectively deal with societal changes that "impact" the building.

50. share decision making with others.

51. schedule appropriate and meaningful meetings.

52. recognize the needs and concerns of students.

53. actively coordinate the curricular program.

54. display a detailed understanding of the instructional program in your school.

55. provide appropriate structure within the school organization.

56. support high professional standards.

57. set improvement goals.

58. systematically evaluate the educational program.

59. encourage cooperation rather than competition among the staff.

60. emphasize the importance of each part of the school organization.

61. maintain high visibility in the building.

62. clearly understand what are important school problems.

63. place a high priority on student academic achievement.

64. make decisions based on information rather than personal opinion.

65. place a high priority on student emotional development.

66. support the staff.

67. write concisely and correctly.

68. emphasize production and getting things done on time.

69. demonstrate skill in problem resolution and decision making.

70. use effective oral communication skills.

71. support unconventional activities.

72. assist the staff with personal and professional concerns.

73. understand diverse ethnic and multi-cultural backgrounds of staff and students.

74. actively help the staff achieve their goals.

75. place a high priority on student social development.

76. provide positive reinforcement to students and the staff.

77. provide sound leadership.

78. provide social leadership within the building.

79. show an employee-centered orientation.

80. expect staff loyalty to the school.

81. serve as a symbol of the building.

82. assign staff to positions in which they are most comfortable.

83. arrange the school to promote employee job satisfaction.

84. participate in community groups.
APPENDIX F

CONVERSION CHARTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile Rank</th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Middle Schools</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Middle Schools</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Middle Schools</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Middle Schools</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Middle Schools</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Middle Schools</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>74.60</td>
<td>86.80</td>
<td>42.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.30</td>
<td>87.15</td>
<td>44.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>84.40</td>
<td>89.85</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>88.20</td>
<td>90.20</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.10</td>
<td>92.10</td>
<td>47.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>96.60</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>49.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>93.90</td>
<td>99.90</td>
<td>51.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>95.30</td>
<td>100.30</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>101.65</td>
<td>52.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>97.70</td>
<td>103.35</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>54.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>106.80</td>
<td>55.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>102.50</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>56.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>108.45</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>104.60</td>
<td>109.00</td>
<td>56.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>109.15</td>
<td>57.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>105.50</td>
<td>110.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>111.85</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>107.40</td>
<td>112.80</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>109.00</td>
<td>112.55</td>
<td>59.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>109.90</td>
<td>113.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>110.25</td>
<td>115.25</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>112.20</td>
<td>116.60</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>113.95</td>
<td>117.95</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>114.30</td>
<td>118.90</td>
<td>61.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>116.30</td>
<td>121.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-4 Raw Scale-Percentile Rank Conversion of School Mean Scores
Supervisor's View of the Extent to Which Principal Engages in Behavior that Promotes
Goal Attainment, Integration, Maintenance, and Adaptation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Adaptation</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Goal Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.20</td>
<td>73.72</td>
<td>36.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.51</td>
<td>76.51</td>
<td>38.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>73.40</td>
<td>79.80</td>
<td>39.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>77.03</td>
<td>79.34</td>
<td>87.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>77.96</td>
<td>79.88</td>
<td>88.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>80.67</td>
<td>80.42</td>
<td>90.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>80.96</td>
<td>91.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>83.50</td>
<td>85.50</td>
<td>95.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>85.36</td>
<td>90.36</td>
<td>100.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>89.05</td>
<td>95.22</td>
<td>101.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>106.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>109.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>91.80</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>111.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>93.99</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>114.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>96.52</td>
<td>99.84</td>
<td>114.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>98.38</td>
<td>101.46</td>
<td>115.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>103.08</td>
<td>116.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.10</td>
<td>104.70</td>
<td>116.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>101.96</td>
<td>105.22</td>
<td>116.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>102.91</td>
<td>105.49</td>
<td>117.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>105.76</td>
<td>123.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>126.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>128.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>107.15</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>132.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>110.68</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>135.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>113.96</td>
<td>107.87</td>
<td>137.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>116.00</td>
<td>112.46</td>
<td>139.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>116.35</td>
<td>117.05</td>
<td>140.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>117.00</td>
<td>121.64</td>
<td>141.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>118.03</td>
<td>142.42</td>
<td>60.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>122.28</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A-8 Raw Score-Percentile Rank Conversion of School Mean Scores

**Teacher's View of the Extent to Which the Principal Engages in Behaviors that Would Lead to Greater Goal Attainment, Integration, Maintenance, and Adaptation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile Rank</th>
<th>Maintenance Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Adaptation Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Goal Attainment Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Integration Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Maintenance Middle Schools</th>
<th>Adaptation Middle Schools</th>
<th>Goal Attainment Middle Schools</th>
<th>Integration Middle Schools</th>
<th>Maintenance High Schools</th>
<th>Adaptation High Schools</th>
<th>Goal Attainment High Schools</th>
<th>Integration High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>39.08</td>
<td>92.42</td>
<td>70.72</td>
<td>70.52</td>
<td>39.08</td>
<td>92.42</td>
<td>70.72</td>
<td>70.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.14</td>
<td>96.10</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>73.27</td>
<td>41.14</td>
<td>96.10</td>
<td>70.83</td>
<td>73.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>33.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>39.69</td>
<td>33.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>42.38</td>
<td>40.16</td>
<td>34.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.38</td>
<td>40.16</td>
<td>34.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.62</td>
<td>40.62</td>
<td>35.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.62</td>
<td>40.62</td>
<td>35.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>42.84</td>
<td>41.09</td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.84</td>
<td>41.09</td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.15</td>
<td>41.64</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.15</td>
<td>41.64</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.29</td>
<td>42.20</td>
<td>39.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.29</td>
<td>42.20</td>
<td>39.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>43.79</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>41.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.79</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>41.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>44.50</td>
<td>43.38</td>
<td>42.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.50</td>
<td>43.38</td>
<td>42.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>45.21</td>
<td>44.25</td>
<td>42.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.21</td>
<td>44.25</td>
<td>42.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>45.86</td>
<td>45.11</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.86</td>
<td>45.11</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>47.02</td>
<td>45.98</td>
<td>43.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.02</td>
<td>45.98</td>
<td>43.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>48.76</td>
<td>46.79</td>
<td>43.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.76</td>
<td>46.79</td>
<td>43.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>49.40</td>
<td>47.54</td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.40</td>
<td>47.54</td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>50.08</td>
<td>48.30</td>
<td>44.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.08</td>
<td>48.30</td>
<td>44.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>50.65</td>
<td>49.06</td>
<td>44.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.65</td>
<td>49.06</td>
<td>44.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>50.87</td>
<td>49.37</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.87</td>
<td>49.37</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>51.15</td>
<td>49.58</td>
<td>46.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.15</td>
<td>49.58</td>
<td>46.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>51.32</td>
<td>49.78</td>
<td>47.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.32</td>
<td>49.78</td>
<td>47.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>51.37</td>
<td>50.12</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.37</td>
<td>50.12</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>51.51</td>
<td>51.45</td>
<td>48.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.51</td>
<td>51.45</td>
<td>48.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>51.84</td>
<td>52.78</td>
<td>48.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.84</td>
<td>52.78</td>
<td>48.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>52.49</td>
<td>54.11</td>
<td>49.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.49</td>
<td>54.11</td>
<td>49.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>53.62</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>49.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.62</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>49.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>54.58</td>
<td>55.93</td>
<td>49.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.58</td>
<td>55.93</td>
<td>49.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>56.07</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.07</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>57.72</td>
<td>57.40</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.72</td>
<td>57.40</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>57.90</td>
<td>131.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>60.52</td>
<td>135.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Vita

Malcolm E. Hutchinson, Jr.
Route 6 Box 6
Manchester KY 40962
(606)598-2057
E-mail mehutch@juno.com

Summary of Qualifications

Education:
- Andrews University, Ed D. Educational Administration, 2000
- Atlantic Union College, M.A. Educational Administration, 1994
- Andrews University, M.A. Education, 1982
- Atlantic Union College, B.A. 1979
- Pioneer Valley Academy, 1971

Selected Achievements:
- Gallup Poll Teacher Perceiver Graduate, 1996
- Philanthropic Development Training, 1996
- Rotarian, Freeport, ME 1988-1993
- Ordained SDA Minister 1985

Selected Strengths:
- Excellent at organization
- Financial acumen
- Multiple task management
- Staff management
- Excellent health
- Interactive teaching style

Work Experience:
Current
- Executive Director of Appalachian Community Services & Spiritual Life Director Memorial Hospital Manchester KY

1997-1998
- Andrews University Contract Professor courses taught: Teaching School Marketing & Development, Supervision of Instruction, and Administration of School Systems
- Interim Director of Human Subject Review Board

1994-1996
- Principal, Bakersfield Adventist Academy, (K-12) Bkfd Ca
- Vice Principal, Blue Mountain Academy, (9-12) Hamburg, Pa.

1988-1993
- Principal, Pine Tree Academy, (K-12) Freeport, ME

1978-1988
- Pastor Northern New England and Ill. Conferences of the Seventh-day Adventist Church

1971-1977
- Self-employed Contractor, residential and commercial properties.