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ABSTRACT

APPLYING KRUMBOLTZ’S THEORY OF CAREER DECISION MAKING (CDM) TO THE LONGEVITY OF PRINCIPALS IN THE NORTH AMERICAN DIVISION OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

by

Sadrail Saint-Ulysse

Chair: Jay Brand
>Title: Applying Krumboltz’s Theory of Career Decision Making (CDM) to the Longevity of Principals in the North American Division of Seventh-Day Adventists

Problem

Ledesma (2011) reports that principals’ average tenure in Adventist schools in North America “ranges from 2.5-4.0 years. Elementary principals remain in leadership for 2.5 years, day academy principals stay for 3.6 years, and boarding academy principals leave after 4.0 years” (p, 8). Ledesma also noted that the length of tenure of a school principal in the Adventist school system mirrors that of other school systems. In an attempt to understand more about the possible factors related to this seemingly high voluntary turnover, this research sought to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model (Krumboltz, 1979; Krumboltz, Mitchell, & Jones, 1976; 1979), considered individually and collectively, and
longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists. The four factors consist of 22 variables altogether. Each of these 22 factors functionally fall under one of the four components/factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model according to the following conceptual structure:

First, personal characteristics included: (a) gender, (b) age (evaluated as a covariate; rationale included in chapters 3 and 4), and (c) ethnic background. Second, environmental conditions included: (a) school type, (b) enrollment, (c) hours at work, (d) perceived engagement as per the Employee Engagement questionnaire by Studer Education, referred to as engagement in this study. The purpose of the Employee Engagement questionnaire is to evaluate how well the immediate supervisor or person who completes the employee’s performance evaluation provides a work environment that allows the employee to reach his/her potential. Additionally, five of the six dimensions of the School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES) were included as follows: (e) autonomy, (f) decision making, (g) impact, (h) professional growth, and (i) status.

Third, learning experiences, included: (a) degree, (b) certification or licensure, and (c) preparation (before) or (d) preparation (after) becoming a principal. Fourth, task skills were evaluated using (a) principals’ perceived level of self-efficacy, one of the six dimensions of the SPES; according to Bandura (1994), ‘self-efficacy’ includes subjective confidence in one’s task abilities; and finally (b) feeling of preparedness.

Method

A quantitative approach was adopted using an online survey. Descriptive statistics, Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), and Multiple Regression Analysis that explores associations between 22 variables, controlled for Age, and longevity were
conducted to analyze the responses of 507 principals and head teachers throughout the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists school system.

Results

Age accounted for 11% of the variance in Same School Longevity, and the 22 variables accounted for an additional 7.7% of the variance in Same School Longevity, a significant increase over the contribution of age. Using an alpha criterion of 0.05, only two of the 22 variables, controlling for Age, contributed to a regression model. Salary explained 2.4% of the variance in ‘Same School Longevity’, controlling for Age, and ‘Preparation Before’ explained 1.1% of the variance in ‘Same School Longevity’, again controlling for Age. ‘Preparation Before’ was negatively related to ‘Same School Longevity’ – i.e., principals with training BEFORE becoming a principal had lower ‘Same School Longevity’.

Conclusions

Salary and Preparation Before, two of the items under Environmental Conditions from Krumboltz’s Social Learning Theory of Career Decision Making, were found to be statistically significant predictors of job tenure and contributed 2.4% and 1.1% respectively of the variance in Same School Longevity, controlling for Age.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The job of the principal “has never been harder on the people in it” (Steinberg, 2003, para. 2). Bohn (2013) commented that “many people are unaware of everything principals do on a daily basis” (para. 3). Williamson and Campbell (1987) explained that principals are faced daily with conflicts and confrontation which “often seriously impede the principals’ job performance, in addition to their physical and mental health” (p. 109).

In the same vein, Boyland (2011) reported that “for many years, the principalship has been described as a stressful position and the degree of stress appears to be increasing over time” (p. 2). The same author emphasized that “one can understand how in this age of amplified accountability and public dissatisfaction with schools; even the most effective principals are feeling under immense pressure” (p. 6).

A report from “The MetLife Survey of the American Teacher: Challenges for School Leadership” (2012) indicates that “three-quarters (75%) of principals feel the job of the principal has become too complex” (p. 5), nearly “half (48%) of principals feel under great stress several days a week or more” (p. 5), fewer reported being satisfied with their job, 59%, as compared to 68% in 2008, and “one-third (32%) of principals indicate they are very or fairly likely to leave their job as a school principal to go into other occupations” (p. 34).
It is clear that the job of a school principal has become increasingly challenging not to mention that parents, boards, and legislators often add to the already complex job description. Some of the many demands on principals include: (a) the expectation for them to be instructional leaders, (b) run the day-to-day operation of schools, (c) supervise teachers, (d) develop and implement curriculum, (e) be responsible for student learning outcomes, and (f) discipline.

The stress and the demands of the principalship have caused many principals to leave the profession altogether, voluntarily or involuntarily. Colleges and universities have the task of ensuring that their principal preparation programs equip aspiring principals for the job and provide additional training to current principals. The necessity for aspiring principals to obtain the training that will enable them to become long term school leaders is vital. For instance, the website of Eastern Michigan University contains a brochure that states that the university offers a Master’s Degree in Educational Leadership, which “is designed for professional educators who are seeking the skills and knowledge to become educational leaders” (2015, p. 1). Overall, K-12 school administration and leadership programs prepare aspiring principals for school administration leadership positions.

These programs are designed to equip aspiring principals “with the four leadership roles found to be essential for 21st century school leadership: (1) instructional leadership, (2) ethical leadership, (3) distributed leadership, and (4) visionary leadership” (Burks, 2014, p. 10). These 21st century skills and knowledge are needed for principals to become effective principals at improving curriculum, instruction, and student achievement. Taylor-Backor and Gordon (2015), in their study building on an original
study by Taylor-Backor (2013) on “how university principal preparation programs should prepare effective instructional leaders” (Taylor-Backor, 2013, p. 63), “gather [ed] perceptions from university scholars, practicing principals who were strong instructional leaders, and outstanding teacher leaders” (Taylor-Backor & Gordon, 2015, p. 107).

Based on their findings, the following functions were suggested or recommended:

- Teacher evaluation
- Professional development
- Curriculum development
- Clinical supervision
- Action research
- Cultural diversity
- The supervision of special education
- Effective instruction
- Instructional technology
- Communication skills
- Teaching assessment skills
- Group facilitation skills
- Understanding one’s self
- Cultural responsiveness
- Positive interpersonal relationships with faculty, staff, students, parents, and community members
- Willingness to be visible and collaborate with stakeholders
- Field experiences that integrate theory and practice. (Taylor-Backor & Gordon, 2015, pp. 109-117)

Similarly, The Wallace Foundation (2013) in its issue entitled, “The School Principal as Leader: Guiding Schools to Better Teaching and Learning,” cited the finding of its study in 2010 that “school and district administrators, policymakers and others declared principal leadership among the most pressing matters on a list of issues in public school education. Teacher quality stood above everything else, but principal leadership came immediately after teacher quality” (p. 5).

The Wallace Foundation (2013) in the same issue also noted “that school improvement does not happen overnight. A rule of thumb is that a principal should be in place about five to seven years in order to have a beneficial impact on a school” (p. 15). Similarly, Bottoms and O’Neil (2001) assert that “the principal’s job description has expanded to a point that today’s school leader is expected to perform in the role of ‘chief learning officer,’ with ultimate responsibility for the success or failure of the enterprise” (p. 5). Dempster, Lovett, and Flückiger (2011) state “in the United Kingdom, Tony Bush (2009), citing Leithwood et al. (2006), argues that there is consistent agreement in the
research literature that leadership matters both to improve schools and to raise student achievement” (p. 10).

Furthermore, school leadership development should be a priority to employers. Dempster et al. (2011) also cite Bush (2009) who asserts that “there is a growing list of responsibilities placed on school leaders” (p. 10). As a result, as per the authors, Bush (2009) argues “that employers have a moral obligation to provide them,” that is school leaders, “with appropriate preparation and development for their roles” (p. 10).

Principals receive their preparation for the principalship by enrolling in a preparation program. In order to become a principal in the public school system, according to the website of the United States Department of Labor (2015) which includes the *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, candidates “typically need a master’s degree in education leadership or education administration” (para. 2). It continues, “these master’s degree programs prepare future principals to manage staff, prepare and manage budgets, set goals, and work with parents and the community” (para. 2). In addition to the master’s degree, “most principal positions require candidates to have work experience as a teacher” (para. 3). Furthermore, “most states require public school principals to be licensed as school administrators” (para. 4). The job description for private and religious schools is the same. Many states in the United States do not regulate educational requirements for principals of private schools (U.S. Department of Education Office of Innovation and Improvement Office of Non-Public Education, 2009).

In the United States, public school principal preparation programs are designed to meet state requirements. Therefore, state certification requirements play a vital role in how principal preparation programs are designed. Shelton (2012) highlights that “a
state’s authority to license and certify school leaders can be an important policy tool to ensure schools are led by effective leaders” (p. 8). Furthermore, she adds that states serve as “gatekeepers” and regulate entry into the principalship in public schools by setting the qualifications for school leaders.

Contrary to public school principals’ licensure requirements in the United States, principals in the Seventh-day Adventist school system in the United States are not required to complete educational leadership or administration programs before or after becoming a principal. While the *Handbook for Principals in Seventh-day Adventist Schools* (North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists Office of Education, 2015) states that “all administrative and instructional staff must hold and maintain denominational certification” (p. 60), a Seventh-day Adventist teacher may even become a school principal as he or she gets his or her first teaching appointment, especially in small schools. Usually, teachers in Seventh-day Adventist schools are promoted to the principalship as teaching principals at the recommendation of the superintendent of schools and or school boards with or without principals’ certification or licensure.

According to the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists Office of Education’s website (2017), the North American Division (NAD) of Seventh-day Adventists (SDA) operates 729 elementary schools and 109 secondary schools. The NAD of SDAs is composed of nine Unions. Each Union operates an education department to serve the educational system of its territory or Conferences under the leadership of the NAD education department.

Conferences provide leadership to the individual schools in their territories and are responsible for the supervision of the school principals or head teachers. A head
teacher in the Adventist school performs the same administrative duties as a principal. The head teacher serves as the principal of a small school, sometimes with one or two other teachers. Fifty eight and a half percent of the schools in the North American Division are classified as small schools (Havens, Kido, & Thayer, 2015). The North American Division K-12 Board of Education provides guidelines for teacher and principal certifications (NAD of SDAs Office of Education, 2014).

As per the K-12 Educators’ Certification Manual of the NAD of SDAs Office of Education (2016), “the administrator certificate is specifically designed for school principals, conference educational personnel” (p. 16) and teachers. The candidate must hold a master’s degree and have the following:

Has a minimum of eighteen semester/twenty-seven quarter hours of graduate courses selected from the areas of curriculum, school administration, supervision, school law, school finance, school plant planning, personnel administration, school public relations, religious education, and field experience, or holds a doctorate degree in school administration. (pp. 16, 17)

In order to receive the “principal endorsement,” the applicant must have “completed a minimum of one graduate-level course in each of the following areas: curriculum, supervision, school law, school administration, and school finance” (p. 28).

The importance of principal training leading to state licensure cannot be over emphasized. Cheney, Davis, Garrett, and Holleran (2010), stated that “training and development experiences are sequenced to build readiness for a principalship upon program completion” (p. 70). After obtaining a principal position, remaining in that position represents a challenge for many principals. According to Béteille, Kalogrides, and Loeb (2012), “more than one out of every five principals leaves their school each year” (p. 1). Principals work in an era marked by high expectations from their several constituencies invariably resulting in a tremendously high level of stress for principals.
As one example says, “the burden of school success – and individual student achievement” has typically been placed on “the principal’s shoulders” (Bottoms & O’Neil, 2001, p. 5).

Traditionally, according to Schneider and Burton (2005), it is expected that principals will already possess a deep understanding of the role and duty of principal as they move up the managerial education ladder. However, most principals in the Adventist school system rise to the principalship directly from the classroom without formal principal training or prior administrative role(s).

According to Knox (2005), the attrition rates of new teachers and principals are higher than those of any other profession. Public and private school principals move from school to school very frequently. Kuhn (1978) reports a 38% mobility rate, which is referred as “the frequency of moves from school to school or place to place by teachers and principals” (p. 10) among Adventist teachers and principals in Canada, which is a part of the North American Division. Ledesma (2011) reports that “Adventist principals in North America stay an average of 2.5 years at the elementary level, 3.6 years at day secondary schools, and 4.0 years at secondary boarding-schools” (p. 8).

According to Viadero (2009), “Data available from a handful of states suggest that only about half of beginning principals remain in the same job five years later, and that many leave the principalship altogether” (p. 1). As mentioned earlier, Ledesma (2011) reports that “Adventist principals in North America stay an average of 2.5 years at the elementary level, 3.6 years at day secondary schools, and 4.0 years at secondary boarding-schools” (p. 8). One of Ledesma’s recommendations for further research based on her investigation of the longevity of SDA administrators in North America,
highlighted a study comparing the longevity of principals who were involved in a principal preparation program with those who were not.

Based on these efforts, it is clear that several studies on principals’ retention and attrition have been conducted. However, a review of the literature indicates that only limited research has investigated the impact of the “factors” of “career decision making (CDM)” (Krumboltz, Mitchell, & Jones, 1976) on principals’ retention at the same school.

Sorapuru (2012) conducted a study in low-performing schools in Louisiana to explore the extent to which “The four factors of Krumboltz’s (1979) social learning theory of career decision making (personal characteristics, environment, formal learning experiences, and task skills) combine to predict principals’ intent to stay in the role of principal” (p. 9). Additionally, very little research relates to the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs. The results from implementing such study will allow Union and Conference personnel to develop evidence-based policies and informed budgets to address the pre-mentioned factors. Furthermore, the results and their related variables will inform administrators as to how to earmark funds to improve principals’ longevity, which hopefully can in turn improve student achievement.

**Statement of the Problem**

The Wallace Foundation (2013) emphasizes that “school improvement does not happen overnight. A rule of thumb is that a principal should be in place about five to seven years in order to have a beneficial impact on a school” (p. 15). However, Ledesma
(2011) reports that principals’ average tenure in Adventist schools in North America “ranges from 2.5-4.0 years. Elementary principals remain in leadership for 2.5 years, day academy principals stay for 3.6 years, and boarding academy principals leave after 4.0 years” (p. 8).

Ledesma (2011) also noted that the length of tenure of a school principal in the Adventist school system mirrors that of other school systems. An exploration of the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs constitutes the focus of this research.

The following work provides further context and framing for the present investigation. Muir and Li (2014), using definitions adapted from Price and Muller (1981) and Steers (1977) presented a list of description and definition of 12 retention factors in their study of the top factors that drive employee retention. They include: (a) advancement opportunities, (b) constituent attachments, (c) extrinsic rewards, (d) flexible work arrangements, (e) investments, (f) job satisfaction, (g) lack of alternatives, (h) location, (i) nonwork [sic] influences, (j) organizational commitment, (k) organizational justice, and (l) organizational prestige.

Similarly, Sorapuru (2012) in a study of “Factors Impacting Principals’ Career Decision Making” presented the following finding based on the literature review, which indicates: “The results of the surveys from various states identify four major areas impacting principal retention: location of school, length of work day, salary, and stress related to the job responsibilities” (p. 20). The findings of the study revealed that most of
principals “do not intend to stay as principal in a low-performing school longer than three to five years” (p. 90).

Sorapuru (2012) also highlighted similar findings from a study conducted by Fuller and Young (2009), which indicate that principals did not remain “in the profession of principalship more than 3 to 5 years. In low- performing schools, principals remained even fewer years (2.5 years)” (p. 63). Additionally, as per Sorapuru’s (2012) study, “The top three factors principals cited as reasons they would leave the principalship are: (1) stress of the position (40.0%), (2) lack of district support (25.2%), and (3) time demands of the positions (23.7%)” (p. 63). Furthermore, “the factors, on-the-job learning experiences and school performance scores for the school, does predict at a significant level principals’ intent to stay in a low-performing school in Louisiana” (p. 67).

Although principals in public schools enter the principalship after completing a principal preparation program leading to state certification, principals’ attrition rate continues to rise. Principals in both the private and public schools experience the challenge of the complexity of the principalship which has caused an equal percentage of attrition. In the NAD of SDAs’ educational system, a teacher may become a principal without completing a leadership or administrative training program that would lead to the school administrator certification in the Adventist school system. Several studies on Adventist principals’ retention and attrition have been conducted (Kuhn, 1978; Ledesma, 2011). However, a review of the literature indicates that there is limited research as it relates to the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs.
Purpose of the Study

This research sought to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs.

Research Questions

The research questions of this study were as follows:

1. Is there a significant association between any of the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered separately, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs?

2. Is there a significant association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered together, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs?

Theoretical Framework

The framework guiding this study of the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs using 22 variables measured by two quantitative survey instruments is based on the theory of CDM as proposed by Krumboltz, Mitchell, and Jones (1976), which was based on Bandura’s (1971) social learning theory. “In social learning theory, human functioning relies on three regulatory processes. They include stimulus, cognitive, and reinforcement control” (p. 11).

Bandura (1971) stated that “in the social learning view, psychological functioning involved a continuous reciprocal interaction between behavior and its controlling
conditions” (p. 39). Building on Bandura’s social learning theory, Krumboltz et al.
(1976) introduced “social learning theory” or “theory of career selection” known as
“Krumboltz’s social learning theory of career decision making” in which they “explain
how educational and occupational preferences and skills are acquired and how selections
of courses, occupations, and fields of work are made” (p. 71).

Krumboltz et al. (1976) suggested four categories of influencers, also called
constraints or facilitators that “produce movement along one career path or another” (p.
71). First, “genetic endowment and special abilities such as race, sex, and physical
appearance and characteristics” (p. 71). Second, “environmental conditions and events
that are usually outside the control of any one individual” (p. 71). They include: Number
and nature of job opportunities, number and nature of training opportunities, social
policies and procedures for selecting trainees and workers, rate of return for various
occupations, labor laws and union rules, physical events such as earthquakes, droughts,
floods, and hurricanes, availability of and demand of natural resources, technological
developments, changes in social organization, family training experiences and resources,
educational systems, and neighborhood and community influences (pp. 71, 72).

Third, “learning experiences which include instrumental (self) and associative
(environmental) learning experiences” (p. 72). Fourth and lastly, “task approach skills
which are unexplained interactions between genetic and environmental influences such as
set of skills, performance standards, mental sets, and emotional responses” (p. 72).

Krumboltz’s (1979) social learning theory of career decision making has been
used to describe career mobility in agricultural education (Grady, 1990) and most
recently by Sorapuru (2012) in her study of principals’ career decision making. Sorapuru
(2012) cited Krumboltz et al. (1979) and Mitchell and Krumboltz (1990), who espoused that “the different combinations of these influencers” (p. 6), which consist of “genetic or personal characteristics, work environment, learning experience, and task skills . . . can create various interactions and produce a multitude of different career choices” (p. 6).

Sorapuru (2012) added that “this would include an individual’s decision to stay in or leave a profession” (p. 6). A “Conceptual Map: Influences Associated with Principals’ Intent to Stay. Based on Krumboltz (1990)” as per Sorapuru (2012). Figure 1 is shown below.

**Figure 1.** Conceptual Map: Influences Associated with Principals Intent to Stay. Based on Krumboltz (1990)” as per Sorapuru (2012).

**Research Design**

In this study, a quantitative approach was used to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs using 22 variables, controlling for age.
Two quantitative survey instruments were utilized for this study to help explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs. The two quantitative survey instruments are as follows: modified versions of the Employee Engagement questionnaire Survey (EES) by Studer Education and the SPES by Short and Rinehart (1992). These questionnaires were administered electronically. In this study, the four factors subsumed 22 variables, controlling for age (see Table 1). Descriptive statistics, ANCOVA, and Multiple Regression using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) were used to analyze results.

Table 1

*Factors of Krumboltz’s Model and Classification of 22 Measured Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Personal Characteristics</td>
<td>Gender, age, ethnic background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Formal Learning Experiences</td>
<td>Degree, license, preparation (before), and preparation (after)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Environmental Conditions</td>
<td>Weekly hours, salary, enrollment, school type, Engagement, Five of the six dimensions of School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES): autonomy, decision making, impact, professional growth, and status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Task Skills</td>
<td>Self-efficacy (a dimension of SPES) and feeling prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Longevity/retention (Same school longevity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations

The information gathered for this study may not be based on objectively factual data but on the perceptions and opinions of the respondents. Respondents may be unable to share their perceptions accurately through a survey.

Delimitations

This study only included principals from the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists. Other delimitations include set of variables that could be used to explain the variance in principals’ retention. Only the four factors in Krumboltz’s model, along with the 22 variables measured in the selected survey instruments, controlling for age, were tested regarding their relationship(s) relating to retention (see Table 1) were selected for the study. Also, the six dimensions measured by the SPES were selected to address two of the four factors of Krumboltz’s model; five of these dimensions fell under environmental conditions and one under task skills. Because additional theoretical implications potentially derived from the conceptual structure implied by the classification of survey items under Krumboltz’s four-factor model were not addressed by the research questions, they were not explored or described further. Yet the questionnaires selected allowed the researcher to explore additional contextual issues relevant to the study (e.g., demographics).

Also, although task skills may be related to formal learning experiences, in this study, task skills were evaluated using principals’ perceived level of self-efficacy, one of the six dimensions of SPES, and perceived preparedness. According to Bandura (1994), ‘self-efficacy’ includes subjective confidence in one’s task abilities.
Definitions of Terms

The terminologies that follow guided the study on the exploration of the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs.

In addressing principals’ retention and attrition, most researchers refer to them as leavers or stayers (Battle & Gruber, 2010; Goldring & Taie, 2014). The definitions described by Billingsley (2003) have been modified to refer to principals’ attrition and retention by changing key words to fit the definitions given below. In this study, retention is analogous to longevity.

Attrition: Also includes principals who leave the principalship or may include principals who remain in education but not as principals.

Longevity/Retention: Principals remain in the same principal assignment at the same school as the previous year(s) or the number of years at the same school within the NAD of SDAs.

Movers: Principals who transfer to another principal position within the NAD of SDAs.

North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists (also referred to as NAD of SDA): According to the NAD Education website (2017), The NAD of SDA operates a system of more than 1,000 elementary and secondary schools and 13 colleges and universities.

Principal: “The principal is the chief executive officer responsible for both the instructional and financial operation of the school” (Columbia Union Code, 2016, p.)
111). In the SDA school system, as per the Columbia Union Education Code (2016) which states:

The term “principal” is used when there are three or more teachers (including the principal) in a small elementary school or junior academy with at least three teachers. The general practice is to appoint a teaching principal who is charged with performing the duties of a principal in addition to teaching assignments established by the local school board and local conference office of education (p. 111).

*Principals’ Preparation Programs:* Also referred to as leadership preparation programs or “administrator preparation.” It also “refers to leadership education graduate programs in universities granting masters and doctoral degrees in educational administration or educational leadership” (Hoyle & Hoy, 2015, para. 1).

Principals’ preparation for the NAD is also referred to as individuals who completed the required courses for the NAD administrator certification. These individuals may or may not have attended a planned principals’ preparation program. However, they possess a master degree and have completed the required courses leading to the SDA principal certification.

*Principal’s Relationship with their Superintendent:* How well immediate superintendents/supervisors provide a work environment that allowed principals to perform at a high level as defined by the Employee Engagement Questionnaire.

**Summary**

Chapter one consists of a general overview of the exploration of the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the
NAD of SDAs. The chapter sets the stage for the study of the principalship, its preparation, certification, and other factors such as longevity, retention, and attrition that impact the principalship.

This study allows the researcher to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

It has been said that the strength of a nation depends on the strength of its schools. Principals collaborate with teachers, parents, and boards to improve schools. Their work primarily functions to positively impact students’ learning outcome (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007). The leadership ability of the principal makes a positive impact in schools. Because it has been said that leaders are made and not born, people rely on principal preparation programs to train aspiring principals with the skills that will enable them to succeed and remain at their schools over time in order to bring stability to schools. Consequently, several studies have been conducted on principals’ retention (Akiba, & Reichardt, 2004; Béteille et al., 2012; Blazer, 2010; Fuller, & Young, 2008; Jensen, 2014; Ledesma, 2011).

Sorapuru (2012) conducted a study in low-performing schools in Louisiana to explore the extent to which “the four factors of Krumboltz’s (1979) social learning theory of career decision making (personal characteristics, environment, formal learning experiences, and task skills) combine to predict principals’ intent to stay in the role of principal” (p. 9). There exists a gap in the literature in regard to the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs.
Darling-Hammond et al. (2007) reiterated the pivotal role principals play in setting the direction for successful schools. They also emphasized the lack of knowledge on the best ways to prepare and develop highly qualified principals. This literature review will address principal preparation programs, principal retention, the career path of principals, and principal mobility. This review will lay the foundation for the study on the study on the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs.

**Theory of Career Decision Making**

One of the questions that Krumboltz et al. (1976) sought to answer that led to the development of the social learning theory of career decision making was “how or why is it that they [people] change from one educational program or occupation to another at various points throughout their lives?” (p. 71). The theory “identifies the interactions of genetic factors, environmental conditions, learning experiences, cognitive and emotional responses, and performance skills that produce movement along one career path or another” (p. 71). Feller, Honaker, and Zagzebski (2001) stated that the “development of the Social Learning Theory of Career Decision Making (SLTCDM) diverged significantly from the predominant model of that time period (trait-and-factor)” (p. 220).

Krumboltz et al. (1976) posited four factors that influence the theory of career decision making as follows:

1. Genetic endowment or special abilities, which consists of “race, sex, physical appearances and characteristics, including physical defects or handicaps that cannot be changed” (p. 71).
2. Environmental conditions and events. These are “factors usually outside the control of any one individual”. They result in “number and nature of job opportunities”, “number and nature of training opportunities”, “social policies and procedures for selecting trainees and workers”, “rate of return for various occupations”, “labor laws and union rules”, “physical events such earthquakes, droughts, floods, and hurricanes”, “availability of and demand for natural resources”, “technological developments”, “changes in social organization”, “family training experiences and resources”, “educational system”, and “neighborhood and community influences” (pp. 71, 72).

3. Learning experiences, which consists of “instrumental learning experiences” where “the individual acts on the environment in such a way as to produce certain consequences” and “associative learning experiences” which are due to “external stimuli” (p. 72).

4. Task approach skills, which are “set of skills, performance standards and values, work habits, mental sets, and emotional responses” that are “interactions between genetic and environmental influences” (p. 73) as per Krumboltz et al. (1976).

**Principals’ Preparation Programs**

In their theory of preparation, Berry and Beach (2009) noted that historically, “the supervision and administration of education in the early 1800’s was professionally unskilled; an extension of the men who governed within the local community” (para. 4). Levine (2005), who is known as a critic of leadership preparation programs (Berry & Beach, 2009), lamented that “increasingly, education schools are being blamed for intractable social problems they did not create and cannot solve. They have been faulted for the quality of the people who choose to become teachers and administrators” (p. 6).
Berry and Beach (2009) quoted Prince (1901) who noted that “the evolution of a specialized role for school leadership culminated when Massachusetts authorized towns and city councils to require the school committee” (para. 6) to hire “a superintendent of public schools who under the direction and control of said committee shall have the care and supervision of the schools” (para. 6). They also noted that there is “no accepted theory of program preparation in educational administration” (Berry & Beach, 2009, para. 39).

A study of school leadership preparation programs would not be complete without a close look at the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (2015), formerly Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. As per the new manual, “the Council of Chief State School Officers published the first standards in 1996 which was followed by a modest revision in 2008 based on empirical research at the time.” Whereas, “the 2015 Standards are the result of an extensive process that took an in-depth look at the new education leadership landscape” (p. 2). The 2015 “Standards recognize the central importance of human relationships not only in leadership work but in teaching and student learning” (p. 3).

Consequently, as per the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015), “the 2015 Standards embody a research-and practice-based understanding of the relationship between educational leadership and student learning” (p. 3). Improving student learning became the major focus with “a holistic view of leadership” (p. 3). Therefore, school leaders “must focus on how they are promoting the learning, achievement, development, and well-being of each student” (p. 3) in all that they do. Furthermore, “the 2015 Standards are “model” professional standards” (p. 4). That is,
“they are a compass that guides the direction of practice directly as well as indirectly through the work of policy makers, professional associations and supporting institutions” (p. 4).

Prior to October 2015, state guidelines have used the ISLLC standards in creating their own standards to ensure that aspiring school principals are equipped with skills that will positively influence student learning. For instance, the Pennsylvania Department of Education posted a document on its website in which it explains that in the state of Pennsylvania, “Framework and Guidelines for Principal Preparation Programs is designed to establish highly effective preparation programs within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to meet the increasing need for highly qualified instructional leaders” (p. 2). In addition to using the national standards, the document also states that their framework and guidelines are also based on “commonalities in the leadership programs that have correlated program design to higher student outcomes” (p. 2). Additionally, “it is expected that principal preparation programs incorporate these practices into their program design” (p. 2). It is stated that “the context for the preparation of school and system leaders is an aligned education system for improved student achievement” (p. 2) that is consistent with the ISLLC Standards.

The objective of ISLLC Standards was to assist in making leadership preparation programs more effective. Leadership preparation programs can be compared to determine their level of effectiveness. As a result, Ballenger, Alford, McCune, and McCune (2008) performed a study “to determine differences in program features and outcome measures” (p. 2) between two groups: Group 1, 143 program graduates; group 2, 100 program graduates from a regional university-based leadership preparation program.
The study “revealed strong, positive results on the effectiveness of program features and graduate learning outcomes of this regional university’s restructured program” (p. 24).

Coupled with student learning outcomes that have been implemented in the principal preparation program, recent graduates also rated significantly higher than former graduates on five other outcomes: “Learning to lead vision building, learned to lead learning for students and teachings, learned to lead organization learning, learned management and operations, and learned to lead parent and community involvement” (Ballenger et al., 2008, pp. 24, 25). They concluded that sustained, ongoing improvement processes have resulted in a more focused and relevant program for the preparation of school leaders.

Another study evaluating the effectiveness of an educational leadership training program (Braun, Gable, & Kite, 2008) investigated “the relationships among leader preparation practices and leader, school, and student outcomes” (p. 1). The study consisted of 88 Rhode Island (RI) elementary and middle school principals. Data for school and student achievements were obtained from the state databases. It was revealed that “a positive and significant relationship was found between the essential leader preparation practices, leader behavior, the school learning environment, and student achievement” (p. 17).

Moreover, Braun et al. (2008) suggested that “the essential preparation practices may play an important role in developing instructional leaders for schools” (p. 18). The results of their study “support both further implementation of essential practices and continued research on the essential preparation practices and their relationship to leader, school and student outcomes” (p. 18).
Likewise, Darling-Hammond et al. (2007) utilized data from a “nationwide study of principal development programs and the policies that influence them” (p. 1) to examine “eight exemplary pre- and in-service principal development programs” (p. 2). One of their objectives was “to determine whether some programs are more reliably effective in producing strong school leaders” (p. 1). The findings suggest that “principals who participated in the preparation and professional development programs selected as exemplary reported being significantly better prepared, holding more positive attitudes, and engaging in more effective practices on average than did the principals in their relevant comparison groups” (p. 143).

Another area of interest is the background or prior training of the aspiring principals before enrolling in a principal preparation programs. Traditionally, before becoming a principal, most principals enter the teaching profession after earning a degree in education that prepares them to sit for the teacher certification examination. However, a minority enters the teaching profession through the alternate route. Brown, LeNeveu, and Bourke (2011) conducted a study “to describe and understand, from the perspective of 10 school administrators who received teacher certification through an alternative means, how experience (or lack thereof) affects accession to and work as school administrators” (p. 2). The three major themes that emerged from his findings included “emotional response,” “professional development to surmount perceived deficiencies,” and “assistive mentor relationships” (p. 3). In the same vein, Marcos, Witmer, Foland, and Vouga (2011) reported that according to superintendents, longevity in school administration is attributed to the mentorship in the field.
Several studies have been conducted on principals’ preparation programs and principals’ preparedness. Barnett (2004) conducted a study involving “practicing school leaders (e.g. principals, supervisors, and superintendents)” (p. 121). The purpose of the study was “to determine frequency of practice and preparedness related to ISLLC Standards” (p. 121). The findings suggested that ISLLC standards were not implemented in principal preparation programs. According to the author, respondents added to the belief pertaining to the ineffectiveness of leadership preparation programs. In a public opinion survey, Farkas, Johnson, and Duffet (2003) uncovered that principals (67%) and superintendents (72%) agree that “typical leadership preparation programs in graduate school of education are out of touch with the realities” (p. 39) of operating schools.

Marcos et al. (2011) conducted a study to explore the impact of “California university Tier I school leadership preparation programs had on overall preparedness for the position, effectiveness of job performance, longevity, transference of skills gained to professional staff development within the school site, and student achievement within their districts” (p. 86). The participants consisted of 12 superintendents and/or assistant superintendents in Los Angeles county of Southern California with school districts with an enrollment of 50,000 students or more. “The study addressed California urban school district administrators’ perceptions of university training programs for educational leaders” (p. 87). One of the objectives was to ascertain whether or not universities were successfully preparing school leaders.

This study defined Tier 1 candidates as certified teachers, and other school personnel such as counselors and school psychologists who desire to become a school
administrator. “Superintendents reported that Tier I candidates were academically well prepared for overall school leadership and candidates emerge with strong instructional leadership and management skills” (p.86). Superintendents and assistant superintendents also reported that “candidates emerge with strong instructional leadership skills; candidates are gaining good management skills; good basic policy procedures and detail protocols are being learned” (p. 91).

Marcos et al. (2011) also identified “missing elements” in the program such as candidates were “not necessarily prepared for urban settings, thinking about systems, know theory, but don’t understand application to systems, lack of understanding of leadership influence, learned experiences are key before they actually enter the job” (p. 91). This was the only study found in which principals’ preparation programs were associated with longevity. However, “superintendents and assistant superintendents reported that longevity has less to do with university preparation than it does with personality and/or traits of personal and professional character” (p. 92). Student learning outcomes were not included in the research. In the study above, Tier I candidates were “academically well prepared for overall school leadership” (p. 86) as perceived by the superintendents.

Research was conducted by Petzko (2008) with 73 new principals and assistant principals with one to three years of experience to “identify the knowledge and skill areas they perceived to be important to their initial success” (p. 224). The study was designed so that the researcher could ascertain “the areas each principal group considered to be the most important to initial success and also to see if there were perceived gaps between what was important and what was well covered in graduate school preparation programs”
(p. 232). New principals and assistant principals indicated that “two thirds of the domains were very important to critically important to their success” (p. 233). Human relations and personnel were considered the most important. They were followed by “educational leadership, curriculum, site leadership, organizational change, administration of special programs, learning theory, and student services” (p. 233).

In the same study above, historical foundations of education and facilities were considered to be the least important knowledge and skills necessary for initial success of new and assistant principals. Petzko (2008) recommended that preparation programs emphasized the importance of human relations “such as communication, collaboration, conflict resolution skills, faculty selection, induction, evaluation, supervision, and development” (p. 242) due to their importance to new principals.

Finally, Petzko (2008) suggested that “each principal preparation program should assess its own graduates’ perceptions of their program” (p. 243) in order to revamp their program as deemed necessary. In sum, principals were asking for more practical experiences in order for principals to be better prepared for the principalship which could result in a positive learning climate impacting student learning as found in exemplary principals’ preparation programs.

**Principals’ Preparation Programs and School Improvement**

Orr and Orphanos (2011a) conducted a study to “determine the influence of exemplary leadership preparation on what principals learn about leadership, their use of effective leadership practices, and how their practices influence school improvement and the school’s learning climate” (p. 18). The authors “compared 65 principals who had graduated from one of four selected exemplary leadership preparation programs to a
national sample of 111 principals” (p. 18). The Exemplary Preparation Programs were described as follows.

Delta State University, Cleveland, MS: Candidates who are enrolled in the program earn a master’s degree in 14 months. The program focuses on instructional leadership. It also includes a “full-time internship and full-year financial support for teachers to prepare to become principals” (Orr & Orphanos, 2011b, p. 52). The program’s goal “is to prepare candidates to transform schools in poor, mostly rural regions” (p. 52). Each cohort begins with 15 candidates. The candidates “are recommended by their districts, based on their teaching and informal instructional leadership” (p. 52). The courses for the program are “designed through field-based projects and problem-based learning” (p. 52). Also, internships are supervised by experienced administrators.

University of Connecticut’s Administrator Preparation Program, Storrs, CT: The program is described as “a 2-year, 32-credit post–master’s degree program that combines leadership related course work and a 2-year internship for working professionals” (p. 52). It is a two-year cohort program for 15 candidates. Candidates must be recommended by their superintendents. The program is described as having a “rigorous selection process” (p. 52). Moreover, “candidates complete 80 days of internship (including summer school) in a different district, under the supervision of a mentor principal” (p. 53). Furthermore, “each candidate develops his or her own plan of study and produces a portfolio of documented work, including a school–community analysis” (p. 53). The program has a special emphasis on school improvement.
Principal’s Institute at Bank Street College, New York, NY: The Principal Institute is described as “a private school of education in New York City, Region 1 (one of 10 divisions of NYC public schools) developed a continuum of leadership preparation, including principal preparation, induction, and in-service support, using public and private funding” (Orr & Orphanos, 2011b, p. 53). In collaboration with Bank Street College, the Principal’s Institute prepares school leaders for the “improvement teaching and learning closely linked to the district’s instructional reforms” (p. 53). Applicants are nominated based “based on their teaching quality and instructional leadership” (p. 53). The selected candidates are enrolled in an 18-month program designed to prepare school leaders for principal certification. Additionally, “participants experience a full-time summer internship and two other robust field-based experiences, and an advisory and conference group structure that fosters reflective learning under the supervision of an experienced educator” (p. 54). At the end of the program, candidates also receive a master’s degree.

Educational Leadership Development Academy at the University of San Diego, San Diego, CA: The program is “a partnership between the school district and the University of San Diego, made possible through foundation support” (Orr & Orphanos, 2011b, p. 54). Candidates are nominated by the school district based on excellence on teaching and instructional leadership. It is a 12-month program in which candidates are paid during their internship. It provides “preservice and in-service programs” to “support the development of instructional leaders within a context of district instructional reform” (p. 54). The curriculum includes a combination of “instructional leadership, organizational development, and change management, with an emphasis on school
planning and teacher professional development” (p. 54). The program ensures that candidates have the opportunity to network during their preparation.

The above programs are described as exemplary and quality programs. The findings of Orr and Orphanos (2011b) indicated that “quality preparation matters and contributes significantly to what graduates learn and, ultimately, to how they practice leadership and work to improve their schools” (p. 50). Additionally, the findings also indicated that “the quality of the program features—focus, content, faculty, and internships—was more important for a candidate’s success than simply enrolling in an exemplary program” (p. 50). These findings were also in congruence with the research below in regard to teacher outcomes that in turn benefit student performance.

**Principals’ Preparation Programs and Student Performance**

In regard to student performance, several studies have indicated that principal preparation positively influence student achievement (Braun et al., 2008; Fuller, Young, & Baker, 2011; Young & Fuller, 2009). Findings from Fuller et al. (2011) suggest that there is “a way principal preparation programs can more directly influence student achievement—namely, preparing principals to recruit, select, and retain well-qualified teachers to increase the overall qualifications of the team of teachers on campus” (p. 205).

Baker et al. (2010) also commented that empirical evidence has shown “that principals may substantively influence schools, teachers, and student achievement (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Heck & Hallinger, 1999; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005 [sic]; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003)”
They have also indicated that preparation programs impact on the quality of teachers that principals hire and on student achievement.

Darling-Hammond et al. (2007) noted that it would seem to be “possible to create systematic learning opportunities for school leaders that help them develop the complex skills needed to lead and transform contemporary schools” (p. 153). Furthermore, they noted that exemplary programs share “a number of elements in common, including the nature of their curricula, the teaching and learning strategies they employ, the ways they organize communities of practice, and the kinds of clinical experiences they construct” (pp. 153, 154). Also, their research suggested that it was “possible to create pre- and in-service programs that develop principals who can engage successfully in many of the practices associated with school success: cultivating a shared vision and practice, leading instructional improvement, developing organizational capacity, and managing change” (p. 143). Notably, these findings were also consistent with the aims of the ISLLC Standards.

Bottoms et al. (2003) commented that “some schools are lucky enough to have excellent principals” (p. 1). They called for a “reliable leadership development system that takes luck out of the equation” (p. 1). Such a system, they described, as one that “identifies recruits and develops people who have proven records of raising student performance and closing achievement gaps” (p. 10). They provided demographic statistics showing that there are enough certified principals to go around but not enough qualified ones.

For instance, Bottoms et al. (2003) research also indicate that Texas had certified more than 7,000 principals in four years, and Georgia has 3,200 people who were
certified as principals but do not currently hold such position. There were 1,946 schools in Georgia. While there are many school administrators with principals’ certification, many do not meet district’s criteria and needs. For instance, they cited that “one large urban district recently reviewed 35 certified applicants for a principal vacancy at a high school, and not one met the district’s criteria and needs” (p. 2). They emphasized the difference between being certified and being qualified.

As a result, the research cited above called for a more selective process for admission to recruit talented leaders who will then be licensed based on performance. Below is a description of a randomly selected principal preparation program’s course offerings. These programs were selected based on convenience.

**Description of Selected Leadership Preparation Programs**

Drexel University – According to its 2016 – 2017 catalog, “School Principal Certificate program was designed to produce school leaders who are knowledgeable about current theories and strategies in leadership and change” (para. 1). Furthermore, “components of the program’s conceptual bedrock are heuristic diagnostic learning, intelligent use of emotions in interpersonal skills of leadership, creative problem solving, and learning technologies” (para. 1). Applicants must have a teaching certificate and a minimum of three years teaching experience. A minimum of 24 credits is required in the areas of curriculum, supervision, school law, school administration, and finance.

Since the study is primarily interested in preparation programs in Adventist schools, an analysis of required courses for principal certification in the NAD of SDAs (as per the K-12 Educators’ Certification Manual) will be followed. First, how do the requirements for administrator (principal) certification in the NAD of SDAs compare to
those just highlighted within national, broadly successful educational leadership programs? In order to receive the Administrator (Principal) endorsement for SDA schools, applicants must hold a master’s degree, a professional teaching certificate, and must earned at least 18 graduate semester hours “selected from the areas of curriculum, school administration, supervision, school law, school finance, school plant planning, personnel administration, school public relations, religious education, and field experience” (2016, p. 16).

Andrews University is one of the SDA universities that works closely with the NAD of SDAs to offer a principal preparation program. Its 2016 – 2017 catalog for school administration certificates states that its “course work and certificate can be used to fulfill some of the SDA and/or Michigan State administrative certification requirements” (para. 2). The 18 – 24 credit Educational Leadership Graduate Certificate program “is designed for post-baccalaureate or post-masters participants who want to enhance their administrative skills” (para. 2). The principal endorsement consists of 18 credits minimum in school administration, school law, curriculum, supervision, and school finance.

**The Job of the Principal (The Principalship)**

The objective of leadership preparation programs is to prepare aspiring principals for the principalship. Therefore, after examining leadership preparation programs, it is appropriate to analyze the day to day work of principals or the principalship. Spillane and Hunt (2010) in a study to “examine the work of US school principals from the perspective of their workday” (p. 293), collected data involving “52 principals and 2400 school personnel in a mid-sized urban school district in the south-eastern US” (p. 293).
Among the “52 schools, there were 30 elementary schools, eleven middle schools, seven high schools, and four alternative/special education schools” (p. 296).

Their findings were that “school principals manage and lead instruction through both direct and indirect means, not all of which require direct observation of classroom teaching” (Spillane & Hunt, 2010, p. 316). They noted that principals spent more time in administration-related activities. “An average of at least one-third of their time in administration-related activities and at least one-fifth of their time in instruction and curriculum-related activities” (p. 316). Furthermore, “none reported spending greater than 10% of their time on professional growth or relationship-fostering activities” (p. 316).

Finally, it was reported that “principals spent no less than 15% and no greater than 30% of their time leading alone” (Spillane & Hunt, 2010, p. 317). This research, although it did not address principals’ preparation programs, can be beneficial to those responsible for the planning of principals’ preparation programs. Preparation program leaders can use this study to plan real-world curriculum giving emphasis to areas that will equip aspiring principals.

**Principal Retention**

Principals must be trained to meet the demands of the complexity of the principalship. The stress caused by the position has caused many principals to leave the principalship altogether. Goldring and Taie (2014) report that during the 2011 – 2012 school year, of the 114, 330 principals, 78% of them remained at the same school, 12% left their principal position altogether, 6% moved to a different school (p. 2). In the same vein, Battle and Gruber (2010) report that during the 2007 – 2008 school year, of the
117,140 principals, 80% remained at the same school, 6% went to a different school, and 12% left the position of principal (p. 3).

In another study on retention, Young and Fuller (2009) sought “to provide basic information about the actual length of tenure and retention rates of newly hired principals” (p. 2) in Texas public schools from 1996 to 2008. They reported that “high school retention rates are strikingly low for all schools—just over 50% of newly hired principals stay for three years and less than 30% stay for five years” (p. 2). They discovered that “the average tenure from 1996 through 2008 was almost five years for elementary school principals and about 3.8 years for high school principals” (p. 3). Two of the eight major findings were related to principal preparation programs and retention. The authors stated that “a principal’s certification test results appear to have little impact on principal retention rates” (p. 2). Additionally, “measures of preparation program quality such as the average certification scores of graduates and Carnegie Classification are not strongly related to principal retention, but more accurate measures of the actual quality of training could bear more fruitful results” (p. 2).

Baker et al. (2010) conducted a study addressing principal stability, moves, and departures to investigate and characterize principals’ backgrounds, “individual level data on principals and data on the characteristics of Missouri schools from 1999 to 2006” (p. 533). Additionally, “factors associated with leadership stability, and principal career paths and exit behaviors” (p. 523) were also analyzed. They found that “principals spent about 70% of their time in a single school” (p. 539). Contrary to national statistics on principals’ retention, stability was “somewhat lower in middle schools and somewhat
higher in high schools” (p. 539). They also noted that the stability of principals increases with higher salary and fewer Black students at the school.

Farley-Ripple, Mead, Raffel, Sherretz, and Welch (2012) presented “a State-based research” with the focus “on the number of leaders that are leaving the field” (p. 11). According to the findings, they cited Darling-Hammond and Orphanos (2007) in their research of principals in California who reported that “only 48% of administrators surveyed plan to stay in the principalship until they retire (compared to 67% nationally)” (p. 12). They also cited Baker (2010) in a study that “examined principal data in Missouri over an eight-year time period” (p. 12).

The study above involved “approximately 2,500 to 2,700 total principals per year, only 848 remained in the data set for all eight years (about 31.5%)” (Bruton et al., 2010, p. 11). They also cited a study from Fuller and Young (2009) that “just over half of newly hired principals stay for three years, and less than 30% stay for five years” (p. 11). Examining principals’ retention in the state of Delaware, they found that during a five year period, “more than a third experienced at least one change in school assignment” (p. 25). They concluded that “turnover is experienced in virtually every school in Delaware: less than 10% of schools maintained stability of school leadership between SY 2003-04 and SY 2008-09” (p. 27).

Looking at its own principals’ retention rate, the Maryland State Board of Education in the year 2000 created the Maryland Task Force on the Principalship “to examine the principal’s role, recruitment, retention, salary, and professional development” (2000, p. 1). The objectives of the taskforce were to address: (a) the changing role of the principal and the structure of the position, (b) the professional
preparation and development of principal, and (c) principals’ compensation/incentives and accountability. Twenty-one superintendents and 121 aspiring, assistant, and current principals were surveyed and interviewed. It was noted in the report that the State of “Maryland mirrors the nation not only in the magnitude of its principal deficit but in the reasons for it” (p. 2).

A decade later, Rowe (2010) conducted a study “to evaluate how well the Maryland Task Force on the Principalship recommendations have been implemented throughout the state of Maryland” (p. 4). His findings suggested that “nearly half of the responding principals (48%) indicated some level of agreement with the statement that their school district has implemented the recommendations of the Maryland Task Force on the Principalship” (p. 164).

One of the recommendations “aimed at attracting and retaining principals to serve as principals in schools with difficult challenges” (Rowe, 2010, p. 172). The author cited the initial report stating that districts “provide a multi-year commitment (no less than three years) and additional compensation for principals who take on difficult challenges and who meet established priorities” (p. 172). Rowe reported that “only 17% of the principals agree that this recommendation has been implemented in their school district while 57% disagree” (p. 172). The principals in the study highly value internships and mentor programs which Rowe suggested that colleges and universities could utilize these findings “to develop principal preparation programs with the focus on high-quality mentorship” (p. 177).

In a study of principals’ retention in the State of Florida, Isaacs (2003) investigated “relationships among the dimensions of resilience, leadership practices, and
individual demographics of high school principals” (p. 107) in his research of “68 high school principals, 136 assistant principals, and 340 teachers selected from 6 school districts” (p. ix) in that state. The results of his investigation provided “a wealth of additional information for the selection of training materials for enhancing in-service components in school leadership for school districts and for pre-service courses in educational leadership for universities charged with preparing school principals” (p. 106).

On a blogpost commenting on principal turnover, Fuller (2012) addresses principal turnover citing his work with several other colleagues using data from Texas from 1989 to 2010. He points out that “only about one-half of newly hired middle school principals remained at the same school for three years, while only 30 percent remained at the high school level for three years” (para. 9). He also states that “after five years, less than one-half of newly hired middle school principals remained, and only 27 percent of high school principals” (para. 9).

Fuller (2012) also highlights a relevant anecdote from a school in Texas that, before its closure by the State, was led by 13 principals in 11 years. He stated that “the average tenure for a high school principal in Texas is just over three years” (para. 10). To put this in perspective, most freshmen classes will not graduate under the same principal that they started with their 9th grade year.

A recent study of principal turnover reported by Goldring and Taie (2014) in the National Center for Education Statistics summarizing results from the 2012–13 Principal Follow-up Survey found 22% principal turnover nationwide during the 2011–2012 school year. However, principal turnover varies by state and districts. For instance, each year, Washington State experiences 15% principal turnover, slightly lower than the
national average (Campbell, DeArmond, & Denice, 2014), while Gootman (2006) reported in the New York Times a “heavy turnover” in New York’s principals. According to this article, “more than half the principals in the New York City public school system have left their jobs over the past five years” (para. 1).

Another study of principals’ attrition was conducted in the State of Colorado by Akiba and Richardt (2004). They noted that it was “the first attempt to empirically examine the factors associated with school leaders’ attrition” (p. 2) in Colorado. “Colorado state data on elementary school principals’ and assistant principals’ career paths from 1999 to 2001” (p. 2) and school achievement-level data were analyzed. “The data comprise information on 714 principals and assistant principals in 694 elementary schools in 94 districts” (p. 6). The findings suggested that “limited monetary compensation is a crucial factor that needs improvement in order to keep qualified elementary school principals and assistant principals” (p. 15). Additionally, “female leaders are more likely to leave low-achieving schools” (p. 14). The authors also suggested the need for effective leadership “so that student achievement can improve and that the challenges in low-achieving schools can be overcome” (p. 15).

In studying principals’ retention in Adventist schools, Ledesma (2011) conducted a study describing the experiences of Adventist principals in North America who stayed a minimum of 10 years in one location. She noted that principals in the SDA school system is North America remains at a school at an average of 2.5-4.0 years (p. 8); that is, “2.5 years for elementary principals, day academy principals stay for 3.6 years, and boarding academy principals stay for 4.0 years” (p. 8). The author concluded that those “who have stayed in one building for 10 or more consecutive years are resilient spiritual
leaders” (p. 271) who succeed “in spite of the fact the role and expectations associated with their jobs are “undefined and quite complex” (p. 271). Challenges such as “demands of the job, personnel issues, parent and student issues, board issues, financial issues, and constituency issues, all contribute to over work and imbalanced lives” (p. 271). Their resilience is due to their sense of calling.

**Factors Related to Principals’ Longevity**

In this study, the selected researched variables for principals’ longevity were based on studies by Sorapuru (2012), Belt (2009), and Evans (2010). Belt (2009), in his study of principals in three mid-western cities found that salary, educational background, gender, school type affected principals’ stability, which was defined as the amount of time (years) a principal spent in any given school. Evans (2010) utilized “a cross case study” (p. 12) format to study reasons why principals in urban school districts remained or left their schools. He identified staying principals had supportive collaborative relationship with central office and their senses of self-efficacy or competence at their jobs.

According to Sorapuru (2012), “the most common factors in the literature found to influence a principals’ decision to stay or leave the profession are amount of time spent at work, inadequate compensation, and complex job responsibilities” (p. 40). She also added that performance levels of the school or school size have been found to be significant.

Krumboltz’s social learning theory of “career decision making” has been used in career mobility in agricultural education (Grady, 1990) and most recently by Sorapuru (2012) in her study of principals’ career decision making. Similarly, this study utilized
Krumboltz’s social learning theory of career decision making to conceptualize principals’ longevity in Adventist schools in the NAD. Variables in this study were selected based on prior literature reviews and further organized by categories based on Krumboltz’s social learning theory of career decision making which consists of “personal characteristics, work environment, learning experience, and task skills” (Sorapuru, 2012, p. 42).

**Preparation Programs and Career Paths**

In an article posted at Forbes.com entitled “No Career Path, No Retention,” Vorhauser-Smith (2012) argues that “the value derived from new talent is only realized if the talent can be retained long enough to tap its treasures” (para. 1). Schools desire to retain well trained principals who contribute positively to their schools. The most common path of these talents or principals that schools seek to retain is traditionally teaching. According to Baker et al. (2010), principals begin their paths into leadership positions as teachers.

Fahrni (2001) conducted a study “to examine the career pathways of successful secondary school administrators and to compare pathways experienced by female principal to those experienced by male principals” (p. 14). The author concluded that “the educational job position most consistently held by administrative aspirants was teacher” (p. 131). Fahrni also added that “the position of teacher continues to remain a valuable experience for all educators. However, women were more likely than men to spend additional years in the classroom teaching” (p. 131). For instance, Papa, Lankford, and Wyckoff (2002) reported that in New York, nearly 90% of all principals started their careers as teachers within the New York public school system.
Additionally, Myung et al. (2011) sought to explore an “informal recruitment of teachers to become principals” (p. 3), which the authors called tapping. They commented that “in theory, every teacher has the same opportunity to pursue a school leadership position by earning an administrative credential” (p. 3). They sent online surveys to every teacher, assistant principal, and principals in the Miami-Dade County Public Schools from the 2007–2008 school year to collect data for their research. Data for the study consisted of 15,840 teachers (82%), 583 assistant principals (85%), and 312 principals (91%).

The findings of the study above by Myung et al. (2011) indicate that “teachers are being encouraged to consider becoming a principal in this district and not necessarily by their school principal” (p. 11). It was also noted that “thirty-four percent [sic] of current teachers have been approached by at least one person who has encouraged them to consider becoming a principal” (p. 11). When current administrators were asked about their experiences with tapping when they were teachers, the results indicate “that 93 percent [sic] of principals and 89 percent [sic] of assistant principals were encouraged to consider becoming a principal by at least one individual” (p. 11).

In studying career pathways in the State of Indiana, Bathon and Black (2011) demonstrated “how program production and career pathways can be profiled” (p. 3) by “utilizing Indiana state licensure and employment data sets for all individuals initially licensed as building-level administrator over a five-year period” (p. 1). Data were collected from 17 state accredited approved preparation programs.

Graduates of the State of Indiana were linked with the U. S. Census Bureau to determine where principal’s preparation program graduates work and job type
(administrator or non-administrator). Bathon and Black (2011) indicated that their findings mirror that of Pounder and Crow (2005) who found that “the majority of educational leadership programs prepare their graduates for work in districts in close proximity to the preparation programs” (p. 19). The findings indicate that “graduates employed in rural settings were more likely to be employed as administrators” comparing to “those in urban settings” (p. 1).

Another study of career paths in the State of Texas was conducted by Fuller, Young, and Orr (2007). They investigated “the career paths and leadership effects of graduates from educational administration programs” (p. 5) through the Texas principal database. They noted that “a large percentage of individuals employed as principals left the principalship over time. Nearly 50% left within 5 years and over 75% left within 10 years” (p. 42). It was also noted that “a relatively small percentage of the principals became assistant principals, teachers, associate superintendents, or superintendents” (p. 42). Their study indicated that “females were less likely than males to remain a principal after 5 years, but more likely than males to remain a principal after 10 years” (p. 42).

In a study on principal career paths and school outcomes of a large urban public school district in Miami, Béteille et al. (2012) concluded “that principal preferences for easier to staff schools leads to considerable leadership turnover in schools with more disadvantaged students” (p. 8). Their study also indicated that principals who switched schools tended “to move to schools with fewer students in poverty and fewer low achieving students compared to where they start” (pp. 22, 23). Their findings corroborate with prior studies which the authors cited when stating “when principals transfer, they generally move to a school with more affluent and higher achieving students relative to
where they start (Loeb, Kalogrides, & Horng 2010; Papa, Lankford, & Wyckoff 2002a)” (p. 4).

**Impact of Principals Departure on School Performance**

Traditionally, the career paths to the principalship would include a teacher who has impacted student learning as a teacher and then would later enroll in a principal preparation program to receive the skills necessary that will enable him or her to become principals to improve schools. Ideally, the principal would remain at the same school over a period of time to help sustain the school program in order to impact student learning outcome over a long period of time. What happens when principals leave schools? According to Miller (2009), using 12 years of administrative data from North Carolina public schools, “principal departures typically follow a downturn in school performance” (p. 2).

**Summary**

This chapter laid the foundation for principals’ preparation programs and other attributes associated with the principalship such as principals’ preparation and principals’ preparedness, retention, and the career paths of the principal. As described in this chapter, principals’ preparation positively influences teachers and student achievement (Baker et al., 2010; Braun et al., 2008; Fuller et al., 2011). Additionally, principals’ departure affects student learning outcomes. Derived from this available literature, the present investigation sought to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs.

Research Design

In this study, a quantitative approach was used to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs.

Two quantitative survey instruments were utilized for this study to help explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs. The two quantitative survey instruments were as follows: modified versions of the Employee Engagement questionnaire by Studer Education and the SPES by Short and Rinehart (1992) were utilized for this study. These questionnaires were administered electronically. In this study, the four factors were defined and measured using the 22 variables (see Table 1). Descriptive statistics, ANCOVA, and Multiple Regression using SPSS were used to analyze results.
**Statistical Analysis**

A quantitative approach was adopted using an online survey. Descriptive statistics, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), ANCOVA to statistically control for principals’ age, and Multiple Regression Analysis to test and explore associations between the 22 variables and longevity were conducted to analyze the responses of 507 principals and head teachers throughout the NAD of SDAs school system.

Analysis of Variance tests were conducted to see if age was correlated with the 22 variables. Hinkle, Jurs, and Wiersma (2003) state that “correlation indicates relationship or association between two variables” (p. 114). It is reasonable to assume that a 24-year old principal cannot have longevity as a principal due to his or her age. Analysis of Variance was used to analyze if age were associated with any of the 22 variables. If age was correlated with the variables, this was evidence that age needed to be controlled. Therefore, ANCOVA was used, and because age groups were not theoretically meaningful or relevant to any research question or hypothesis, no post-hoc tests were needed to determine statistical significance based on age groups.

An ANCOVA is a combination of regression analysis and ANOVA which helps the researcher to be “better able to investigate the effects of the primary independent variables” (Hinkle et al., 2003, p. 497). The authors cited above also explained that “analysis of covariance is used primarily as a procedure for the statistical control of an extraneous variable” (p. 497). According to Hall (1998) such variables are not variables of interest (i.e., they are not specifically mentioned in any research question or hypothesis). They influence the outcome of an experiment by adding within-subjects error to an experiment. He added, “a major goal in research design is to decrease or control the influence of extraneous variables as much as possible” (para 1). Therefore,
age, in this study, needed to be controlled and was treated as an extraneous variable. The ANCOVA was conducted to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs, controlling for age.

**Control**

Several studies have found it necessary to control for Age in relation to employee retention (Kivimäki et al., 2007; Ng, 2007). In this study, it was deemed necessary to treat Age as a covariate when conducting the ANCOVA. Exploratory analyses were conducted to determine whether or not this approach was necessary. Because this study included all the principals in the NAD of SDAs regardless of their age, it was very likely that Age would need to be evaluated as a covariate because of its potential direct association with employee longevity.

**Scale**

Goforth (2015) states that “Cronbach’s alpha is a measure used to assess the reliability, or internal consistency, of a set of scale or test items” (para. 1). For this study, the reliability analysis was conducted for the two questionnaires used. The reliability results were as follows: Employee Engagement (Cronbach’s Alpha = .85) and the School Participant Empowerment Scale (Cronbach’s Alpha = .92). Such high coefficients of reliability or consistency suggest that both questionnaires were “an excellent measure of a single construct (e.g., Employee Engagement)” (p. 5) (J. Kunselman, from a personal e-mail document, October 19, 2015) and Participant Empowerment. Goforth (2015) states that “Cronbach’s alpha is a measure used to assess the reliability, or internal consistency, of a set of scale or test items (para. 1). Also, “many methodologists recommend a
minimum $\alpha$ coefficient between 0.65 and 0.8 (or higher in many cases) (para. 4). In this study, all scales have satisfactory reliability as cited earlier.

**Research Questions**

The research questions of this study were as follows:

1. Is there a significant association between any of the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered separately, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs?

2. Is there a significant association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered together, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs?

**Population and Sample**

According to the NAD of SDAs Office of Education’s website (2016), the NAD of SDA operates 729 elementary schools and 109 secondary schools. Furst (2003), commented that “in the Seventh-day Adventist system, many elementary schools do not have a full-time administrator. A full-time classroom teacher (often referred to as a “head teacher”) [sic] is often the sole administrator” (p. 15). This research attempted to study all the principals and head teachers (total 838) in the NAD of SDAs. Consequently, 838 e-mail invitations along with the electronic survey were sent to the principals and head teachers.

The population for this study consisted of the 838 principals and head teachers throughout the NAD of SDA school system. An e-mail invitation indicating that participation in the study was voluntary accompanied by the consent form and the survey
instrument were sent to those 838 principals. The number of principals who participated in the study is noted below.

**Data Collection**

Approval for data collection was secured from the vice-president of education for the NAD late summer 2015. This approval allowed the researcher to obtain names and e-mail addresses of 838 K-12 principals and head teachers in the NAD of SDAs. All of them received an e-mail invitation to participate in the study. The invitation indicated that participation was voluntary. Of the 838 e-mail invitations sent, an overview from Survey Monkey indicated the following: 714 were opened (85.2%), 98 remained unopened (11.7%), four of them were bounced (0.5%), 591 clicked through the survey (70.5%), and 22 opted out. 507 K-12 school principals (60.5%) in the NAD of SDAs completed the survey. Nulty (2008), in a review of the literature comparing response rate of online surveys versus on-paper surveys, revealed that on-paper surveys yield a higher response rate. Nulty (2008) cited “Richardson (2005) who cited Babbie (1973, p. 165) and Kidder (1981, pp. 150 – 151) when stating that 50% is regarded as an acceptable response rate in social research postal surveys” (p. 306). Consequently, a 60.5% response rate for this online survey is acceptable for this study.

**Variables**

The dependent variable was principal’s longevity/retention, the number of years that a principal has been at his or her current school (Same school longevity). In this study, the selected variables consist of 22 items thought to be associated with principals’ longevity (see Figure 2) based on studies by Sorapuru (2012), Belt (2009), and Evans (2011). Age was used as a covariate. Each of those 22 factors would conceptually fall
under one of those four components of the 4 factors of Krumboltz’ “career decision making.”

The 22 variables were used and grouped as per Krumboltz et al. (1976) CDM as follows: First, genetic endowments, which were referred to as personal characteristics by Sorapuru (2012). This survey used the same terminology as Sorapuru. In this study, relevant *personal characteristics* included: (a) gender, (b) age (evaluated as a covariate), and (c) ethnic background.

Second, *environmental conditions* included: (a) school type, (b) enrollment, (c) hours at work, (d) salary, (e) perceived engagement as per the Employee Engagement questionnaire by Studer Education, referred to as Engagement in this study. The purpose of the Employee Engagement questionnaire is to evaluate how well the immediate supervisor or person who completes the employee’s performance evaluation provides a work environment that allows the employee to reach his/her potential. Additionally, five of the six dimensions of the SPES were included as follows: (f) autonomy, (g) decision making, (h) impact, (i) professional growth, and (j) status. The Studer Education questionnaire states that “the purpose of the Employee Engagement questionnaire is to evaluate how well the immediate supervisor or person who completes the employee evaluation provides a work environment that allows the employee to perform at a high level” (2015, para. 1). That is, providing “a work environment that supports them in reaching their highest potential” (2015, para. 1).

Third, *learning experiences*, included: (a) degree, (b) certification or licensure, (c) preparation (before) or (d) becoming (after) becoming a principal. According to
Krumboltz et al. (1976), “educational and occupational decision making is also influenced by the individual’s past learning experiences” (p. 72).

Fourth, task skills were evaluated using (a) principals’ perceived level of self-efficacy, one of the six dimensions of the SPES and (b) perceived preparedness. Self-efficacy is one’s beliefs in one’s capabilities to accomplish tasks and complete goals (Bandura, 1994; Locke & Latham, 2002). Similarly, Business Dictionary (2017b) defines self-efficacy as one’s “belief about his or her ability and capacity to accomplish a task” (para. 1). In sum, in this study, the four factors of Krumboltz’s model consist of 22 variables, while controlling for age, as listed in Table 1.

**Survey Instrument**

In order to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs, a slightly modified version of the Employee Engagement questionnaire by Studer Education and the SPES by Short and Rinehart (1992) were utilized.

The Studer Education questionnaire states that the purpose of EES is to evaluate how well the immediate supervisor or person who completes the employee’s performance evaluation provides a work environment that allows the employee to reach his/her potential. Variables for environmental conditions were measured using the Employee Engagement questionnaire and five of the six dimensions of the SPES. The Employee Engagement questionnaire was slightly modified only by replacing the terms your principal/supervisor with your superintendent. In a document prepared by StuderEducation (2012) entitled Metrics - Employee Engagement Survey Reliability and
Validity Analysis, which was e-mailed to the researcher by Dr. Julie Kunselman, Research and Development Leader at Studer Education on October 19, 2015. For this study, reliability and validity analysis were found to be satisfactory as cited earlier.

The SPES by Short and Rinehart (1992) consists of six dimensions: (1) autonomy, (2) decision making, (3) impact, (4) professional growth, (5) self-efficacy, and (6) status. The survey was designed to measure teacher empowerment. Williams (2002) argues that effective empowerment can lead to “higher levels of employee skill development” (para. 1). This survey was slightly modify to help analyze two of the four factors of Krumboltz et al. (1976) model. Five of the six dimensions were classified with environmental conditions included: (a) autonomy, (b) decision making, (c) impact, (d) professional growth, and (e) status; one of the SPES’s six dimensions, self-efficacy, was used to measure one of the two variables related to task skills. A high internal consistency (Cronbach’s Alpha = .92) was found for the SPES. The slight modification of the survey involved minor changes to some of the words.

There were no substantial modifications of either of the two surveys. The two surveys were selected to help in the analysis of two (environmental conditions and task skills) of the four factors in order to explore the association of the four factors of Krumboltz et al. (1976) CDM model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs. The other two variables (personal characteristics and learning experiences) were addressed through demographic inquiries. Both questionnaires were administered electronically using SurveyMonkey. Table 1, cited earlier, showed the four factors consist of 22 variables altogether. Each of these 22 factors functionally fall under one of the four
components/factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model according to the following conceptual structure:

First, personal characteristics included (a) gender, (b) age (covariate), and (c) ethnicity. Second, environmental conditions included: (a) school type, (b) enrollment, (c) hours at work, (d) perceived engagement as per the Employee Engagement questionnaire by Studer Education, referred to as engagement in this study. The purpose of the Employee Engagement questionnaire is to evaluate how well the immediate supervisor or person who completes the employee’s performance evaluation provides a work environment that allows the employee to reach his/her potential. Additionally, five of the six dimensions of the SPES were included as follows: (e) autonomy, (f) decision making, (g) impact, (h) professional growth, (i) status.

Third, learning experiences, included: (a) degree, (b) certification or licensure, and (c) preparation (before) or (d) preparation (after) becoming a principal. Fourth, task skills were evaluated using (a) principals’ perceived level of self-efficacy, one of the six dimensions of SPES; according to Bandura (1994), ‘self-efficacy’ includes subjective confidence in one’s task abilities; and finally (b) feeling of preparedness.

Ramakrishna and Sudhakar (2015) define empowerment as “the process of increasing the capacity of individuals or groups to make choices and to transform those choices into desired actions and outcomes” (p. 424). A prior study has shown the results of empowerment through skills development (Ramadorai, 2014). Bandura (1994) argues that “people with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided” (para. 2).
Finally, the dependent variable was principal’s longevity/retention (same school longevity). Since the dependent variable was collected as categorical, it was recoded as continuous variable by selecting the median of each category. The usage of the median as a measure of central tendency may be appropriate when dealing with interval data (Hinkle et al., 2003). Therefore, each category was recoded as a 0-2= 1, 3-5=4, 6-10=8, and so forth.

Operationally, the independent variables were collected as numerical and categorical variables as follows: (1) Numerical independent variables consist of (a) feeling prepared, (b) hours worked per week, (c) salary, (d) school enrollment, the six dimensions of SPES: (e) decision making, (g) professional growth, (h) status, (i) self-efficacy, (j) autonomy, and (k) impact, and (l) employee engagement. (2) Categorical independent variables consist of (a) preparation (before) or (b) preparation (after), (c) degree, (d) gender, (e) ethnicity, (f) license, and (g) school type. There was a total of 22 variables altogether, controlled for age. Each of these 22 factors definitionally fall under one of the four components/factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making (see Table 1) that helped addressed the research questions in this study.

For this study, permission was obtained to modify the Employee Engagement Survey so that the questions could be asked to principals rather than teachers and the SPES. Modifications of both surveys were very minimal, in most cases only a few words were slightly changed from the original question. For example, an original question stated “I have the opportunity to collaborate with other teachers in my school” was slightly modified to state: “I have the opportunity to collaborate with teachers and school personnel in my school.” All other modifications were minor in order to ensure that the
questions were addressed to principals rather than teachers. The minor modifications can be referred to as “adopting” as described by Korb (2012) below:

First, when the instrument is adopted, then the reliability and validity research studies that have been conducted on that instrument can be applied to your study, so you do not have to collect validity evidence. However, when an instrument has been adapted, then it has been significantly changed so the reliability and validity evidence will not apply to your study. Second, adopting an instrument links your study to all other research studies that have used the same instrument. Finally, adopting the instrument saves you time and energy in making significant changes. (para. 2).

The EES is a 14-item questionnaire that helps in the evaluation of employee level of satisfaction with his/her environment at school. The first 10 of these items was utilized in this study. The words, “my principal/supervisor” have been altered to “my superintendent/supervisor” since this survey was distributed to principals instead of teachers. In the original survey, “items 1 - 10 are associated with one’s principal or superior, while items 11 – 13 are associated with one’s superintendent, and item 14 is an overall measure of one’s willingness to “recommend” the school district for his/her child.”

The researcher decided that three of the last four items seemed to be directed toward the entire district comparing to the first 10 items that addresses directly relationships between the teachers (principals for the purpose of this study) and their principals (superintendents for the purpose of this study) or supervisors. The items that were omitted were as follows: “The superintendent manages district finances effectively; the superintendent uses a variety of methods to promote effective communication throughout the district; and the superintendent makes informed decisions based on the best interest of the district.” In this study, a high internal consistency (Cronbach’s Alpha = .92) was found for the EES, as shown in Table 1.
Additionally, a Likert scale with five categories ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree was used to evaluate the principals’ perceived experience. Responses are anonymous. The document entitled *Metrics - Employee Engagement Survey - Reliability and Validity Analysis* (2012) indicates that “two separate measures of reliability are used: Internal Consistency (Cronbach’s Alpha) and Test-Reset (Pearson Correlation)” (p. 4). High internal consistency (Cronbach’s Alpha = .941) were found and near “suitable” results with the range 0.663 – 0.821 for the Test-Reset (Pearson Correlation).

The SPES by Short and Rinehart (1992), principals asked to rate how they feel empowered in their position. An analysis of the SPES (Short & Rinehart, 1992) by Klecker and Loadman (1996) noted that “the 38-item instrument measured teacher empowerment, for this study, principal empowerment, on six dimensions: (a) decision-making, (b) professional growth, (c) status, (d) self-efficacy, (e) autonomy, and (f) impact” (p. 5). They also noted that “Cronbach's coefficient alpha reliabilities for the subscales measuring the dimensions were reported as: decision-making, .79; professional-growth, .66; status, .84; self-efficacy, .83; autonomy, .83, and impact, .91. Alpha reliability for the total scale was .94 (Short & Rinehart, 1992)” (p. 5). The survey was designed to obtain teachers’ perception on their perceived empowerment at their school. However, in this study, the survey was modified to obtain principals’ perception on their empowerment at their school in order to measure environmental conditions and task skills. Williams (2002) argues that effective empowerment can lead to “higher levels of employee skill development” (para. 1).
Permission was granted by the authors to modify the instrument. Results of the analyses for this study was recorded in the result section using tables and graphs as needed.

Schedule

The researcher began to collect data in the early spring semester of 2016 with the objective to complete the research and dissertation by the spring semester of 2017. The researcher developed the dissertation under the supervision of the chair and the dissertation committee.

Data Analysis

The survey was distributed electronically and data were analyzed in the same way. To explore the research questions above, Descriptive statistics, ANCOVA, and Multiple Regression were conducted to explore the relationship among the four factors, using SPSS.

Professional Disclaimer

A professional disclaimer statement or informed consent statement was prepared and included with the electronic survey instrument (see the Appendix A). Participants were asked to click on whether or not they agree with the statement. Additionally, participants were informed that confidentiality of the data will be maintained. Cautionary measures were taken to ensure the security of research-related records and data (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012).
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs. The results of this study are presented in this chapter.

Data Source

As previously mentioned in chapter 3, an online questionnaire was used to collect data from SDA principals in the NAD. A total of 507 principals participated in the survey.

Descriptive Statistics

In this study, the selected researched variables for principals’ longevity/retention were based on studies by Sorapuru (2012), Belt (2009), and Evans (2011). These variables were selected in accordance with Krumboltz et al. (1976) CDM theory which consists of four factors as follows: First, genetic endowments or personal characteristics; second, work environment of the principal or environmental conditions; third, formal learning experiences and lastly, task skills. These four factors consist of 22 variables, controlled for age. Below are descriptive statistics for each of the four factors according to Krumboltz et al. (1976) CDM model.
Personal Characteristics

First, in this study, descriptive statistics for “personal characteristics,” one of Krumboltz’s four factors were measured by age, gender, and ethnicity. As shown in Table 2 below, the majority of the respondents were female 66% \((n = 322)\), Caucasians 72.9% \((n = 355)\), and nearly a third of them 31.5% \((n = 154)\) were between the ages of 50 and 59.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Personal Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Characteristics of Environmental Conditions**

Second, characteristics of environmental conditions were measured by the following variables: (a) Salary, (b) school type, (c) enrollment, (d) hours at work, (e) perceived engagement as measured by Studer Employee Engagement Survey, and five of the six dimensions of the SPES: (f) decision-making, (g) professional growth, (h) status, (i) autonomy, and (j) impact. Tables 3, 4, and 5 show descriptive statistics for environmental conditions.

Table 3 presented descriptive statistics for salary, school type, enrollment, hours at work, Table 4 presented descriptive statistics for employee engagement while Table 5 showed descriptive statistics for the six dimensions of the SPES. The purpose of the Employee Engagement questionnaire by Studer Education, referred to as engagement in this study is to evaluate how well the immediate supervisor or person who completes the employee’s performance evaluation provides a work environment that allows the employee to reach his/her potential. Additionally, five of the six dimensions of the SPES were included as follows: (e) autonomy, (f) decision making, (g) impact, (h) professional growth, (i) status.

As shown in Table 3, the majority of the principals (68.9%) worked in P/K – 8 schools, with an enrollment of 1 – 50 students. Additionally, a large percentage (42.1%) of the principals spent between 50 – 60 hours at work. Most of the principals, 75.8% ($n = 367$) indicated earning less than $60,000. 11.0% indicated earning between $60,000 and $64,999. A low percentage, 6.2% ($n = 30$), indicated earning between $65,000 and $69,999, while 7.0% ($n = 37$) indicated earning $70,000 or more.
In order to explore the perception of the quality of principals’ relationship with their superintendents, one of the factors for work environment, descriptive statistics for Employee Engagement were calculated as shown in Table 4. The purpose of the Employee Engagement questionnaire is to evaluate how well the immediate supervisor or person who completes the employee’s performance evaluation provides a work
Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics for Environmental Conditions (Cont.): Employee Engagement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My superintendent/supervisor provides me a good processes and resources to do my job.</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superintendent/supervisor provides feedback on my strengths as an employee.</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent/Supervisor led staff meetings make efficient use of time and are productive.</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superintendent/supervisor recognizes good performance.</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superintendent/supervisor demonstrates a genuine concern for my welfare.</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superintendent/supervisor makes the best use of available funds.</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superintendent/supervisor consults me on the decisions that affect my job.</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superintendent/supervisor sets clear expectations for judging my performance.</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superintendent/supervisor provides the support needed to accomplish my work objectives.</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superintendent/supervisor provides feedback concerning areas for improving my performance.</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average of Employee Engagement</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
environment that allows the employee to reach his/her potential. Each response was measured on a five-point scale labeled and scored as follows: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree. The item labeled “My superintendent/supervisor demonstrates a genuine concern for my welfare” had the highest mean of 4.14 (SD = .97) and the lowest being “My superintendent/supervisor sets clear expectations for judging my performance” with a mean of 3.5365 (SD = 1.00). An average of the scores of descriptive statistics scores was calculated for employee engagement, showing a mean of 3.74 \( (n = 45, SD = .79) \) with minimum of 1.00 and maximum of 5.00.

Table 5 showed descriptive statistics for five of the six dimensions of the SPES.

Each response was measured on a five-point scale labeled and scored as follows: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree. The results for this study showed a minimum score of 1.83 and a maximum of 5.0 for status.

The mean was 4.16 with a standard deviation of 0.51 for status.

Table 5

*Descriptive Statistics for Environmental Conditions (Cont.): Five of the Six Dimensions of the SPES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formal Learning Experiences

Third in this study, formal learning experiences were operationally defined as (a) license, (b) degree, and (c) completing of a preparation program (before) or (d) completion of a preparation program (after). These variables were selected as learning experiences, according to Krumboltz et al. (1976). Table 6 showed that the majority of the principals, 72.0% \( (n = 357) \), indicated not being certified as a principal while the majority of the principals, 61.4% \( (n = 299) \) completed a master’s degree. Additionally, most of the principals, 84.7% \( (n = 400) \) did not complete a principal preparation program for aspiring principals before becoming a principal.

Table 6

*Descriptive Statistics for Formal Learning Experiences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAD School Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License/Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorates</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (Before)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (After)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task Skills

Lastly, the fourth set of influencers according to Krumboltz’s theory of CDM, task skills, were considered. In this study, task skills were operationally defined using self-efficacy, one of the six dimensions of the SPES and perceived preparedness. According to Bandura (1994), “perceived self-efficacy is defined as people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives” (para. 1). LeVan (2010) argues that self-efficacy is “about believing you are capable of producing a desired result – that you can achieve your goals” (para. 3).

According to the BusinessDictionary.com (2017a), “empowerment is based on the idea that giving employees skills, resources, authority, opportunity, motivation, as well holding them responsible and accountable for outcomes of their actions, will contribute to their competence and satisfaction” (para. 2). Ramakrishna and Sudhakar (2015) define empowerment as “the process of increasing the capacity of individuals or groups to make choices and to transform those choices into desired actions and outcomes” (p. 424). A prior study has shown the results of empowerment through skills development (Ramadorai, 2014).

Table 7 showed descriptive statistics for self-efficacy as measured by one of the six dimensions of the SPES. Each response was measured on a five-point scale labeled and scored as follows: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree. The results for this study showed a minimum score of 2.50 and a maximum of 5.0 for self-efficacy. The mean was 4.37 with a standard deviation of 0.44 for self-efficacy. Table 8 showed a high level (69.5%) of perceived preparedness among the principals.
Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for Task Skills (Self-Efficacy) – One of the Six Dimensions of SPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Task Skills (Cont.) – Perceived Preparedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Prepared</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat prepared</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat not prepared</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all prepared</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal’s Longevity Retention
(Same School Longevity)

The dependent variable, principal’s longevity/retention (same school longevity/retention), was operationally defined as the number of years at his or her current school. Table 9 showed the responses for the number of years as a principal at current school, which was used as the dependent variable. Seven categories were given. The first category was 0 – 2 years. 41.3% (n = 202) indicated having been in the 0 – 2 years category. 27.4% (n = 134) chose the second category 3 – 5 years. 18% (n = 88) belonged to the third category 6 – 10 years. 7.2% (n = 35) belonged to the 11 – 15 years category. 3.5% (n = 17) belonged to the 16 – 19 years category.
Finally, 2.6% \((n = 13)\) indicated having been at their school between 20+ years.

The dependent variable was longevity which was previously defined as the number of years at the same school i.e. the number of years that a principal has been a principal at his or her school. Since the dependent variable was collected as categorical, it was recoded as continuous variable by selecting the median of each category. The usage of the median as a measure of central tendency may be appropriate when dealing with interval data (Hinkle et al., 2003). Therefore, each category was recoded as a 0-2= 1, 3-5=4, 6-10=8, and so forth as shown below in Table 9.

Table 9

*Descriptive Statistics for Principal’s Longevity/Retention (Same School Longevity): Years as Principals at Current School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years as Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 2 (1)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5 (4)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10 (8)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15 (13)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 19 (17.5)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 25 (22.5)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to transform the dependent variable data for principal longevity from a categorical to a continuous variable for statistical analysis purposes, the researcher used the median as described above. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (2013), “the median is less affected by outliers and skewed data than the mean, and is usually the
preferred measure of central tendency when the distribution is not symmetrical” (para. 7).

However, Manikandan (2011) argues that median “does not take into account the precise value of each observation and hence does not use all information available in the data” (para. 5).

Summary of Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were presented in Tables 2 – 9 based on Krumboltz et al. (1976) theory of CDM. As previously mentioned, Krumboltz’s social learning theory of career decision making has been used in career mobility in agricultural education (Grady, 1990) and most recently by Sorapuru (2012) in her study of principals’ career decision making. Sorapuru (2012) cited Krumboltz, Mitchell, and Jones (1979) and Mitchell and Krumboltz, (1990), who espoused that the different combinations of the four influencers which consists of “genetic or personal characteristics, work environment, learning experience, and task skills,” as already cited, “can create various interactions and produce a multitude of different career choices” (p. 6). Sorapuru (2012) added that “this would include an individual’s decision to stay in or leave a profession” (p. 6).

Statistical Results

Analysis of Covariance and Multiple Regression using SPSS were conducted to address the two research questions for this study.

After conducting descriptive statistics on the variables shown in Tables 2 – 9, the researcher conducted ANCOVA and Multiple Regression using SPSS to address the two research questions for this study. Each research question was analyzed in this section. Below are the tables for the ANCOVA and Multiple Regression.
Relationships Between Age and Same School Longevity

Because it was apparent that the dependent variable, Longevity at the same school, was correlated with Age, prior to testing the relationships between Longevity and the independent variables, it was necessary to determine the relationships between age and the dependent and independent variables to see whether the analyses needed to control for Age.

Relationship Between Age and the Numerical Independent Variables

The relationship between Age and all other variables was examined. First, the correlation between Age and the dependent variable (Same School Longevity/Retention), and each numerical independent variable was computed (see Table 10). Same School Longevity/Retention, the dependent variable, had a significant moderate correlation with Age. Five of the other numeric independent variables had significant, but small, correlations with Age.

Relationship Between Age and the Categorical Independent Variables

Then the relationship between Age and each categorical independent variable was analyzed using ANOVA. Analysis of Variance was used to analyze if age was associated with any of the independent variables. If age was correlated with the independent variables, this was evidence that age needed to be controlled. Therefore, there was no need to conduct additional post-hoc tests to determine which age group was significantly different from the others, because such comparisons would have no relevance to any of
the research questions or hypotheses. There was no significant relationship between Age and Gender, \( F_{(1,486)} = 2.629, p = .106 \).

Table 10

**Correlations Between Same School Longevity and Numerical Independent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( P )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same School Longevity</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeric Independent Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Prepared</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked per week</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School enrollment</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPES Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SPES</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.021*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *\( p < .05 \)

Ethnicity had a significant relationship with Age, \( F_{(3,453)} = 4.743, p = .003 \).

African American and Caucasian principals were older than Asians and Hispanics (see Table 11).
Table 11

Relationship Between Age and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50.82</td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.65</td>
<td>10.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>50.18</td>
<td>11.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.33</td>
<td>10.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree (highest education) had a significant relationship with Age, $F_{(2,484)} = 14.251, p = .000$. Principals with masters and doctorate degrees were older than principals with a bachelors’ degree (see Table 12).

Preparation before becoming a principal had a significant relationship with Age, $F_{(1,484)} = 6.038, p = .014$. Principals who completed a principal preparation program before becoming a principal were older than those who did not (see Table 13). Likewise, Preparation after becoming a principal had a significant relationship with Age, $F_{(1,482)} = 5.683, p = .018$. Principals who completed a principal preparation after becoming a

Table 12

Relationship Between Age and Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorates</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58.04</td>
<td>10.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>50.85</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>46.64</td>
<td>11.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

*Relationship Between Age and Preparation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation (before)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (before)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>10.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preparation</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>49.12</td>
<td>11.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation (after)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (after)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>51.87</td>
<td>11.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preparation (after)</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>48.96</td>
<td>11.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>License</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>License</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>10.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No License</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>48.73</td>
<td>11.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* There was no significant relationship between Age and School Type, $F_{(2,485)} = 2.066, p = .128$.

principal were older than those who did not (see Table 12). Similarly, having a License or Certificate had a significant association with Age, $F_{(1,486)} = 8.869, p = .003$. Principals with a license or principal’s certificate were older than principals without a license or certificate as shown also in Table 13.

**Relationship Between Same School Longevity and Each Independent Variable Alone**

In this section, the relationship of each of the four factors of Krumboltz et al. (1976) career decision making was analyzed to determine their individual relationship with principal’s longevity/retention (same school longevity) in SDA Schools.

As previously noted in Chapter 3, the four factors consist of 22 variables altogether. Each of these 22 factors functionally fall under one of the four
components/factors of Krumboltz et al. (1976) CDM model according to the following conceptual structure:

First, personal characteristics included: (a) gender, (b) age (evaluated as a covariate; rationale included in chapters 3 and 4), and (c) ethnic background. Second, environmental conditions included: (a) school type, (b) enrollment, (c) hours at work, (d) perceived engagement as per the Employee Engagement questionnaire by StuderEducation, referred to as engagement in this study. The purpose of the Employee Engagement questionnaire is to evaluate how well the immediate supervisor or person who completes the employee’s performance evaluation provides a work environment that allows the employee to reach his/her potential. Additionally, five of the six dimensions of the SPES were included as follows: (e) autonomy, (f) decision making, (g) impact, (h) professional growth, (i) status.

Third, learning experiences, included: (a) degree, (b) certification or licensure, and (c) preparation (before) or (d) preparation (after) becoming a principal. Fourth, task skills were evaluated using (a) principals’ perceived level of self-efficacy, one of the six dimensions of SPES; according to Bandura (1994), ‘self-efficacy’ includes subjective confidence in one’s task abilities; and finally (b) feeling of preparedness.

The analyses thus far have shown significant relationships between Age and many of the variables. Therefore, ANCOVA will be conducted and age will be used as a covariate. Pourhoseingholi, Baghestani, and Vahedi (2012) states that “ANCOVA tests whether certain factors have an effect on the outcome variable after removing the variance for which quantitative covariates (confounders) account” (para. 15). Howell (2010) explains that ANCOVA reduces the “error term from which the variance...
attributable to the covariate has been partialled out” (p. 600). Thus, resulting in the
adjusted means being different than the unadjusted means.

**Rationale**

Given the significant relationships between Age and many of the variables to be studied, it was decided to control for Age in all analyses. The analyses below were conducted to study the first research question which states: Is there an association between any of the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered separately, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs?

**Relationship Between Same School Longevity and Each Categorical Independent Variable Alone**

The analysis used to study the relationship between Same School Longevity and each categorical independent variable was ANCOVA, using Age as the covariate (control for Age).

There was no significant relationship between Same School Longevity and Gender, $F_{(1,485)} = 1.287, p = .257$, controlling for age. There was no significant relationship between Same School Longevity and Ethnicity, $F_{(3,452)} = 1.280, p = .281$, when controlled for age. There was no significant relationship between Same School Longevity and Degree, $F_{(2,483)} = .466, p = .628$, controlling for age. There was no significant relationship between Same School Longevity and Preparation before becoming a principal, $F_{(1,483)} = 2.948, p = .087$, controlling for age. There was no significant relationship between Same School Longevity and holding a principals’ License or certificate, $F_{(1,485)} = .571, p = .450$, when age is controlled. There was no significant relationship between Same School Longevity and School Type, $F_{(2,284)} =$
1.768, \( p = .172 \), when controlled for age. However, there was a significant relationship between Same School Longevity and Preparation after becoming a principal, \( F_{(1,481)} = 5.716, \ p = .017 \), controlling for age. Principals who completed a Preparation program after becoming a principal remained longer at the Same School, controlling for age (see Table 14).

**Relationship Between Same School Longevity and Each Numerical Independent Variable Alone**

The analyses used to study the relationship between Same School Longevity and each numerical independent variable was Sequential Multiple Regression, controlling for Age by studying the relationship between Age and each numerical independent variable in addition to (controlling for) Age.

Salary had a significant relationship with Same School Longevity, controlled for Age, \( F_{(1,481)} = 12.549, \ p = .000 \). Salary contributes 2.2% of the variance of Same School Longevity in addition to Age (see Table 15). Enrollment had a significant relationship with Same School Longevity, controlled for Age, \( F_{(1,485)} = 4.674, \ p = .031 \). Enrollment contributes less than one percent of the variance of Same School Longevity in addition to Age (see Table 16).

Perceived Preparedness had no significant relationship with Same School Longevity/Retention, controlled for Age, \( F_{(1,483)} = 2.709, \ p = .100 \). Hours Worked per Week had no significant relationship with Same School Longevity, controlled for Age, \( F_{(1,462)} = .401, \ p = .527 \).
Table 14

*Relationship Between Same School Longevity and Each Categorical Independent Variable Alone, When Controlled for Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M*</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation (After)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (After)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preparation</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation (Before)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (Before)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Preparation</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorates</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>License</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No License</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/K-8</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/K-10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/K-12 and 9-12</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* *Estimated Marginal Means*
Table 15

*Relationship Between Same School Longevity and Salary, controlled for Age: Model Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>Sig $R^2$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age + Salary</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Dependent Variable: Same School Longevity*

*p<.05

Table 16

*Relationship Between Same School Longevity and Enrollment, controlled for Age: Model Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>Sig $R^2$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age + Enrollment</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.031*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Dependent Variable: Same School Longevity*

*p<.05

Engagement had no significant relationship with Same School Longevity, controlled for Age, $F_{(1,480)} = .066, p = .797$. None of the six dimensions of SPES had significant relationship with Same School Longevity, when controlled for Age.

When analyzed individually, (a) Decision Making had no significant relationship with Same School Longevity, controlled for Age, $F_{(1,472)} = 3.751, p = .053$; (b) Professional Growth had no significant relationship with Same School Longevity, controlled for Age, $F_{(1,472)} = 1.198, p = .274$; (c) Status had no significant relationship
with Same School Longevity, controlled for Age, $F_{(1, 472)} = 1.970, p = .161$; (d) Self-efficacy had no significant relationship with Same School Longevity, controlled for Age, $F_{(1, 472)} = .745, p = .389$; (e) Autonomy had no significant relationship with Same School Longevity, controlled for Age, $F_{(1, 472)} = 2.401, p = .122$; and (f) Impact had no significant relationship with Same School Longevity, controlled for Age, $F_{(1, 472)} = .224, p = .636$.

Collectively, SPES or Total SPES had no significant relationship with Same School Longevity, controlled for Age, $F_{(1, 472)} = 2.428, p = .120$.

**Relationship Between Same School Longevity and All Variables Together**

To study the relationship between Same School Longevity and all variables together, it was necessary to construct dummy variables for each categorical variable. Simultaneous Multiple Regression was then used to study the relationship between Same School Longevity and all variables together. Including the dummy variables, there were 22 variables in the model. This analysis also statistically controlled for Age.

These analyses helped address the second research question below:

Is there a significant association between the four factors of Krumboltz et al. (1976) CDM model, considered together, and longevity among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs?

Because there were so many variables included in this model, there were sufficient missing data that it was important to consider how to deal with these missing data. Listwise, pairwise, and mean substitution procedures were all employed to see what effect each would have on the results, and because the results of all three procedures were similar, Listwise deletion was used, even though it would give the smallest sample size. Listwise deletion resulted in an $N$ of 408.
The 22 variables were entered into the regression equation in addition to Age. Age accounted for 11% of the variance in Same School Longevity, and the 22 variables accounted for an additional 7.7% of the variance of Same School Longevity, a significant increase over the contribution of age, $F_{(22,384)} = 1.654$, $p = .033$, $p < 0.05$, (see Table 17). Salary was the only one of the 22 variables significant in the model including Age and the 22 variables (see Table 18).

Table 17

*Relationship Between Same School Longevity and All Independent Variable Together: Model Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>Sig $R^2$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age + All 22 Variables</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.033*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Dependent Variable: Same School Longevity*

*p<.05
Table 18

**Simultaneous Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-2.603</td>
<td>-2.341</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>7.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-8.711</td>
<td>-2.110</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>6.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep (before)</td>
<td>-1.256</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep (after)</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Prep.</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>1.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hrs.</td>
<td>-0.234</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>2.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>1.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>-0.640</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>-1.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Growth</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>-0.298</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>1.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>-0.501</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afric. Am</td>
<td>1.351</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>1.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>1.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/K-8</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/K-12 and 9-12</td>
<td>1.779</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>1.670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because there were so many non-significant variables in the model, stepwise multiple regression was used to find a smaller model containing only significant variables. Using a criterion of 0.05, only two of the 22 variables were included in a small model. Salary explained 2.4% of the variance in Same School Longevity in addition to Age ($F_{(1, 405)} = 31.254, p=.001$), and Preparation Before explained 1.1% of the variance of Same School Longevity in addition to Age and Salary ($F_{(1, 404)} = 5.423, p=0.020$), giving a total of 14.5% of the variance in Same School Longevity explained (see Table 19). Preparation Before had a negative relationship with Same School Longevity – those with training before becoming a principal had lower Same School Longevity (see Table 20).

### Table 19

**Relationship Between Same School Longevity and Significant Variables Only: Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>Sig $R^2$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age + Salary</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age + Salary + Preparation Before</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Dependent Variable: Same School Longevity  
*p<.05*
Table 20

*Stepwise Coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$T$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-2.603</td>
<td>-2.341</td>
<td>7.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>7.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-3.765</td>
<td>-3.270</td>
<td>7.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>7.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>3.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-2.258</td>
<td>-1.717</td>
<td>7.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>7.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>3.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep (Before)</td>
<td>-1.569</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-2.329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists. This chapter analyzed responses of 507 principals from the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists. Descriptive statistics, Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) and Multiple Regression using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to address the two research questions for this study. Each research question was analyzed and results were recorded in Tables 2 – 20.
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the study, summary of the literature with a special focus on the four factors of Krumboltz et al. (1976) CDM, highlight major findings, conclusions, delimitation, and discuss recommendations for practice and future research.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs.

Summary of the Literature

Muir and Li (2014) argue that “retention can be viewed as logical inverse of turnover as the behavior to stay rather than leave the organization” (para. 3). They also state that retention and turnover metrics are “compliments rather than reverse” (para. 3). Therefore, this review will address retention and turnover of employees, specifically, as they relate to school principals.

Fuller and Young (2009) cited that 90% of new principals who leave a school leave the principalship altogether. They also found that “elementary school principals
had the longest average tenure (4.99 years) while high school principals had the lowest average tenure (3.84 years). Schools designated as both elementary and secondary schools have the lowest tenure overall at 3.71 years” (p. 6). Ledesma (2011) reports that “Adventist principals in North America stay an average of 2.5 years at the elementary level, 3.6 years at day secondary schools, and 4.0 years at secondary boarding-schools” (p. 8).

In a study on the role of principals in school’s effectiveness, Hallinger and Heck (1996) found that principals affect positively student learning. Fuller and Young (2009) argue that “schools with high levels of principal retention tend to have higher levels of teacher retention” (p. 3). Boyce and Bowers (2016) draw from past studies to argue “that principal turnover has significant negative consequences on students, teachers, and schools” (p. 1).

The study that follows will present a brief overview of the literature review in light of principals’ longevity in relation to Krumboltz et al. (1976) theory of CDM model according to the following conceptual structure:

First, personal characteristics included: (a) gender, (b) age (evaluated as a covariate; rationale included in Chapters 3 and 4), and (c) ethnic background. Second, environmental conditions included: (a) school type, (b) enrollment, (c) hours at work, (d) perceived engagement as per the Employee Engagement questionnaire by StuderEducation, referred to as engagement in this study. The purpose of the Employee Engagement questionnaire is to evaluate how well the immediate supervisor or person who completes the employee’s performance evaluation provides a work environment that allows the employee to reach his/her potential. Additionally, five of the six dimensions of
the SPES were included as follows: (e) autonomy, (f) decision making, (g) impact, (h) professional growth, (i) status.

Third, learning experiences, included: (a) degree, (b) certification or licensure, and (c) preparation (before) or (d) preparation (after) becoming a principal. Fourth, task skills were evaluated using (a) principals’ perceived level of self-efficacy, one of the six dimensions of SPES; according to Bandura (1994), ‘self-efficacy’ includes subjective confidence in one’s task abilities; and finally (b) feeling of preparedness.

**Personal Characteristics**

Most studies include personal characteristics such as age (covariate), race, gender, etc. Fuller and Young (2009) concluded that “the personal characteristics of principals such as age, race, and gender appear to have only a small impact on principal retention rates (p. 17). Baker et al. (2010) found that age “seems to play a role in exit behavior in Texas, as principals younger than age 46 are more likely to stay in their building positions” (p. 528). They also found that “gender seems to play a role, as female building leaders leave their principal positions at a higher rate than men” (p. 528). Agyeman and Ponniah (2014) identified gender and age as two of the demographic characteristics that were associated to retention factors in their study. Hayes (2015) identified age and gender as two of the significant factors in their study of employee turnover intentions. Also, age have been used in several studies as covariates (Boyce & Bowers, 2016; Knight, Edwards, & Flynn, 2011). Fuller and Young (2009) found that “race/ethnicity did not appear to substantially influence tenure” (p. 8) of principals in Texas. Baker et al. (2010) also found “that minority principals are more likely to be unstable, as are male principals” (543).
Formal Learning Experiences

Ainsworth and Eaton (2010) explained that formal learning experiences as the type of learning that is intentional, organized and structures. They are arranged by institutions and are guided by curriculum. Several studies have been conducted on principals’ preparation programs and principals’ preparedness (Barnett, 2004; Farkas et al., 2003; Marcos et al., 2011). Hayes (2015) stated education as one of the demographic characteristics which were found to be significant factors in employee turnover intentions. Similarly, in a review of the literature, Agyeman and Ponniah (2014) cited education as one of the demographic factor variables that was found to have stable relationship with retention. Similarly, Hayes (2015) identified education as one of the significant factors in their study of employee turnover intentions.

Environmental Conditions

Maintaining a working environment which provides supports for current employees to remain in their employment is one of the objectives of retention efforts. In several principals’ retention related studies, environmental conditions include but not limited to (a) weekly hours worked, (b) salary, (c) enrollment, (d) school type, (e) engagement or relationship with superintendent, and five of the six dimensions of SPES were included as follows: (f) decision-making, (g) professional growth, (h) status, (i) autonomy, and (j) impact. These five dimensions in this study analyzed the level of principals’ perceived empowerment in their position. Gawlik (2008) cited Bogler and Somech (2005) who argue that “increased school autonomy is believed to enhance an individual’s sense of ownership” (p. 1). Williams (2002) states that effective empowerment of employees can lead to higher levels of skills development.
School Leaders Network (2014) cited a study conducted by the National Association of Elementary School Principals in which long hours were reported as one of the primary reasons for leaving. Salary or compensation was one of the factors that have been found to be significant in relationship to retention (Baker et al., 2010; Emiroğlu, Akovab, & Tanriverdi, 2015; Luebke, 2013; Sorapuru, 2012). For instance, Baker et al. (2010) found that “the higher the salary, the more likely a principal is stable and less likely he or she is to move to another school” (p. 524). They added, “doubling the principal’s salary relative to others on the same labor market increases the likelihood that a principal is stable by 2.27 times” (p. 541). Similarly, Hayes (2015) found income to be one of the factors associated with employee turnover intentions.

Durow and Brock (2013) cited Ramsey (1999) who noted that “long hours, low pay, few perks, and limited respect associated with the principal’s role” (p. 194) as “factors contributing to retention problems” (p. 194) of principals. Also, Fraser and Brock (2013) cited Durow and Brock (2004) who “revealed that in spite of enjoying their work and impact on Catholic education, principals left positions due to inadequate compensation, lack of career opportunities, or conflict with governing authorities” (p. 427). Moreover, Tran (2016) found that “principals who are unhappy with their pay were found to be more likely to intend to leave their schools” (p. 14).

In regard to enrollment, Tran (2016) cited Partlow (2007) who “argues that school size may be more related to high school principals’ turnover intentions because of the increased severity of the disciplinary problems involved with high school students (Heaviside et al., 1998)” (p. 8). In addressing school type, Baker et al. (2010) stated that “stability is somewhat lower in middle schools and somewhat higher in high schools. It
is conceivable that some principals view the middle school principalship as a stepping stone to a secondary school principalship” (p. 539). Finally, Luebke (2013) in a study of high school principals who remained at their job emphasized the positive results of principals’ engagement or relationship with their superintendents when stating that “relationships with the superintendent were mentioned by all principals as critical to their tenure in their positions” (p. 194).

Task Skills

Task skills in this study analyzed the level of (a) principals’ self-efficacy in their position and (b) principals’ perceived preparedness. Self-efficacy is one’s beliefs in one’s capabilities to accomplish tasks and complete goals (Bandura, 1994; Locke & Latham, 2002). Similarly, Business Dictionary (2017b) defines self-efficacy as one’s “belief about his or her ability and capacity to accomplish a task” (para. 1). Bandura (1994) argues that “people with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided” (para. 2). LeVan (2010) states that self-efficacy is “about believing you are capable of producing a desired result – that you can achieve your goals” (para. 3).

According to Boyce and Bowers (2016), principal self-perfections of influence are reported on what is described as multiple “leadership activities.” These activities are listed as “establishing curriculum, setting performance standards, determining the content of professional development programs for teachers, deciding on how the school budget will be spent, setting discipline policy, hiring teachers, and evaluating teachers” (p. 5). They found that satisfied principals were those with higher level of influence at their schools.
Summary of Findings

As presented in chapter four, descriptive statistics, ANCOVA, and Multiple Regression were conducted to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz et al. (1976) CDM model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs. In this study, Age accounted for 11% of the variance in Same School Longevity, and the 22 variables accounted for an additional 7.7% of the variance in Same School Longevity, a significant increase over the contribution of age. Salary was the only one of the 22 variables that was found to be significant in the model including Age and the 22 variables. Salary, one of the items under Environmental Conditions from Krumboltz et al. (1976) Social Learning Theory of CDM, contributed 2.2% of the variance in Same School Longevity in addition to Age.

First, in this study, the majority of the principals (66%) were female. According to Mui and Li (2014) in their research based on a literature review of employee retention, “retention is lower for women than men” (para. 10). One of the reasons cited by the authors is due to the fact most of the workforce is dominated by males. Since most of the workforce in the school system is women, 76% of teachers are women (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2014), if gender is a factor in this study, it will not be because of the make-up of the workforce.

Also, most of the principals in this study were Caucasians (72.9%). It was also indicated that minorities experience a lower retention rate than whites (Mui & Li, 2014). In terms of the relationship between retention and race, the principals of this study have a racial advantage. Also, the age distribution of the principals is nearly evenly distributed with 53% being 50 years old and above and 47% being between 20 and 40 years old.
The average age of public school principals nationally is 48 years (US Department of Education, 2016).

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2016), older employees remain longer at their jobs than younger ones. For instance, “the median tenure of workers ages 55 to 64 (10.1 years) was more than three times that of workers ages 25 to 34 years (2.8 years)” (para. 4). Therefore, it this study, it was apparent that Longevity at the same school, was associated with Age, it was necessary to determine the relationships between age and the variables to see whether the analyses needed to adjust for Age. Five of the numeric independent variables (feeling prepared, school enrollment, professional growth, status, and self-efficacy) significant (noteworthy) but minor association with Age.

The analyses seemed to indicate that there were no associations between Age and Gender. Ethnicity was associated with Age. That is, African American and Caucasian principals were older than Asians and Hispanics. Drawing from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2016) cited above, the findings seemed to suggest that Caucasian principals were older and had a higher tenure or same school longevity than the other groups of principals (Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks). Thus, a greater need to adjust or control for Age in subsequent analyses. Also, the research seemed to indicate that Degree (highest education) had a significant association with Age. Principals with masters (61.4%) and doctorate (4.7%) degrees were older than principals with bachelors’ degree. In this study, 77.1% of the principals were 40 years old and above. Prior research indicated that people with graduate degrees were older than those with lower degrees (Smith, 1997).

Preparation before becoming a principal had a significant relationship with Age. Principals who completed a principal preparation program before becoming a principal
were older than those who did not. Likewise, preparation after becoming a principal had a significant relationship with Age. Principals who completed a principal preparation after becoming a principal were older than those who did not. Similarly, having a License or Certificate had a significant with Age. Principals with a license or principal’s certificate were older than principals without a license or certificate. Overall, the research seemed to indicate that the older the principal, the higher their education attainment.

When adjusted for Age, only preparation after becoming a principal had a significant relationship with same school longevity. It was found that principals who completed a Preparation program after becoming a principal remained longer at the Same School, when adjusted for Age.

Finally, the 22 variables were entered into the regression equation in addition to Age. Age accounted for (predicted) 11% of the variance (adjustment or change) in Same School Longevity, and the 22 variables accounted for an additional 7.7% of the variance of Same School Longevity, a significant increase over the contribution of age. Salary was the only one of the 22 variables significant in the model including Age and the 22 variables. Salary explained 2.4% of the variance in Same School Longevity in addition to Age. Most of the principals (75.8%) indicated earning less than $60,000 compared to the median annual salary of $100,150 nationally for school principals, according to salary.com.

Preparation Before explained 1.1% of the variance in Same School Longevity in addition to Age and Salary, giving a total of 14.5% of the variance in Same School Longevity explained. Preparation Before had a negative relationship with Same School
Longevity – those with training before had less Same School Longevity. Enrollment had a significant relationship with Same School Longevity, controlled for Age. Enrollment contributes less than one percent of the variance of Same School Longevity in addition to Age. The findings seemed to suggest that principals stay longer in schools with higher enrollment.

There were several confounding issues with this study that were due to Age. Age seemed to be a major “causal” factor in this study. With age comes more experience, which is one of the ingredients for survival as a principal. According to Bartlomiejczuk and Jin (2015), “human capital theory suggests that performance should improve over time, because employees accumulate job experience, which provides them with more knowledge, skills, and abilities to apply to their work” (para. 1). Older principals may use these experiences in dealing with school related issues to navigate through the principalship successfully. With age also comes wisdom. Principals rely heavily on wisdom in dealing with the multifaceted aspects of the principalship. Good sense and judgment are some of the words used to define wisdom, according to the Merriam Webster Online Dictionary (2017). Good sense and judgment are developed over time.

Preparation before or after the principalship is also associated with Age. Most of the principals of the study are older. Very few, if any, principals get a job as a principal straight out of college at the age of 21 or 22. In this study, only 4.5% of principals were between the ages of 20 and 29. In this study, older principals had higher education than the younger ones. As Blackmer (2014), vice-president for education for the NAD who provides leadership to the North American Division Office of Education (NADOE), noted, “the Seventh-day Adventist education system values an additional degree or its
equivalent to the extent that most union conferences pay the tuition and related expenses for the teacher to get a master’s degree” (p. 100). The same is true for principals because most principals served as teachers before becoming a principal.

Enrollment was found to be a significant, but small, factor in relationship with Same School Longevity. Most Adventist principals (54.5%) in this study served in small schools with enrollment ranges from 1 – 50 students. It is safe to assume that the larger schools are staffed with older and more experienced principals. Principals in larger schools have more financial and human resources to operate their schools. Although principals in larger schools experience more pressure in dealing with students’ behavior related incidents, they experience less financial pressure in regards to finances. Principals in smaller schools face daily challenges that are financial challenges which may force them to move to more financially sustainable schools in order to ensure the viability of their employment.

Finally, Salary was found to be a significant factor in relationship with Same School Longevity. Blackmer (2014), the vice president for education of the NAD of SDAs who operates the North American Division Office of Education (NADOE), highlights that “within the Adventist educational system, teachers are expected to work toward finishing a master’s degree, or its equivalent (NADOE, 2010), in order to get professional certification and receive top wages” (p. 100). As noted earlier, principals with higher degrees were older. Since obtaining a master’s degree or its equivalent results in a professional certificate which in turns leads to top salaries, we can deduct that older principals are the ones receiving higher pay or top salaries. Again, Age is a factor in salary acquisition among principals in SDA schools.
Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore the association between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively and longevity, among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDAs. Salary, one of the items under Environmental Conditions from Krumboltz et al. (1976) Social Learning Theory of CDM, was found to be statistically significant and contributed 2.2% of the variance in Same School Longevity in addition to the role of Age considered as a covariate. In addition to these direct results, this outcome at least tentatively suggests that Krumboltz’s CDM model may not be as applicable to principals serving in parochial school systems.

Delimitations

This study only included principals from the NAD of SDAs. Other delimitations include variables that could be used to explain the variance in principals’ longevity/retention. Additionally, Krumboltz’s four-factor model was chosen for testing, using 22 relevant variables measured by the two selected survey instruments, controlling for age, regarding their relationship(s) with longevity/retention (see Table 1). The six dimensions of the SPES were selected to address two of the four factors of Krumboltz’s model, five of these were classified with environmental conditions and one with task skills. The five dimensions under environmental conditions included: (a) decision-making, (b) professional growth, (c) status, (d) autonomy, and (e) impact; one of the SPES’s six dimensions, self-efficacy, was used to measure one of the two variables related to task skills. Any additional theoretical implications potentially derived from the conceptual organization of the classification of survey items within Krumboltz’s four-factor model were not addressed by the research questions, so they were not explored or
described further. Yet the two selected questionnaires allowed the researcher to explore additional contextual issues relevant to the study (e.g., demographics).

Also, although task skills may be related to formal learning experiences, in this study, task skills were evaluated using principals’ perceived level of self-efficacy, one of the six dimensions of the SPES, along with perceived preparedness. In this regard, according to Bandura (1994), ‘self-efficacy’ includes subjective confidence in one’s task abilities.

Discussion

This study examined associations between the four factors of Krumboltz’s career decision making model, considered individually and collectively, and longevity/retention among P/K-12 principals in the NAD of SDA using 22 variables measured by two quantitative survey instruments. In regard to these associations, two of the variables classified under Environmental Conditions, salary and enrollment, along with preparation (after), a measured item classified under Formal Learning Experiences in Krumboltz et al. (1976) Social Learning Theory of CDM, achieved statistical significance.

A similar attempt to predict principal longevity/retention by Sorapuru (2012), uncovered two major findings: “Principals’ perceived effectiveness of formal learning experiences received by district level employees or school boards and school performance” (p. 91). Sorapuru (2012) stated that these two variables “could predict principals’ willingness to remain in the position as principal” (p. 91). In a study of “retention and attrition of Catholic school principals,” Durow (2013) found that “compensation was not a major consideration in job choice” (p. 2001).
Although the present study employed variables similar to those used in Sorapuru’s study, this study focused only on the association between the factors of Krumboltz et al. (1976) CDM and longevity. The goal was not so much to predict willingness to remain as a principal as to analyze possible associations between the four factors of Krumboltz’s model and principal’s actual longevity/retention. Therefore, it was not a complete surprise to note discrepancies between these results and those from related studies. Although Sorapuru (2012) considered school performance as a factor, this study did not include school performance. Currently, no study of principals has involved school performance in SDA schools, although an investigation by Blackmer (2014) examined teacher characteristics and student achievement in schools in the NAD of SDAs.

Because this study found a significant relationship between salary and longevity of SDA principals at the same school, a brief analysis of the “North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists Remuneration Scale, Effective January 1, 2016” document will shed light on the way school principals are compensated in the SDA school system. The document states that “the philosophy of remuneration is predicated upon the fact that a spirit of sacrifice and dedication should mark all denominational employees irrespective of the position they hold or the department or service they represent” (p. 1). The objective is described as follows: “to provide employees with an adequate income while endeavoring to provide a reasonable level of comfort” (p. 1). The remuneration scale includes “a percent spread between entry level and maximum rates in the various categories” (p. 1). The remuneration scale is the same for Superintendent of Schools, K-
12 principals and teachers with professional certificate (p. 10). There seems to be a clear distinction in percentages at the college and university levels (p. 11).

Preparation (before) explained 1.1% of the variance in Same School Longevity in addition to Age and Salary, giving a total of 14.5% of the variance in Same School Longevity explained. Preparation (before) had a negative relationship with Same School Longevity – those with training before had lower Same School Longevity. This latter somewhat counterintuitive finding documented that principals who completed a principal preparation program for aspiring principals actually had a slightly higher turnover rate. This finding seems to suggest that only investing in training for principals after they have had some experience serving as a principal pays off. In this regard, principals who received training after becoming a principal remained longer as previously mentioned. Considered together, these findings suggest that investments in principal training prior to becoming a principal may not be as valuable as training after becoming a principal. Perhaps actual leadership experience while serving as a principal serves to focus attention on areas of inadequacy, ensuring that subsequent training will be valued and effective.

Enrollment had a significant relationship with Same School Longevity, controlling for age. However, enrollment contributed less than one percent of the variance of Same School Longevity, in addition to age. This finding seemed to suggest that principals stay longer in schools with higher enrollment. Perhaps schools with higher enrollment would tend to be more financially stable. Yet Sorapuru (2012) found that school size did not significantly impact principals’ intent to stay. This apparent discrepancy may result from the fact that in the public sector, school financial health may
not depend on school size as much as it does in private schools, where reliance on tuition to fund operations remains common.

Finally, because any consideration of longevity would tend to be confounded with age, it was necessary to statistically control for age. All the principals in the NAD of SDAs were invited to participate in the study. Obviously, young principals cannot have longevity as principals. Analysis of Covariance was thus necessary to control for Age.

**Recommendations for Practice**

There appears to be a clear distinction in the salary pay scale between public school teachers and SDA principals as per salary.com. Forsyth (2016) defended the salary of school administrators in comparison to teachers by stating that “considering then that teachers’ salaries are lower than others in the marketplace and administrators earn only marginally more (when all factors are considered), one can only conclude that school administrators are not overpaid” (para. 11). On the other hand, the remuneration scale for SDA principals in the NAD of SDAs document clearly indicates that school principals (and superintendents) are compensated at the same scale as teachers. Based on the findings of this study, I would recommend a revision of the remuneration scale for K-12 in SDA schools, at least for principals. The remuneration scale document states that “Preparation, education and commitment, previous experience and achievement” (p. 1) should be recognized when setting rates. I would suggest that responsibility also be considered when setting rates. A scale with differentiation in responsibility as indicated by the scale for colleges and universities could serve as a model for K-12.

When possible, a merit system based on tenure should be developed and implemented in determining the salary of principals in the SDA school system.
Principals could receive an increase in salary after a certain number of years of being a principal at the same school. For instance, an increase could be given to a principal every five years for being a principal at the same school. Such a system would encourage principals to remain longer at a school instead of moving from school to school by providing incentives that support longevity at the same school. As mentioned earlier, such a method of financial rewards recognition for principals may in turn improve student achievement.

**Suggestions for Further Studies**

The importance of retaining school principals at the same school cannot be overstated. Krumboltz et al. (1976) Social Learning Theory of CDM is only one of several theories related to retention. Determining the factors that would positively affect principal retention at the same school may be almost as complex as there are schools and principals. In this regard, this study has paved the way for further studies:

1. A study relating principal salary and school performance in SDA Schools;
2. A study relating principal longevity and school performance in SDA schools (e. g., relate longevity to test score results or recruiting and retention of students);
3. A qualitative study of Krumboltz’s four factors that influence the nature of CDM and longevity of principals in SDA schools;
4. Research that addresses different models of compensation of employees and how these models affect principal longevity;
5. Research that includes additional measures for task skills and their influence on principal longevity.
6. Mixed methods research comparing the effectiveness of SDA leadership training programs for principals and such training programs in public schools.
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APPLYING KRUMBOLTZ’S THEORY OF CAREER DECISION MAKING (CDM) TO THE LONGEVITY OF PRINCIPALS IN THE NORTHAMERICAN DIVISION OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

Informed Consent Form
This research study is part of my dissertation project, in partial fulfillment for my PhD in Educational Administration at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated. The objective of my research is to explore the impact of principal’s training and various work factors on principal’s longevity or tenure at the same school within the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists.

Principal Investigator: Sadrail Saint-Ulysse

Participant Informed Consent Statements: Participation in this study is voluntary. Please read this participation informed consent form carefully before you decide if you would like to participate.

Duration of participation in study: 10 – 15 minutes.

Procedures: The survey consists of three parts with a total of 63 questions. The first part (questions 2 – 15) consists of demographic questions. The second part of the survey (questions 16 – 25) will help evaluate how well your immediate supervisor (person who completes your evaluation) provides a work environment that allows you to perform at a high level. Finally, in the third part of the survey (questions 26 – 63), you will be asked to rate a series of statements describing how you feel empowered at your school.

Benefits: The result from this study will allow Union and Conference personnel to develop evidence-based policies and informed budgets to address principal’s training and various work factors as they consider earmarking funds to improve principals’ longevity which will in turn improve student achievement.

Risks: None

Voluntary Participation: I have been informed that my participation in this study is completely voluntary, refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. That I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled.

Confidentiality: I understand that my identity in this study will not be disclosed in any published document. And that the researcher will collect responses anonymously.

Contact: I am aware that I can contact the supervisor/advisor, Dr. Jay Brand, at 269-471-3487 or the principal investigator, Sadrail Saint-Ulysse, at (609) 498-4884 for answers to questions related to this study.

I have read the contents of this Consent and received verbal explanations to questions I had. My questions concerning this study have been answered satisfactorily. I hereby give my voluntary consent to participate in this study by clicking “Yes.” Furthermore, this consent to participate also constitute consent from my institution. I am fully aware that if I have any additional questions I can contact researcher and/or the advisor.
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Appendix B: Questionnaire

APPLYING KRUMBOLTZ’S THEORY OF CAREER DECISION MAKING (CDM) TO THE LONGEVITY OF PRINCIPALS IN THE NORTH AMERICAN DIVISION OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

Informed Consent Form

This research study is part of my dissertation project, in partial fulfillment for my PhD in Educational Administration at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated. The objective of my research is to explore the impact of principal’s training and various work factors on principal’s longevity or tenure at the same school within the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists.

Principal Investigator: Sadrail Saint-Ulysse

Participant Informed Consent Statements: Participation in this study is voluntary. Please read this participation informed consent form carefully before you decide if you would like to participate.

Duration of participation in study: 10 – 15 minutes.

Procedures: The survey consists of three parts with a total of 63 questions. The first part (questions 2 – 15) consists of demographic questions. The second part of the survey (questions 16 – 25) will help evaluate how well your immediate supervisor (person who completes your evaluation) provides a work environment that allows you to perform at a high level. Finally, in the third part of the survey (questions 26 – 63), you will be asked to rate a series of statements describing how you feel empowered at your school.

Benefits: The result from this study will allow Union and Conference personnel to develop evidence-based policies and informed budgets to address principal’s training and various work factors as they consider earmarking funds to improve principals’ longevity which will in turn improve student achievement.

Risks: None

Voluntary Participation: I have been informed that my participation in this study is completely voluntary, refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. That I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled.

Confidentiality: I understand that my identity in this study will not be disclosed in any published document. And that the researcher will collect responses anonymously.

Contact: I am aware that I can contact the supervisor/advisor, Dr. Jay Brand, at 269-471-3487 or the principal investigator, Sadrail Saint-Ulysse, at (609) 498-4884 for answers to questions related to this study.

I have read the contents of this Consent and received verbal explanations to questions I had. My questions concerning this study have been answered satisfactorily. I hereby give my voluntary consent to participate in this study by clicking “Yes.” Furthermore, this consent to participate also constitute consent from my institution. I am fully aware that if I have any additional questions I can contact researcher and/or the advisor.
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Demographic Questions
The following demographic questions are provided so that better insight can be obtained regarding the perceptions of various groups of principals. These questions are not presented as a means of identifying individual principals. Thank you for your time and assistance. Please select the appropriate response:

2. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

3. What is your age?
   - 20 to 29
   - 30 to 39
   - 40 to 49
   - 50 to 59
   - 60 and above

4. What is your our ethnic background?
   - African American
   - Asian
   - Caucasian
   - Hispanic
   - Other

5. What is your highest academic degree?
   - Associates
   - Bachelors
   - Masters
   - Doctorates
   - No Degree
6. How many years have you been a principal?

- [ ] 0 – 2
- [ ] 3 – 5
- [ ] 6 – 10
- [ ] 16 – 19
- [ ] 20 – 25
- [ ] 26+

7. How many years have you been a principal at your current school

- [ ] 0 – 2
- [ ] 3 – 5
- [ ] 6 – 10
- [ ] 11 – 15
- [ ] 16 – 19
- [ ] 20 – 25
- [ ] 26+

8. Before you became a principal, did you complete a school administrator training or principal preparation program for ASPIRING school principals?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

9. After you became a principal, did you complete a school administrator training or principal preparation program for school principals?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

10. Do you currently hold a North American Division license/certificate in “school administration” or principal endorsement?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

11. How prepared do you feel you were for the principalship when receiving your principal position?

- [ ] Very prepared
- [ ] Prepared
- [ ] Somewhat prepared
- [ ] Somewhat not prepared
- [ ] Not at all prepared
12. How many hours per week do you currently work?
- 20 – 30
- 30 – 40
- 40 – 50
- 50 – 60
- 60+

13. What is your salary range?
- Less than $60,000
- $60,000 – 64,999
- $65,000 – $69,999
- $70,000 – $74,999
- $75,000 – $79,999
- $80,000 – $84,999
- $85,000 – $89,999
- $90,000 and over

14. What is the current enrollment at your school?
- 1 – 50
- 51 – 100
- 101 – 150
- 151 – 200
- 201 – 250
- More than 250

15. Select the best description of your school’s type (Grades offered)
- P/K-8
- P/K-10
- P/K-12
- 9-12
APPLYING KRUMBOLTZ’S THEORY OF CAREER DECISION MAKING (CDM) TO THE LONGEVITY OF PRINCIPALS IN THE NORTHAMERICAN DIVISION OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to evaluate how well your immediate supervisor (person who completes your evaluation) provides a work environment that allows you to perform at a high level. Please answer each question using the scale provided to evaluate your experience. This survey is anonymous.

16. My superintendent/supervisor provides me good processes and resources to do my job.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Mixed Feelings | Agree | Strongly Agree |

17. My superintendent/supervisor provides feedback on my strengths as an employee.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Mixed Feelings | Agree | Strongly Agree |

18. My superintendent/Supervisor led staff meetings make efficient use of time and are productive.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Mixed Feelings | Agree | Strongly Agree |


| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Mixed Feelings | Agree | Strongly Agree |

20. My superintendent/supervisor demonstrates a genuine concern for my welfare.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Mixed Feelings | Agree | Strongly Agree |


| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Mixed Feelings | Agree | Strongly Agree |

22. My superintendent/supervisor consults me on the decisions that affect my job.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Mixed Feelings | Agree | Strongly Agree |

23. My superintendent/supervisor sets clear expectations for judging my performance.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Mixed Feelings | Agree | Strongly Agree |
24. My superintendent/supervisor provides the support needed to accomplish my work objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mixed Feelings</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

25. My superintendent/supervisor provides feedback concerning areas for improving my performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mixed Feelings</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

APPLYING KRUMBOLTZ’S THEORY OF CAREER DECISION MAKING (CDM) TO THE LONGEVITY OF PRINCIPALS IN THE NORTHAMERICAN DIVISION OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

School Participant Empowerment Scale (SPES)

Please rate the following statements in terms of how well they describe how you feel.

26. I am given the responsibility to monitor programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

27. I function in a professional environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. I believe that I have earned respect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

29. I believe that I am helping kids become independent learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

30. I have control over daily schedules.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

31. I believe that I have the ability to get things done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

32. I make decisions about the implementation of new programs in the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I am treated as a professional.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I believe that I am very effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I believe that I am empowering students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I am able to lead as I choose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I participate in staff development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I make decisions about the selection of teachers for my school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I have the opportunity for professional growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I have the respect of my colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I feel that I am involved in an important program for children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I have the freedom to make decisions on how my school operates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I believe that I am having an impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I am involved in school budget decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
45. I work at a school where kids come first.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

46. I have the support of my colleagues.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

47. I see students learn.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

48. I make decisions about curriculum.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

49. I am a decision maker.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

50. I am given the opportunity to evaluate my teachers.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

51. I am given the opportunity to continue learning.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

52. I have a strong knowledge base on how to operate my school.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

53. I believe that I have the opportunity to grow by working daily with teachers and school personnel.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

54. I perceive that I have the opportunity to influence others.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

55. I can determine my own schedule.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

56. I have the opportunity to collaborate with teachers and school personnel in my school.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

57. I perceive that I am making a difference.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
58. Teachers and school personnel solicit my advice.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
59. I believe that I am good at what I do.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
60. I can plan my own schedule.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
61. I perceive that I have an impact on teachers and students.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
62. My advice is solicited by others.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
63. I have the opportunity to teach teachers about innovative ideas.
Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

Top of Form
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VITA
SAADRIL SAINT-ULYSSE
409 Chesterfield –Jacobstown Rd.
Chesterfield, NJ 08515
(H) 609-291-0889
(C) 609-498-4884
saintulysse@njcsda.org

EDUCATION

PH.D. CANDIDATE  ANDREWS UNIVERSITY (2016)
M.A.  CENTENARY COLLEGE (2005)
M.DIV.  ANDREWS UNIVERSITY (1998)
B.S.  JERSEY CITY STATE COLLEGE (1992)
A.A.S.  UNION COUNTY COLLEGE (1989)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

NEW JERSEY CONFERENCE OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS INC. 1998 – PRESENT

Superintendent of Schools/Pastor  2009 - Present
As a superintendent of Schools, I serve as agent of the conference board of education in administering and supervising the New Jersey Conference system of education in accordance with established policies, and in the recruitment, placement, evaluation, transfer, and dismissal of educational personnel in consultation with local school administration, board, board of education, and the executive committee. Additionally, I provide leadership to the board of education in developing strategic planning for the conference school system in the areas of school administration, spirituality, facilities, marketing and enrolment, finances, and fund development. Furthermore, I work collaboratively with the conference administration, pastors, and principals to acquaint the constituency with the necessity of Adventist education.
As a local church pastor, I provide leadership and work collaboratively with the elders, department leaders, and church members to develop and implement strategic plan to nurture, equip members for in-reach and out-reach as we await the soon return of Jesus.

Principal/Grades 9 & 10 Teacher (Meadow View Junior Academy, Chesterfield, NJ)  
July 2005 – June 2009
As the principal and grades 9 and 10 teacher, I served as the chief executive officer responsible for both the instructional and financial operation of the school. I worked closely with the conference, district pastors, and constituents to grow the school enrollment and reimage the school. Under my leadership, the school regained its junior academy status.

Vice Principal/ Bible, Math, Science Teacher/Recruiter/Guidance Counselor/Chaplain  (Garden State Academy, Tranquility, NJ  
July 1998 – June 2005
Upon graduating from Andrews University Theological Seminary in June 1998, I joined the faculty at Garden State Academy where I served as Chaplain/Religion, Science and Math teacher from 1998 to December 2000. In December 2000, I was promoted to the
position of vice principal due to my leadership abilities. In addition to teaching Bible classes, I served as the guidance counselor and the vice principal for student services. During that period, I also served as a church planter. From 2002 to 2005, I continued serving as the vice principal for students’ services as lead the recruiting efforts of the school which brought about a growth in enrollment.

Medical Technologist (Elizabeth General Hospital (Pathology Department)
Elizabeth, New Jersey (June 1989 – June 1994)

MEMBERSHIP & CERTIFICATION

• Ordination Certificate to the Ministry - November 2001, New Jersey Conference
• Administrator Certification in Superintendent, Principal, Supervisor of Instruction, NAD
• Membership with Seventh Day Adventist Science Teachers
• Certificate In Informational Technologies, Seton Hall University
• Certification in Courtship Leadership Seminar and Marriage Enrichment Leadership Seminar