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Problem

Statistics Canada (1977) reported that the national mobility rate of the teaching force in Canadian public elementary and secondary schools in 1975-76 was 11 percent, compared with 15 percent in 1970-71. During the 1970-78 period, Seventh-day Adventist church schools (elementary/secondary day schools) in Canada reported a 38 percent teacher/principal mobility rate. It was the purpose of this study to identify factors that cause high mobility of teachers and principals in SDA church schools of Canada by investigating the relationship of opinions between the school board members and the school faculty members of these schools on the topics of: principal mobility,
teacher mobility, and efficient school board operation. In addition, the study sought to examine a few actual school board practices, and some biographical characteristics of school board members, teachers, and principals in these schools, to provide supplementary information that may lead to further identification of intrinsic or other factors that affect teacher and principal mobility.

Method

Lists of teachers who had served in these schools during the 1970-78 period (provided by the local conference education directors) were used to determine the teacher/principal mobility rates. A sixty-nine-statement questionnaire, devised from a review of related studies, was submitted to the principals, teachers, and school board members of forty-two selected SDA church schools in Canada. The three topics considered by these respondents were: (1) reasons why principals move, (2) reasons why teachers move, and (3) factors important to efficient school board operation. The school board members and principals also reported whether or not these factors were in actual practice at their school or in their school board.

Computer analysis of the data received from the 282 respondents yielded such statistical information as the mean, the median, Spearman's rho values, t test values, and percentages of responses. Tables were made according to the computer printout.

Results

The null hypotheses were rejected at the .05 level, on the basis of the above statistical tests, and the alternative hypotheses were retained—that is, there was a significant relationship between
the mean responses of the school board members and the faculty members regarding: (1) the reasons for principal mobility, (2) the reasons for teacher mobility, and (3) factors important to efficient school board operation.

Conclusions

From this study, it was concluded that teacher and principal mobility rates in Canadian SDA church schools are considerably higher than those of the public school system. Student discipline problems, personality clash of teachers and principals with parents of students, and the board's decision regarding teacher/principal performance are three significant factors that cause teacher/principal mobility. That the school boards are not generally following the practices which the respondents indicated were moderately important to efficient school board operation, was reported by the school board members and principals.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Fifty years ago the feeling in educational circles was that an inordinately high number of teachers were leaving their positions each year or transferring from one location to another. This gave rise to the not inappropriate epithet for the teaching profession, "the teaching procession" (Elsbree, 1928, p. 1).

Industrial leaders long ago recognized the disastrous consequences of high turnover among their employees. The problem concerned them primarily from an economic aspect—turnover representing an actual loss in dollars and cents. This realization resulted in a number of scientific investigations of the causes of labor turnover, and a studied attempt on the part of management to make use of their newly-found knowledge in controlling this leakage. The extent of their efforts may be judged from the ever increasing amount of welfare work and the growing attention paid to personnel problems (Elsbree, 1928, p. 1).

Educational profit or loss is not measurable in dollars and cents. Inefficient teaching is not as apparent as spoiled work in industry; hence, the community is scarcely aware of the loss it is sustaining with each withdrawal of a competent teacher. If the seriousness of the teacher mobility problem and all of its implications were realized, the community might exhibit anxiety about the amount
and nature of its teacher mobility and take aggressive interest in means for its control, rivaling that of our largest industrial concerns (Elsbree, 1928, p. 1).

Statistics Canada (1977, pp. 7, 26-27) indicated that there was an 11 percent mobility rate for public elementary and secondary school teachers and principals in Canada during the school year, 1975-76; and the average tenure of the teaching staff was 5.0 years. Studies of Seventh-day Adventist church school teachers and principals in the United States by Hehling (1972) and Noble (1965) showed teacher mobility rates from 25-40 percent, with an average tenure for teachers ranging from 2.5-4.0 years. The disparity between the mobility rates of teachers in public schools and teachers in church schools raises the question, "Why?"

Any amount of faculty mobility is in itself of considerable consequence to those directly concerned with the school. To educational directors, it means a round of letters, applications, interviews, perhaps observation of candidates at work, and the final selection of new teachers. To the principals, it means additional responsibility for the adjustment of the newcomers to the school routine, extra supervision, and increased attention to problems of discipline. To the school boards, it means new personnel to work with and additional moving expenses. To the pupils, it means getting accustomed to a new personality and to different methods of instruction. To the parents, it means the necessity of acquainting the new teacher with the special needs of their children. This task of initiating new teachers becomes small or great exactly as the rate of mobility varies from a negligible amount to greater proportions.
If the causes for teacher mobility are unavoidable or socially desirable, the additional effort involved in each replacement may be regarded as either inevitable or justifiable. If, however, the mobility might well be reduced, it would be worth the extra time and effort needed to reduce it. A certain amount of friction attends the process of adjustment when new personnel replace outgoing personnel; moreover, general dissatisfaction is engendered throughout the school system by a high teacher mobility rate because the spirit of harmony is impaired. Consciously or unconsciously, the quality of work is lowered. Thus, mobility, especially that mobility which is avoidable, is doubly expensive (Elsbree, 1928; Van Zwoll, 1964).

That a sound program of Christian education has far-reaching, beneficial effects is part of the Seventh-day Adventist Church philosophy. Church members have given expression to their conviction by establishing church schools. School board members are selected from among the more respected members of the church. The idea, that well-educated and successful community members make effective board members, is supported by research (Whalen, 1954, p. 393; McCune, 1970, p. 30).

School board membership in the Seventh-day Adventist educational system is not an office to be taken lightly. The opportunities and responsibilities involved are tremendous. Adventist church members have placed heavy responsibility for the development of their most precious natural resource, their children, squarely upon the shoulders of their school boards (Davies, 1954, p. 1).
Statement of the Problem

Frequent teacher mobility in Canadian Seventh-day Adventist church schools has become an expensive problem. That a research project giving study to the mobility rates of teachers and principals was "pertinent to the Seventh-day Adventist program of Christian education in Canada" was expressed in a letter by M. S. Graham, associate director of education for the Canadian Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists (appendix B). In this research, therefore, an investigation has been made of the attitudes of teachers, principals, and school board members of the Seventh-day Adventist church schools in Canada regarding the reasons for mobility of teachers and principals. From their responses, elicited by a questionnaire, the following questions specifically have been studied:

1. Is there a relationship between the opinions of school board members and opinions of the faculty as to the reasons given for the mobility of principals?

2. Is there a relationship between the opinions of school board members and opinions of the faculty as to the reasons given for the mobility of teachers?

3. Is there a relationship between the opinions of school board members and opinions of the faculty as to efficient school board practices?

The answers to these questions may suggest the need to re-evaluate existing practices for hiring of teachers, and for the local conferences to re-examine their operational expectations of the local school board.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research has been to identify factors that cause high mobility of the teachers and principals in Seventh-day Adventist church schools of Canada by investigating the relationship of opinions between church school board members and the faculty as to: (1) reasons why principals move, (2) reasons why teachers move, and (3) efficient school board practices.

The investigation included a biographical survey of teachers, principals, and board members in Canadian Seventh-day Adventist church schools for the purpose of providing further information that may lead to the identification of intrinsic or other factors that affect teacher and principal mobility rates.

Importance of the Study

Any organization that has a high mobility rate of its personnel faces all sorts of problems and difficulties. In the educational system some examples might be problems due to lack of continuity in the areas of instructional methodology, curriculum development, and social interaction. Mobility of teachers can become a hindrance to the learning process. It is also economically expensive to schools which already have limited budgets. Can the importance of a study of teacher and principal mobility be overemphasized if it reveals the causes for mobility, and provides answers to the questions raised? Van Zwoll (1964) stated it this way:

In dealing with labor turnover virtually every reference on personnel administration or management takes the position that an unusually high turnover rate is symptomatic of something wrong, something to be uncovered and identified, and something to be remedied (p. 310).
Hypotheses and Criterion

Three hypotheses have been investigated in this study. They have been stated in the null form to facilitate statistical testing. These are:

1. There is no significant relationship between the mean responses of school board members and the mean responses of school faculty as to the thirteen designated reasons for the mobility of principals.

2. There is no significant relationship between the mean responses of school board members and the mean responses of school faculty as to the twelve designated reasons for the mobility of teachers.

3. There is no significant relationship between the mean responses of school board members and the mean responses of school faculty as to the fourteen proposed factors important to efficient school board operation.

The significance level of retention or rejection of the hypotheses is at .05 (α = .05).

Limitations of the Study

This study has been conducted within the framework of the following limitations:

1. The instrument prepared by the researcher naturally could contain statements that exhibit the researcher's bias.

2. Studies dependent upon mailed questionnaires have the limitations of inadequacy in conceptual communication. Mildred Parten (1950) reported:
Since the informant fills in the data on the questionnaire without the assistance of an investigator, he may misinterpret questions, omit essential items, or send in material which cannot be put in form for tabulations, thus making it necessary to discard many of the questionnaires (p. 95).

3. Studies dependent upon mailed questionnaires are subject to less than a one hundred percent return. The lack of a one hundred percent return and the resultant lack of information about those who failed to respond presents a further problem.

**Delimitations**

In order to collect pertinent data, this study was limited to forty-two of the sixty-four existing elementary and secondary Seventh-day Adventist non-boarding church schools in the Canadian provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia. These forty-two schools had an operation record of at least five consecutive years between 1970-78, and had similar education systems. Not included in this study (as a result of being atypical to the rest of Canada in their education systems) were: Quebec, with only one school taught in both French and English; Newfoundland, with a provincially-financed system; and Prince Edward Island, with no SDA schools.

Furthermore, this study was limited to only the opinions of school board members, teachers, and principals (of those schools) who responded to the researcher via the mailed questionnaire.

**Definitions of Terms**

For the purpose of this study the following terms are defined: *Agenda* refers to a list, plan, or outline of things to be
done, e.g., matters to be acted upon by the school board in its meetings.

Church school board as defined by the *SDA Encyclopedia* (1976) refers to:

The administrative body of an elementary or intermediate school operated by a church or group of churches. This body may be the church board or a separate school board elected by the church or a school committee of the church board appointed by the church board. Where two or more churches unite to operate a school, there is a union school board (p. 304).

*Education director,* formerly titled "education secretary," refers to the local or union conference official who is given responsibility for the general supervision of the educational work of the denomination in that conference. His duties include visiting and inspecting schools, suggesting plans, and devising means for the development of the educational work for the Seventh-day Adventist Church (*SDA Encyclopedia*, 1976, p. 416).

*Ex officio* refers to the status of the school board member who is automatically accorded membership by virtue of his office, or official position, e.g., the church pastor.

*Faculty* refers to the members of the teaching profession, including the principal, working in a school.

*General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists* refers to the SDA Church world headquarters (its central governing organization) located in Washington, D.C.

*Local conference* refers to the unit of Seventh-day Adventist church administration in which a number of local churches within a given area, such as a state or province, are associated for administrative purposes. The term is often used to refer to the adminis-
trative headquarters of the constituent churches. The education department of a local conference concerns itself with items pertaining to the church schools—teacher training, teaching procedures, and school inspection. It is also involved in school finances and the appointment of teachers "since most church school teachers are now paid directly by the conferences" (SDA Encyclopedia, pp. 345-346).

Mobility rate refers to the frequency of moves from school to school or place to place by teachers and principals.

Pastor refers to an "ordained or licensed minister assigned to a church or district" by the local conference committee, "and paid by the conference." The SDA Encyclopedia (1976) continued:

He is not considered a regular officer of that church, but he is the leader of the church and assists the officers in carrying out their duties. He has charge of his pulpit, is usually chairman of the church board, is an ex officio member of any committee, but directs his church by influence rather than by any authority vested in him (p. 1083).

Personality clash refers to the character traits, habits, or attitudes of a person that are in conflict with the characteristics of another person, e.g., a teacher in conflict with an associate in the school system.

Policy refers to "a definite course or method of action selected from among alternatives and in light of given conditions to guide and determine present and future decisions" (Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, 1965). Thus, church school policy would refer to the definite course of action adopted for the sake of expediency by the actions of the governing bodies of the church school.

Province refers to the political government administrative
divisions of the country of Canada. A local Seventh-day Adventist conference may be comprised of one or more provinces.

Seventh-day Adventist (Adventist, SDA) refers to the "official name of a specific Christian denomination with a specific body of doctrines" (SDA Encyclopedia, 1976, p. 1324). Worldwide in extent, evangelical in doctrine, and professing no creed but the Bible, it places strong emphasis on the second advent of Christ, which it believes is near, and it observes the Sabbath of the Bible, the seventh day of the week—Saturday.

Teachers refers to the principals as well as other faculty members who are teaching full-time for a period of 180 days or more in the educational system. An exception to this, however, was made in chapter 4 where it was desirable to compare school board members, teachers, and principals separately according to certain items examined in the questionnaire. The term, teachers, in the tables does not include principals.

"Educational personnel are encouraged to have not only a Baccalaureate degree but also graduate work. Teachers are expected to serve in the areas of their academic majors and minors" (SDA Encyclopedia, 1976, p. 1464).

Tenure refers to the length of service that a teacher gives to any particular school.

Union conference refers to the unit of Seventh-day Adventist church organization comprised of several local conferences. The term is often used to designate the administrative headquarters of the constituent conferences—e.g., Canadian Union Conference with its headquarters for the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Canada located
in Oshawa, Ontario. The Canadian Union Conference together with the union conferences of the United States comprise the North American Division of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

Organization of the Study

The researcher has divided this study into five chapters. Chapter 1 defines (a) the problem, its background, and significance; (b) purpose of the study, its limitations, and delimitations; and (c) organization of the research.

Chapter 2 reviews related literature and recent research pertaining to teacher mobility in the United States of America and in Canada.

Chapter 3 describes the research design: (a) the procedures, (b) methodology of research, (c) questions to be investigated, (d) the instrument developed, and (e) the collection and treatment of the data.

Chapter 4 contains the presentation and analysis of the data received (a) from the questionnaire, (b) from letters of information, and (c) from local conference files.

Chapter 5 is the reiteration of the purpose of the study, the procedures utilized in conducting this research in Canadian SDA schools, and the major findings of the study.

The Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations finalize this report. Copies of the supporting documents, letters, and the questionnaire are included in the appendixes.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

From the vast amount of literature available in the area selected for this study, it has been the researcher's intent to present material indicating general trends in the United States of America and Canada.

This chapter is divided into three main sections: (1) uniqueness of the education systems in the United States and Canada, including a brief history of the development of education in North America and of Seventh-day Adventist education in Canada; (2) mobility of teachers; and (3) school board practices.

In section two, "Mobility of Teachers," three sub-sections have been developed from the research of literature: (a) the teaching career—specifically, the variables influencing the flow of teachers into, within, and out of the school system; (b) the task of the teacher in the system; and (c) organizational behavior, involving individual and group issues, such as: conflict, job satisfaction, attitude consensus, and participation in decision making.

The third section of this chapter discusses the school board and is divided into three sub-sections from specific research in the areas of: (a) the American school board, and biographical characteristics of board members; (b) school board practices; and (c) the effectiveness of school boards.
The discussion of board practices, mobility rates and the research related to the study presented here have been used in the final analysis to verify the findings and to arrive at conclusions.

Uniqueness of the Education Systems in
The United States and Canada

In scanning educational antecedents to the 1970s, a look at the Colonial Period in North America is important, in that this particular period reflected the goal for education which had emerged after the Renaissance in Europe. Amongst the colonies in North America, each of the dominant churches claimed exclusive domain over truth. The goals of education were clearly set by the church. Little reason for science was evident in those goals. Heald and Moore (1968) continued:

In New England, the theocracy of the day gave rise to laws which facilitated the emergence of schools with the avowed intent to enable man to read—read the Scriptures—so that he would not fall into Satan's grasp (p. 19).

Patterns of education in Canada have evolved from what was being done in England, continental Europe, and the United States during the first half of the nineteenth century. Phillips (1957) mentioned both the English and American influences when writing on the topic of religious education, though what he says applies to nearly all areas of Canadian education.

In nearly every aspect of education, the Canadian position is between that of England and that of the United States. Denominational schools and religious instruction within the public school system are found everywhere in England, in some parts of Canada, and virtually nowhere in the United States (p. 301).

The twentieth century has challenged the parochial domain of the educational system. Cheal (1962), in a study dealing with reli-
gion and its effect on public schools, cited Newfoundland as an example where government financial support for non-public schools has resulted in an overlap and fragmentation of both public and non-public schools. This has encouraged small schools and limited offerings within the schools.

The Educational Policies Commission in 1936, summarized the objectives of American education as the "accomplishment of self-realization, human relationships, economic efficiency, and civic responsibility." The Commission conceded that no single school could hope to accomplish all the goals any more than any single student might be expected to attain full enlightenment. The school clearly has to engage in some choice-making. The Commission cited the free man as one having "a rational grasp of himself, his surroundings, and the relationship between them." It further stated that "the purpose which runs through and strengthens all other educational purposes—the common thread of education—is the development of the ability to think (and, hence, to choose)." The Commission's "Ten Imperative Needs of Youth," formerly applying only to the secondary schools, now include the system of public education in general. The "Ten Imperative Needs of Youth" are as follow (American Association of School Administrators, 1966):

1. All youth need to develop saleable skills and those understandings and attitudes that make the worker an intelligent and productive participant in economic life. To this end most youth need supervised work experience as well as education in the skills and knowledge of their occupation.
2. All youth need to develop and maintain good health and physical fitness.
3. All youth need to understand the rights and duties of the citizens of a democratic society, and to be diligent and competent in the performance of their obligations as members of the community and citizens of the state and nation.
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4. All youth need to understand the significance of the family for the individual and society and the conditions conducive to successful family life.

5. All youth need to know how to purchase and use goods and services intelligently, understanding both the values received by the consumer and the economic consequences of their acts.

6. All youth need opportunities to develop their capacities to appreciate beauty in literature, art, music, and nature.

7. All youth need to understand the method of science, the influence of science on human life, and the main scientific facts concerning the nature of the world and of man.

8. All youth need to be able to use their leisure time well and to budget it wisely, balancing activities that yield satisfactions to the individual with those that are socially useful.

9. All youth need to develop respect for other persons, to grow in their insight into ethical values and principles and to be able to live and work cooperatively with others.

10. All youth need to grow in their ability to think rationally, to express their thoughts clearly, and to read and listen with understanding.

The tremendous complex of ideas, organizations, and purposes which characterize American schools appears to be almost imponderable. What can one learn from their similarities? How can one grapple with their diversity? How can the imponderable (incapable of being weighed or evaluated with exactness) be reduced to a size small enough to study?

Diversity within the education system

Unlike countries possessing central ministries of education, the United States of America and Canada operate state/provincial public school systems. The different school districts follow various organizational patterns. Consider, for example, grade level organization. Districts advertise K-12; 6-3-3; K-8, 9-12; K-6-6; K-8, 9-13; and so on, in the two countries.

Schools differ in purpose. There are schools devoted to training youth to enter various trades; others are concerned with
preparing young persons for college and university experience; and still others accept a terminal, general education as their fundamental "raison d'etre" (Heald and Moore, 1968, p. 4).

Heald and Moore (1968) discussed diversity in the manner in which schools are financially supported. In some states, large proportions of local educational costs are borne by the state treasury through their allocations to local districts. At the other extreme are local districts in some states which receive little, if any, support from the state level.

Hillier (1971) explained the Canadian plan for financing education as follows:

The School Foundation Plan is a program in which the Municipality and the Province pay an equal sum to the Foundation based on an equalized assessment established by the province. The community funds are raised from local taxation and the province pays into the fund from its general revenues. Funds are then disbursed to schools on the basis of such criteria as: number of teachers, enrolment, transportation, vocational classes, etc. If more funds are needed in a community, additional taxes are levied in that community (p. 163).

Certainly no uniformity exists among schools with regard to the student. Students in a reservation school are different from those in a large city slum area. Rural students are different from those in the plush suburbia. Likewise, midwestern farm communities have student bodies which differ significantly from those found in western cities.

Schools are also different in terms of community expectations which vary according to the community educational, social, and economic level. Within even similar kinds of communities, there is variance in parental aspiration and in the reality of expectations which parents hold for their schools.
Similarity within the education system

The study of public education in North America is not entirely thwarted by unending diversity. Public schools do have some degree of similarity worthy of notice. To varying extents, all public schools in the United States and Canada commit themselves to a program of free public education. It is, of course, true that education at any level is not purely free. Nevertheless, the obligation of all citizens to finance the education of all students is a clearly defined doctrine stemming from the belief that all of society profits from an educated populace (The World Book Encyclopedia, 1972).

State and provincial laws require school attendance of children up to a specified age or completion of certain graduation requirements. In the United States, "the legislature and department of education of each state establish regulations concerning attendance, buildings, curricula, and teachers' qualifications" (The World Book Encyclopedia, 1972), while in Canada (at least in the provinces of Alberta and Ontario) "courses of study, curricular structure and change, teacher education, and attendance are under the direction of the Minister of Education of each province" (Hillier, 1971, p. 158).

The United States Constitution provides for the separation of church and state. Private schools and church schools do not receive tax funds for their direct support. While the issue of religion in the public schools has not been fully satisfied, some communities take advantage of the Elementary and Secondary Education
Act of 1965, which "provided funds for shared-time programs". Under this program "private and parochial school children are allowed to attend a public school for part of the day" (The World Book Encyclopedia, 1972).

Areas of similarity within the systems of education in North America as indicated by the literature selected for this study were: (1) the financing of schools from taxes, (2) the political representative body governing educational affairs, (3) compulsory health services being rendered by the local health units, (4) a similar curriculum, and (5) expression of similar professional needs of school personnel. The need for professional staff, the requests for new and better materials, and the search for more effective educational methods are indicative of the desires of teachers and administrators to upgrade their professional stature, and to improve the professional posture of their schools.

The various states, in delegating authority to the boards of education of local school districts, instituted a concept of education which has proven to have a unique power. The local operation and control of schools has created similarity and diversity among the local schools. Out of the local systems has come an educational product which reflects similarity and diversity according to the source (Heald and Moore, 1968).

Seventh-day Adventist education in Canada

Commenting on SDA schools, the SDA Encyclopedia (1976) stated that the "denomination maintains a church-related system of education embracing schools of all levels"—kindergarten through university.
The SDA Encyclopedia (1976) gave a historical sketch of SDA education:

From 1853 to 1872 in various parts of the United States church-oriented elementary schools were conducted by individual families, groups of families, or local SDA churches. The first official church school (elementary) was established in Battle Creek, Michigan, in 1872; the first college at that place in 1874; and the first secondary school (academy), at Healdsburg, California (followed closely by another, at South Lancaster, Massachusetts), in 1882.

The growth in educational facilities was slow until the 1890's. During that decade 5 colleges, many academies, and more than 200 elementary schools were established in the United States. This same period witnessed new Adventist schools in Canada, England, Australia, Switzerland, Sweden, Germany, Africa, Argentina, Denmark, and Brazil (p. 1296).

The first church school in Canada was opened at South Stukely, Quebec, in 1884, with an enrollment of twenty-five students. Ten years later, in 1894, the first secondary school, the Fitch Bay High School, was opened, also in the eastern township of Quebec. Enrollment at this school was substantial, often including many who were not Seventh-day Adventists. A few of the students were of the Catholic faith, a rather unusual circumstance in the province of Quebec (Smart, 1954).

An early church leader in establishing Christian education had written in the 1800's (White, 1948):

The great object of education is to enable us to use the powers which God has given us in such a manner as will best represent the religion of the Bible and promote the Glory of God (3:160).

In the centennial year of SDA education, Hirsch (1972) wrote:

"In the USA and Canada practically every state and province can attest to at least one church school (p. 343).

The Canadian Union Conference in 1972, the centennial year of SDA education, reported a cumulative enrollment of 3,000 students in
its "49 elementary schools and junior academies, two day academies, two boarding academies, two colleges, . . . with a staff of 300 to care for this growing educational enterprise," and the report said:

To meet the capital and operating costs of the various schools and colleges, church leaders at various levels demonstrate their faith in Christian education by appropriating nearly one and a half million dollars every year (p. 344).

The SDA Encyclopedia (1976) commented:

The SDA denomination from its very beginning has been a staunch advocate of church-state separation, holding that the distinction between church and state is clearly drawn in the New Testament: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's" (Mt.22:21) (p. 293).

Regarding church schools and the state, the SDA Encyclopedia (1976) further stated:

Perhaps the greatest area of concern in church state relations in the United States is in education. As the number of students has multiplied, as the cost of education has increased, church-affiliated institutions have found it increasingly difficult to support their schools. When government funds became available, the temptation was great for the church to accept them.

The argument against the use of government funds for a church-controlled school is twofold:

1. These government funds, received through the taxing power of the state, would be used to teach religious doctrines in which many of the taxpayers do not believe.
2. Control usually follows subsidy. If the church school accepted state money it would sooner or later have to accept an unwarranted degree of government control.

. . . Parents who refuse the education public schools offer their children and patronize a religious school, in the United States at least, should assume the responsibility of financing that religious-oriented education.

Therefore, to protect religious freedom the SDA Church opposes the use of government funds to teach religion. The official action of the General Conference regarding state aid to Adventist schools reads:

"WHEREAS, The Seventh-day Adventist Church in the United States is in full accord with the principles of the separation of church and state as set forth in the Federal Constitution, and has through the years supported this principle:
"We recommend, That in the United States the denominational policy for our schools of all grades shall be to refrain from accepting gifts of money, land, buildings, or equipment from government; or grants from public tax money for the salaries of teachers; or the maintenance, operation, or support of the services which the schools supply.

"This shall not be construed to prejudice the acceptance of the regular functions of the Public Health Department, such as public health nurses' services, vaccinations, inoculations, or tuberculosis surveys; nor shall it forbid the acquisition, for a consideration, of war surplus" (Actions of the Autumn Council of the General Conference Committee, 1949, p. 26). . . .

Regarding the application of the principle of church-state separation in other countries the General Conference Executive Committee in the Autumn Council of 1948 recommended:

"That we reaffirm our belief that this fundamental principle of the separation of church and state should be worldwide in application; recognizing, however, that the applying of certain details of the principle may be different in different parts of the world due to varied forms of government.

"That in view of these considerations, it must, therefore be left to the discretion of Division Committees to determine just how this principle shall be applied in their respective fields; but maintaining that in any overlapping of activities, the state should not enter the spiritual realm of the church, nor the church the civil rights of the state" (Actions of the Autumn Council of the General Conference Committee, 1948, p. 14).

Thus, though there may be differences in application, the basic SDA doctrine is the same around the globe: The church member is a loyal citizen, rendering to his government "the things that are Caesar's" and he is equally a loyal follower of Christ, rendering to his Maker "the things that are God's." The church asks religious liberty for its members and for all others. It regards its function as that of calling men to their duty toward God and man and to their privileges as sons of God—not as that of gaining preferred position or material advantage from the state (pp. 293-295).

Of the ten provinces in Canada, a study by Chalmers (1967, p. 321) indicated that half of them accepted the plan that denominational schools may be tax supported. Evidently the laws of the province of Quebec permitted the issuing of financial grants to voluntarists (the Canadian term referring to those who oppose any relationship, particularly financial, between church and state)
because the Fitch Bay High School was the recipient of such govern­ment grants (Smart, 1954).

Smart (1954) gave a second instance of state support of Seventh-day Adventist education, in Newfoundland. This province has an educational system unlike that of other provinces. There is no public educational system. Financial aid is granted to the denom­inational schools on a per capita basis. In effect, the government is saying to the churches, "You provide the school plant and we will pay the teachers."

Collins (1958) stated:

The right of the provincial government to sovereign power in education was incorporated in the British North America Act of 1867. With the exception of Quebec and Newfoundland, all other provinces in Canada have adopted the system of education which was developed in Ontario. In all of these provinces the administration and supervision of the regula­tions are implemented by a corps of provincially-appointed superintendents or inspectors (pp. 152-157).

The Canadian philosophy of education as it concerns religious minorities is expressed in the British North America Act, the written Canadian Constitution, where provision is made for the inclusion of separate schools as a part of the public system of education (Hillier, 1971, p. 179).

**Mobility of Teachers**

Van Zwoll (1964), speaking of the United States, said:

By comparison with an annual labor turnover of about 4 per cent in manufacturing, the annual turnover of teachers at a rate of 10 to 15 per cent and often ranging from 15 to 25 per cent shows up as a matter of grave concern for edu­cation. Any preventable turnover in which needed and com­petent personnel are lost to the schools is too great a turnover regardless of what the rate is. . . .

Reasons for turnover fall into two major categories, the unavoidable and the unnecessary. The unavoidable leave no
alternatives of identifying causes and changing working conditions to make them conducive to retaining competent personnel for continued school service.

Tenure and job stability serve together to further the cause of education and the effectiveness of the instructional activity to the extent that they retain in school all competent personnel, professional and nonprofessional (p. 316).

Van Zwoll (1964) emphasized the importance of morale (how an employee feels about his job, his fellow employees, and the school system in which he works) as "the most important single factor in getting the best that a school employee has to offer" (p. 172) and he explained:

If morale is to be high, it is imperative that the employee feels appreciated, is recognized, shares in the planning by which he will be affected, and is made to feel that others within the school system, parents, and adults in the community, and pupils in the schools place appropriate value on his job as contributing to the functioning of the important social institution, the school (p. 180).

Despite the fact that "monetary reward is frequently several items down the list of factors of primary significance to the worker," Van Zwoll (1964, p. 177) stated that "pay did obtrude itself as a major consideration for high morale." Van Zwoll (1964) explained:

There really is no question about the importance of pay. Up to the point of subsistence, pay may be even more important to the individual than the job itself; and, if pay is insufficient to provide a living, all but the independently wealthy worker may be expected to give up the work of his choice for something more remunerative.

Beyond the subsistence level pay becomes relatively and progressively less important. However, the fact that social status in the United States is largely accorded on an economic basis tends to adduce to pay a significance that may not be ignored. Thus, when pay is at a low level there is the likelihood that the work and the worker will be held in correspondingly low regard.

Lack of individual status and social prestige because of the economic standing of school employees could easily have demoralizing side effects upon the entire education enterprise (pp. 177-178).
Recognition, besides being "an expression of democratic leadership" is an important factor toward providing motivation and incentive," Van Zwoll (1964) indicated and he commented further:

The worker who has performed well and conscientiously gets a lift from recognition in whatever sincere form it is conferred. It may be that all that is called for is a nod, a smile, or a word of appreciation. Or, the recognition may in instances require formal action in the way of an award or assignment to a position of increased responsibility. 

The real reason for providing recognition is that it contributes to the self-esteem of the individual as he gets deserved personal attention in a big operation in which individuals are easily lost. It re-emphasizes the importance of the job. And, it gets credit to the school and the individual worker who is on the educational firing line where the real job influencing child behavior takes place. Earned recognition will do much for how an employee feels about his job, his associates, and the school system (p. 176).

Statistics Canada (1977, pp. 15-16) reported that public school elementary and secondary teachers in Canada in 1970-71 had a national mobility rate of 15 percent compared with 11 percent in 1975-76. The kernel of the whole mobility problem of teachers lies in the relative importance of the causes of teacher withdrawal. In general, the causes are known: marriage, illness, death, retirement, maternity, job transferral of spouse, dismissal, or home conditions, but few know the proportions of the mobility in their own local school due to each of these causes.

In a memo (appendix B) Graham in 1977, explained some reasons for the mobility rate of teachers in Canadian SDA schools:

1. Rapidly expanding education programs have contributed to added teacher mobility and turnover from the fact that, percentage wise, considerable numbers of new teachers have been added from year to year and appear as one-year teachers. At the same time, longer term teachers have been called to start some new schools and to serve the needs of expanding programs in existing schools.
2. Several conferences are attempting to upgrade teaching staff by hiring teachers who are more professionally qualified in order to meet the demands of education programs today.

3. Teachers also sometimes prefer relocation to areas where their own children can have opportunity to continue their education on the secondary and/or college level.

4. Considerable interest is shown in Canadian teachers in respect to teacher appointments to the mission field.

5. The cost of living, especially housing costs, sometimes plays a role in teachers seeking relocation.

6. Until recently, the stabilizing influence of full-time education superintendents and secretaries, specific Canada-wide and conference level Education Code books, specific employment policies, and policies to encourage teachers' professional growth and long-term residency at a particular school have not been fully appreciated.

Statistics Canada (1977, pp. 15-17) reported that the national recruitment rate of public school elementary and secondary teachers in 1975-76 was 12 percent, having changed from 19 percent in 1965-66 and 17 percent in 1970-71. The report went on to say that the lowered rates of mobility and recruitment "reduced considerably the opportunity for qualified teachers to either re-enter the profession or to enter it for the first time," and that the reason for the lowered rates "may well reflect the concern of practicing teachers for reemployment should they leave the profession at this time." To determine recruitment rates, Statistics Canada explained that new hirings and interprovincial and international transfers were "aggregated and compared to the number of teachers in the previous year." And Statistics Canada (1977) continued:

While recruitment rates are important indicators of the nature of movement in the teaching force, the actual numbers are of equal importance. . . .

While the number of teachers recruited has declined over the past few years, the sources have remained in the same order; namely, universities and teacher colleges, other occupations or duties such as household responsibilities and another province or country. However, the proportions have changed. In 1965-66, for example, 62% came from universities
or other post-secondary institutions, 11% came from another province or country and the remaining 27% came from other occupations or duties (pp. 15—17).

Regarding the experience of teachers, Statistics Canada (1977) reported:

The median teaching experience for all staff in the 1975-76 school year was 8.0 years (up .3 years from 1974-75). However, there was considerable interprovincial variation in the median teaching experience, ranging from 6.0 years in Northwest Territories to 9.0 years in Saskatchewan and New Brunswick.

In 1975-76, the median teaching experience for all elementary teachers was 7.6 years (7.0 for males and 8.0 for females), unchanged from 1974-75. At the secondary level the median teaching experience was 8.0 years (9.0 for men and 6.0 for women).

Over the past two years, teaching staff have tended to remain with the employing board of the previous year. Median experience of this type (tenure) was 4.6 years in 1974-75 (4.0 at the elementary level and 5.0 at the secondary level). In the following year median tenure reached 5.0 years overall, increasing to 5.0 at the elementary level and remaining at 5.0 at the secondary level. Average tenure also increased over the period from 6.2 to 6.5 years at the elementary level and from 6.4 to 6.6 years at the secondary level.

The major cause of the recent increase in tenure is the declining rate of interboard transfers, a drop from 4.6% in 1974-75 to 4.1% in 1975-76 (pp. 26-27).

Thus, mobility of elementary and secondary teachers in the Canadian public schools has declined as tenure has increased.

The teaching career

Why do people enter teaching? How are teachers motivated? What are the characteristics of the people who make up the teaching profession? Heald and Moore (1968) attempted to describe the "average teacher":

1. The average teacher does not want to be a teacher! Fifty-one percent of beginning teachers in a large nationwide sample did not expect to be in the profession five years later—65 percent for women, 26 percent for men. With the men, 51 percent expected to be out of the classroom and into administrative
or supervisory activities. The majority of persons entering the teaching profession must contend with such an attitude.

2. Persons entering teaching are psychologically different from persons entering other professions. Some of the characteristics teachers exhibited were:
   a) more cognitive organization
   b) more self-depreciation and devaluation
   c) more close, friendly relationships
   d) more deference to perceived superiors
   e) more love and protection of others
   f) more concern for detail, neatness, and arrangements
   g) more dependence upon others for love, protection, and assistance
   h) more intense emotional expression
   i) more preoccupation with self
   j) less need to analyze, discuss, or reflect on social objects
   k) less objectivity and more reliance upon perceptions and beliefs
   l) less analytic and problem-solving needs
   m) less assertive behavior with others
   n) less spontaneous, impetuous behavior
   o) less willingness to gamble or take risks (p. 142).

The psychological makeup of teachers varies between the sexes. Gillis (1964, pp. 589-600) reported that male teachers exhibit:

(1) more need to achieve, (2) more need to overcome failure and humiliation, (3) more need for personal power, (4) more aggression and hostility, (5) more desire to manipulate others, (6) more attention-seeking behavior, and (7) less willingness to gamble. Female teachers exhibit: (1) more need to abase and self-criticize, (2) more need to be friendly and have friends, (3) more denial of hostility, (4) more willingness to submit to superiors, (5) more need to love and be loved, and (6) more intense emotional expression (Gillis, 1964, pp. 589-600).

The psychological makeup of teachers varies according to the grade or subject preference of the teacher. Garrison (1961) found:

Women who elected general secondary courses manifested significantly greater need for achievement than did prospective teachers of lower elementary, upper elementary,
and non general (business education, music, art, physical education) secondary education. Prospective women teachers of special education also showed a greater need for achievement than did lower elementary teachers (pp. 955-964).

Lower elementary teachers exhibited a greater need for nurturance than any group except special education teachers. Heald and Moore (1968) reported that the teacher dependent needs are such that when the opportunity arises, "they make a bee-line for mother and the safety of home" (p. 144).

In a sampling of Michigan teachers by Soriano (1965, p. 27), it was found that teachers took their first job only 25 median miles from home and their current job was an average of 16 miles from home. In terms of grade level, the secondary teachers started 50 miles away and moved closer; whereas, the elementary teachers started ten miles away and then moved closer. Teachers from the farm and the very large cities were more prone to head for home than those from medium-sized towns.

More amazing was the study of the true "homers." Fifteen percent actually started in their home towns, and enough teachers joined them to bring the total to 26 percent who were actually teaching in their home town. In addition, those who got to their home town stayed there (88 percent). Only 17 percent of the teachers who started outside their home town stayed out (Heald and Moore, 1968, p. 144).

A study by Noble (1964), who surveyed the tenure of principals in SDA day and boarding academies in the United States and Canada (the North American Division), found that the average tenure of a boarding academy principal was 3.78 years. The total average
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tenure of academy principals was 3.50 years. Noble also found that there is a trend toward principals giving longer service, and that western academies tend to hold their principals longer than academies in other areas.

The task of the teacher within the system

Van Zwoll (1964) mentioned the demands that society makes upon teachers whether in administration, supervision, or the classroom:

As teachers, school personnel have an even greater responsibility for broad interests and keeping up with the times than are imposed upon all adults in terms of their citizenship. The nature of the school and the implications of their tasks add to the demands already made upon teaching personnel, for their initial and further training, the challenge to expand their interests and to become well informed (p. 32).

The teacher's primary task is that of environmental manipulation, according to Heald and Moore (1968, p. 149). This task is not only primary but also critical because the teacher has, in a sense, a captive audience. The teacher can do little to arrange the disposition of student components in the system. The student comes as he is; each brings with him his unique experiential background.

The teacher cannot assure that learning will take place. The best that can be done is to provide appropriate incentive for learning. Certain incentives are provided by the system for all students; whereas, other incentives are provided in individual classrooms or for individual students within the classroom of the teacher. Motivation, on the other hand, is an internal or intrinsic element in learning. It enters the learning situation only as the individual learner.
chooses to invoke it. It is not, then, one of the tasks of the teacher to motivate students—students must motivate themselves (Heald and Moore, 1968, p. 149).

The teacher and the system are challenged with the task of making clear to the community the goals and best motives of the educational system. In a community where the teacher is viewed as a person prudently engaged in a desirable venture, the system will often enjoy strong community support; but when a teacher is engaged in behavior which is divergent from the desires of the community, pressure for change or nonsupport may be invoked by the community (Heald and Moore, 1968, p. 159).

**Organizational behavior**

Hines (1958, pp. 37-40) stated that it is common knowledge that thousands of teachers leave teaching each year. A survey of a class from the University of Illinois College of Education showed that 30 percent of the teachers quit after teaching two years (Meryman, 1962, pp. 104-114). Nelson and Thompson (1963, pp. 467-472) reported that each year the turnover of teachers exceeds 10 percent of the total profession.

Stone (1970, pp. 33-36), who surveyed 298 teachers to obtain reasons for teachers leaving the profession, discovered that the teachers indicated ten significant factors. These follow in the order of greatest dissatisfaction to least dissatisfaction: (1) workload too heavy and lack of time, (2) salary, (3) lack of dedication or commitment, (4) marriage and family responsibilities, (5) other jobs or positions more favorable, (6) lack of support by parents of
students, (7) lack of support by school boards, (8) criticism by patrons, (9) job transfer of spouse, and (10) frustration or nervous exhaustion.

Bristow (1974, pp. 14-15) in a study of teachers' attitudes toward job satisfaction in the Indiana Conference found that teachers felt dissatisfied with the school boards. Teachers indicated that they felt the boards were not promoting effective education because old policies had not been updated.

Hackett (1970, p. 12) described education in the Seventh-day Adventist school system as a very complicated process. Competent teaching methods, more sophisticated equipment and buildings, and keeping up to modern ideas, Hackett felt, must characterize the church school system.

Hirsch (1977) agreed that "the concept of a K-12 program, along with the idea that the church was in need of a system of education" was something that had been proclaimed by Seventh-day Adventist educators for several decades" (p. 10). Hirsch reported that "the organizational model and its working policy for the new Board of Education, K-12, were finally approved by the Annual Council in 1976" (p. 11). Hirsch explained:

Elementary education, to some degree, had been subsidized on a systematic basis by conferences, but no equitable plan of support had been adopted for secondary schools. With the total student costs for boarding academies almost equaling costs for attending college, there has been fear that our schools might be pricing themselves out of the market. The prevailing practice of operating many of these schools without approved budgets at the beginning of each school year had to be curtailed. Such a practice was detrimental to the conference and to the school administration, and was bad business practice. Thus financially, this was one direction to which a new board had to address itself.
Organizationally there is to be a Board of Education, K-12, on each level—division, union, and conference. These boards will have final authority in all matters pertaining to the operation of schools, K-12, such as curriculum planning and upgrading of schools. However, any items that will require special financing or new subsidies will have to go to the respective conference committees for approval.

This new structure centralizes broad administrative functions in the conference superintendent of schools. . . . Secondary-school principals, too, will have to adapt to their new roles and responsibilities (pp. 10-11).

Some reasons given by Adventist teachers leaving the profession were summarized by Noble (1964):

1. Need to increase teachers' salaries to make them on an equal basis with ministers' salaries.
2. Teachers must not be classified as second-rate citizens by the constituency but as professionally trained persons.
3. Teachers need to have time for mental exercise above the level of the children.
4. Lack of harmony sometimes exists between the faculty and the administrators.
5. Teachers desire better communication with the school board.
6. Teachers desire freedom and independence from the growing demands of the community.
7. Lack of school space and sophisticated school equipment.

The most significant different reasons for the transfer of teachers in the SDA schools (than for teachers in public schools) were reported by Hehling (1972). Three reasons were first on the list: excessive expectations of the church, lack of support or cooperation of the school board and parents, and inadequate teaching supplies. Next on the list were: pupil behavior problems and pupils'
negative attitudes toward learning. Lack of expressed appreciation from the school board followed. In many cases, the school board did not realize the needs or problems of the teacher. Hehling suggested that some of the teachers should be invited to attend school board meetings and be able to present some of the needs, as well as the problems. Possibly, there would be a better understanding between the two groups and proper actions could be taken.

Van Zwoll (1964) gave a comprehensive summary of factors that affect the effectiveness of school personnel when he stated:

At this time there is agreement among those who have made a study of personnel administration that such factors as worry, ill health, poor working conditions, personal problems that intrude themselves on the job, low pay, lack of a voice in policy determination, injustice, insecurity, failure to realize in his work one's objectives for himself, a feeling of being like just one more ant in an anthill, and lack of sufficient motivation can singly or in some combination contribute to inefficiency on the job.

The obvious antidote to inefficiency is to identify its causes and to offset them in order to secure the desired outcomes most effectively. It becomes apparent that to look after the welfare of the individual and to give him the recognition that he needs is not merely nice, humanitarian, or even democratic; it is also good business because of the increased instructional output which is the immediate dividend paid upon the capital investment of a practically based personnel policy and its administration (pp. 10-11).

Van Zwoll (1964) listed the basic principles of personnel administration in twelve statements that follow:

1. Education is the primary purpose of the schools. The good will and cooperation of all school employees must be secured if the optimum education is to take place. Such good will and cooperation are the byproducts of employment in which working is a gratifying social experience as well as a means for making a livelihood.

2. The objectives of the schools are functionally driven from the people who have created them as institutions to meet those needs that they want fulfilled through formal education. Personnel policies must therefore be consistent
with all other policies governing the operation of the educative enterprise in accord with its objectives.

3. The people who have instituted the schools and all employees within the school system have the same basic interest. This interest is the provision of the best education possible, consistent with the clearness of the people's mandate in this regard and the means made available for doing the job.

4. Maximum effectiveness of the means for achieving the people's mandates regarding education requires the best possible selection and coordination of all elements comprising those means. The means are comprised of school employees, plant, and supplies. It is the job of personnel administration to assure the optimum in the selection, assignment in terms of job, physical placement, and equipment of personnel.

5. School employees are not commodities. In the sale of a commodity the seller is divorced in the process from the product sold. Personal services remain integral to the seller, who is termed an employee. Thus all the personal considerations of the employee are part of the problem of personnel administration to the extent that they have implications for the work he does.

6. Employees have a private life and a right to the privacy of their own affairs. Invasion of this privacy, no matter how well-intentioned, can be an exasperating irritant which does harm rather than good. It is necessary to tread cautiously in the personal matters of employees even though they may seem to have implications for worker effectiveness. It is virtually impossible to help a worker who is unwilling to confide and to receive aid.

7. The human factor is a variable. The variability is potentially an asset. It is also the cause for many of the most complex and perplexing problems in personnel administration. Temptations to make concessions to the administrative expediency of promoting conformity must be shunned in favor of recognizing and promoting the unique individuality and consequent possible personal development of each within the school system.

8. The most important single factor in getting the best that a school employee has to offer is how he feels about his work, his associates on the job, and the school system in which he is employed. Without negating in any degree the importance of other factors, this emotional factor nevertheless stands out in bold relief. It has implications for assuring appreciation of, recognition for, and a share in the planning by each employee. Everyone has the need to regard his work as worthwhile and to take pride in it if he is to work at his best.

9. Esteem for the intelligence and potential of the employee group is a basic necessity and may be demonstrated by the employer group through acts of confidence. Among such acts are the provision for a continuous flow of signifi-
cant information, open lines of communication, and the joint employer-employee deliberation by which a sound working basis of understanding and mutual confidence is established.

10. Employee problems have to be dealt with in terms of the situation or the conditions at hand. At the same time the continued study of the causes of personnel problems will provide, in instances, a clue to the circumstances under which some problems may be avoided or solved. The flexibility of approach, the collection and appraisal of data, and the development and application of the necessary measures to make more readily attainable the objectives of the schools as instituted are the essence of the personnel activity.

11. All participants in an enterprise are entitled to fair dealing. Unfairness and the appearance of injustice are causes of rankling resentment which is a threat to worker effectiveness. Fairness has implications for monetary rewards, work load, the working period, various conditions that are concomitant or auxiliary to the job, and virtually every other element making up the total working situation.

12. The relationships among employees and between them and their employers can to a large extent be summed up. This summing up should be expressed in written policy. Written policy is a means for assuring consistency, promoting a feeling of security, and avoiding pitfalls of expediency (pp. 5-6).

The School Board

The National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools (1954) stressed the importance of the American school board:

The local school board is a uniquely American institution. For three centuries it has grown with the country. Today it is a living demonstration of grassroots democracy. Visitors from abroad are impressed by the role it plays in every community, and often amazed that so few Americans show appreciation for it (p. 3).

Biographical characteristics of board members

Many research studies have been conducted through the years with respect to school boards and their practices, but few have been undertaken with respect to comparison of public and parochial board
activity. Most research has classified board members in relation to age, sex, occupation, education level, tenure, social status, responsibility, and the specific powers allotted to them.

McCune (1970, pp. 132-133) reported his findings of the social composition of the private and parochial school board members in California as follows:

1. Eighty-one percent of the respondents were males.
2. Sixty-one percent indicated having received most of their formal education in a private or parochial school system.
3. Eighty-four percent of the board members had at least one of their children enrolled in a private or parochial school; 26 percent had three or more children enrolled in such schools.
4. The median age of the board members was fifty years.
5. The median term of school board service was eight years.
6. Ninety-six percent of the respondents reported being of the white race.
7. Eighty-nine percent indicated a Protestant religious preference.
8. Forty-seven percent estimated the value of their homes to be more than $35,000; 36 percent said their homes were from $25,000 to $35,000 in value.
9. Seventy-eight percent received over $10,000 annual income; 30 percent reported an income of over $35,000 annually.
10. Ninety-nine percent of the board members received no salary or "honorarium" in return for their services as school board members.
11. Sixty-nine percent did not belong to any professional educational organization; 6 percent had joined local, state, or national school board associations.
The fact that 86 percent of the board members studied by McCune (1970) were engaged in professional, managerial, or proprietary occupations, and 15 percent were in "non-managerial occupations which included housewives, white and blue collar workers, and farmers" prompted McCune to conclude:

This evidence clearly supports the literature which indicates that the professional-managerial element of society is dominant in controlling the American school system. Apparently the private and parochial school system in California is leaning even more heavily on this influential portion of their constituency than does the public segment of secondary education (p. 66).

McCune (1970) also reported that 93 percent of the board members he sampled "had completed some college work" (61 percent of these had done graduate work past the baccalaureate level). Previous studies indicated "that school board members clearly constitute a much higher educational level than the population at large" (p. 69).

Albert (1959), in a study of the board members of large cities in the United States, reported that 18 percent of the board members were women. Dejnoska (1963), in a study in New York State to ascertain whether men or women board members were the strongest school supporters, found that the women were significantly more supportive. Despite the fact that only 14 percent of the board members were women, Dejnoska wondered if perhaps the women had higher scores because of having been closer to the schools, or having more time to devote to school matters, they were better informed.

Whalen (1954) reported that women constituted about 15 percent of the school board membership of the boards he studied. Other findings by Whalen were that the average age of board members was between forty-six and forty-eight; average income was comparatively
high in comparison with other citizens of their communities; and scholastic training averaged fifteen years.

Statistics Canada (1977, p. 7) reported that 57 percent of the Canadian public elementary teaching staff and 87 percent of the secondary teaching staff in 1975-76 indicated that they had at least one university degree (these figures excluded Ontario).

**School board practices**

In summarizing his review of literature on school boards, McCune (1970) stated:

Policy making and the determination of educational objectives were listed as the basic function of the school boards. Wide disagreement was evident in regard to the relative importance of board responsibilities but all agreed that the board must concern itself mainly with policy making, planning, and evaluation while leaving the actual operation of the school to professional administrators.

Private school systems have considerably more difficulty in establishing clear-cut lines of authority between policy making and actual operation, but recent developments seem to indicate more lay board involvement in this sector of American education (pp. 56-57).

McCune (1970) indicated that the private and parochial school board members apparently saw "their role as needing to become more involved with school practice and operation." This was "in contrast to the major policy making, financing, and evaluation roles in which they are currently basically responsible" (p. 110).

The American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association (1955) stated:

It is important for board members and superintendents to keep their separate functions clearly in mind. It is equally important that they work together in complete harmony and good will. It is sometimes useful to have differing points of view. Unanimity is essential upon only one point—that the educational welfare of children, youth, and
adults who are served by the school shall be the chief yardstick for measuring policy (p. 10).

Morphet (1974) listed the most important "powers" of the board of education as follows:

1. The selection of a chief administrator, the superintendent of schools;
2. The establishment of policies and procedures in accord with which the educational services are administered and a range of programs are developed;
3. The establishment of policies relating to planning improvements and to accountability;
4. The adoption of the budget and the enactment of provisions for the financing of the schools;
5. The acquisition and development of necessary property and the provision of supplies;
6. The adoption of policies regarding and the appointment of necessary personnel to staff the varied services;
7. The appraisal of the work of the schools and adoption of plans for development (pp. 311-312).

Goldhammer (1954) discussed the policy determination role of school district officials and agreed with earlier studies that policy is quite well controlled by business and professional groups except in rural areas where successful farmers are well represented on the school boards as competent members. Reeves (1954, p. 236) reported in the 1950s that while the board of education served as the legislative body, the superintendent of schools acted as the school executive.

Marked growth of interest in the preparation of board policies and regulations were shown in a study by Tuttle (1958). He stated:

A lack of written down school board policies, kept up to date, is a frequent source of inconsistent or ineffective action. Published policies are most helpful to new school board members and superintendents who take up their duties in a school system with which they are unfamiliar (p. 11).

Smittle (1963, p. 14) and Matthews (1968, p. 25) agreed that a written board policy is absolutely necessary in order for a board
to function effectively. Written policy represents the best thinking of the several members of the board relative to a specific problem at a particular time and is the means of a shortcut to effective operations. Board policy should be reviewed at least biannually.

Tuttle (1958) indicated that not more than one-third of the school boards had written policies. It was apparent that where policies are not written, confusion often existed and misunderstandings developed.

In a study of SDA school boards in Alberta, Rose (1974) found that 21 percent of the boards kept a written policy apart from the minutes.

Regarding open and closed school board meetings, Hayes and Nugent (1955, p. 14) reported that superintendents and board members generally believed in open board meetings, while the smaller districts preferred closed or some modification of the open meeting. In open board meetings opportunity is given to visitors to participate in discussions. They may express their concerns about items on the agenda, or give their views on other topics (see appendix E).

Van Zwoll (1964) discussed contracts and job assignments for school personnel in the United States, and how they affect the board:

The contract is supposed to be a definitive statement of the agreement arrived at by the employer and the employee, outlining the duties and obligations of each and thus providing each protection against misunderstanding and assurance that the intent of the agreement will be sustained.

Contracts for school employees are either required or permitted in the 50 states. Many are prescribed by state departments of education. With few exceptions, a review of contract forms in use indicates that they lend themselves better to the protection of the employing agency, the board of education, than to assuring the employee that he will be required to do the kind of work for which he has been hired and for the length of time that was explicit at the time of
employment. There is room for much greater definitiveness which is necessary to provide for fairness to the employee and also to the school system which can only capitalize on its manpower assets to the full as assignments of jobs are in accord with the qualifications of the individual employee.

Malpractices in the assignment of personnel extend throughout the school system among administrative, teacher, office, school nurse, janitorial, and other personnel. Underdeveloped personnel practices, general disregard for individuals and their competencies, administrative convenience and expediency, and failure to use state department and university services are among the main causes for indefensible assignment of employees to jobs for which they have little or no qualification.

The remedies for malpractice in job assignment is virtually implicit in the causes for such assignments.

Much of the problem of assignment might be resolved if schoolmen did not try to do the impossible. If money is lacking, the schools attempt nevertheless to operate as if there are sufficient funds. If there are insufficient personnel, there is an attempt to make up the deficiency in numbers or qualifications through unfair allocation of extra duties through which professional personnel are required—often on the ludicrous basis of thus proving their professionalism—to assume subprofessional jobs. Nonprofessional individuals, in like fashion, are called upon to do some special task in addition to their regular duties.

Thus, recognizing the problem, school administrators have the obligation to take measures to make the contract definitive, as protective of the employee as of the school district, and equitable. This can take place only if vacancies are carefully analyzed, personnel hired in terms of the competencies needed, and job assignments made so as to coordinate worker qualifications with job requirements (pp. 133-134).

Van Zwoll (1964) reported that while interviewing of candidates for a job used to be the "exclusive province of the superintendent," the more recent trend was for the superintendent to obtain "the assistance of supervisors, principals, and sometimes teachers or committees of teachers to assist him in screening candidates" (p. 9). Employees, carefully selected and having a knowledge of what is expected of them, will likely respond to the "good faith demonstrated" in a fair contract by working "in terms of the spirit of their jobs rather than the letter of the contract" (p. 124).
The effectiveness of school boards

Whalen (1954, p. 393) studied the effectiveness of elected and appointed board members. A summary of his study follows:

1. There was little relationship between parenthood of the member and his effectiveness as a member.

2. Membership experience exceeding four to six years made the member more effective.

3. There was a positive relationship between the educational level of the board member and his effectiveness as a member.

4. There was a positive relationship between the income level of the board member and his effectiveness as a member.

5. Neither sex was generally superior although each excelled in particular areas.

6. Written policies improved effectiveness of the board.

Gillis (1937) felt, during the thirties, that focus upon the qualifications of school board members was needed as well as general analysis of the varied activities of the school board. Reeves (1954, p. 86) and Gross (1958, p. 30), in the 1950s, centered attention on group dynamics, attitudes and opinions of school board members, school board effectiveness and tenure, elected versus appointed members, and other studies.

Francois (1970, pp. 9-10) was convinced that not enough was being done to train board members in general for the successful execution of their duties.

Similar feelings of concern about Seventh-day Adventist school board members led to the preparation of a handbook for Advent-

Functions and responsibilities of SDA school board members are given in the School Manual prepared by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Department of Education (1958). The school board is responsible to the church board, and to the congregation from which they were elected. School boards look to the local conference director of education for counsel. They are guided by him also in the hiring and dismissal of teachers (pp. 44-49).

School board members, selected by popular vote, make the most effective members according to Reeder (1944), White (1962), Brickman (1968), and Burris (1969). McCune (1970) stated that "combined studies show that at least 75 percent of all American boards are elected" (p. 36). Regarding selection of board members, however, Stapley (1957), in a study of attitudes and opinions of school boards in Indiana, found that superintendents, as well as board members, thought that an approved list (from which to choose) prepared by a citizens' committee would prove helpful.

McCune (1970) stated:

The literature indicated that voters and officials who appoint board members often ignore the more important qualities needed in a board member. Dejnoska (1963, p. 193) considered these qualities to be, susceptibility to pressure groups, willingness to delegate authority, personal values, and motivation in seeking a school board post. He felt that voters would elect more wisely if they tended to concern themselves more with the perspective board member's behavior than with his pedigree (p. 15).

McCune (1970, p. 81) commented that approximately 55 percent
of the school board members he studied in selected private and parochial schools in California were either ex officio (27 percent) or were appointed (28 percent) by a sponsoring body, and that this concept was not in harmony with most of the literature which seemed to indicate agreement that elected board membership was more effective.

Reeves (1954, p. 17) felt that ex officio members seldom made good board members from the standpoint of providing effective legislation and policy control for the public school. He may not realize it, but the ex officio member might use his position for personal political purposes. It is better, Reeves thought, to have no ex officio members on the school board. This problem is considerably aggravated in the case of the private schools (their very existence may hinge on the approval of the ex officio board members).

Lacki (1967) indicated that the Catholic schools had also realized this problem—clerical domination seemed to threaten the financial support that the schools needed (pp. 161-163).

Alkin's study (1964) confirmed that "public expenditures are related to the religious composition of communities." Most board members, according to McCarty (1959), made it clear that religion was a delicate subject and they tried not to deal with it in their meetings. In order to elude possible religious problems, some boards of education informally apportioned places on the board from among the various faiths represented in their district. Public school officials could anticipate that if a board member had children in the parochial schools, meager support from Catholic board members might be forthcoming.

Watson (1943) sought out factors which tended to influence
the attitudes and opinions of school board members. His research project centered in Wisconsin and was an evaluation of the in-service training methods and the procedures used by the boards of education there. He revealed the need for a well-coordinated, planned program which would better prepare board members for the duties and responsibilities that are theirs. He recommended that board members receive special instruction in: (1) school administration and organization, (2) the duties of the board, (3) current educational objectives, (4) policies and philosophies, (5) factors relating to building maintenance, (6) the changing curriculum, (7) the financial structure, (8) problems of personnel, (9) purchasing, (10) school and community relations, and (11) revision of salary schedules, school laws, taxes, and legislation.

Bretsch (1960) in reporting studies of boards of education in the United States found that the majority of school board members were elected for terms that range from three to six years, and that board members improve in effectiveness up to and beyond six years. Reeves (1954) felt that the effectiveness of a school board increases as the years of experience of its board members increase.

McCune (1970, pp. 89-90) reported that five to seven members per board was the trend in public schools in the United States in the 1960's. Previous studies, he said, indicated that the average number of members on private school boards was 18, while parochial schools averaged 24 members per school board. Protestant parochial schools appear frequently to have "multiple sponsoring churches or other agencies, thus tending to have considerably larger school boards than do Catholic or private non-sectarian schools" (McCune, 1970, p. 89).
Rose (1974), in his study of SDA school boards in Alberta, found that most board members did not read professional literature pertaining to their office. Less than 45 percent had read the Education Code or School Manual and only 30 percent of the board members had received instruction concerning their duties. Fifty-nine percent had not visited the school to observe the daily program; and before assuming boardmanship, 80 percent of the members had never attended a board meeting. Other findings from the same study showed that 72 percent did not receive agendas at least one day before board meetings; 55 percent began their term of service in September, while 21 percent began in January; and 48 percent had one year terms.

Only 5 percent of the board members that McCune (1970) studied in private and parochial schools he selected in California, "had attended five or more educational meetings during the year while 50 percent had attended at least one educational conference" (p. 81). One-half of the board members indicated that they had not attended an educational conference of any kind in that year. Only 6 percent of the board members had membership in a state, local, or national school board association. Thirty-one percent did belong to an educational organization, however (pp. 83-88).

Because 28 percent of the board members in McCune's study had served for more than ten years, and the median term of service was eight years (with several members having reported serving that board for over thirty years, it was a higher than average median), McCune (1970) felt that the members did have a deep interest in their local education situation, but that they "evidenced a rather detached view of American education as a whole" (p. 88).
Van Zwoll (1964) emphasized the importance of orientation, pre-service and in-service education of school personnel, indicating that provision for this education is the responsibility of those who administrate the personnel. He stated:

The over-all objective of all training of school employees is an efficiently operating educational system. The immediate and subordinate objectives are improvement in the competency of the employee, employee gratification resulting from an extension of interests, and sometimes the preparation of the employee for transfer or promotion to another job within the school system, all subsumable under 'staff development' (p. 80).

Summary

This chapter has reported on (1) the uniqueness of public education systems in the United States and Canada, and a brief history of SDA education; (2) mobility of teachers; and (3) the school board—its practices and effectiveness.

In studying the history of education in North America, one becomes aware of individualized differences between Canada and the United States. A strongly religious approach to education in Canada has resulted from the influences of both England and the United States. Similarities in the education systems of both countries are: (1) all public schools commit themselves to a program of free education, (2) expectations for school attendance are clearly defined, (3) public schools should be nonsectarian, (4) schools are financed from taxes, (5) educational affairs are governed by a political representative body, (6) compulsory health services are rendered by local health units, and (7) authority is delegated to the school boards. Both countries have similar curriculums, and teachers express similar professional needs.
In Canada, Seventh-day Adventist schools are generally small. They are financed from tuition and by conference appropriations. Curriculum, attendance regulations, and classroom orientation generally are patterned according to the province in which the school is located. Teachers are professionally trained, and encouraged to do graduate work beyond the baccalaureate degree.

Teacher mobility rates in Canadian public schools ranged from 11 to 15 percent during the 1970-76 period. Teacher mobility in SDA church schools of Canada is affected by such factors as: (1) rapidly expanding education programs, upgrading of teaching staff, overseas mission appointments, and high costs of housing.

The basic function of the school board is to make policies and to determine educational objectives, while the actual school operation should be left to professional administrators. Private schools appeared to have more difficulty than did public schools in establishing clear-cut lines of authority between policy making and actual school administration.

Effectiveness of the board, some studies indicated, is influenced by such factors as: (1) size of the board, (2) length of board terms, (3) education level of board members, and (4) training of board members for their duties on the school board.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

In this chapter the following are discussed: (1) area and time selected for this study, (2) the respondents, (e) the instrument for collecting the data, (4) procedures in the collection of the data, (5) the hypotheses and criterion, and (6) the statistical method used to test the hypotheses and describe the results.

Area and Time Selected

The Seventh-day Adventist elementary and secondary schools in the Canadian Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia were selected for this study. This vast area runs from the Pacific coast on the west to the Atlantic on the east, and from the United States border on the south to the North-west Territories in the north. In June 1976, the Adventist population in Canada was approximately 27,426, with 3,500 children enrolled in the sixty-two church schools (How, 1976, p. 3).

The eight-year period of 1970-78 was chosen from which to calculate mobility rates for teachers and principals in Canadian Adventist schools. Only teachers who taught during the school years 1976-77 or 1977-78 were asked to respond to the questionnaire.
Respondents Selected

The respondents for this study were selected from forty-two schools in seven of the ten provinces of Canada. All of the school board members, teachers, and principals of these schools (schools selected on the basis that they had five or more years of operation since 1970) were contacted with a questionnaire. Information about the location of all teachers in these schools during the 1970-78 period was obtained by correspondence with the educational directors of the participating conferences. From their lists of teachers, the mobility rate of teachers in Canadian SDA church day schools was calculated.

The Instrument

Questionnaires have been used and misused in educational research but most writers admit to their popularity and potential for usefulness. They are quick to suggest caution, however, concerning design and administration. Isaac and Michael (1971) summarized well the case of the questionnaire:

*This is the single most widely used technique in education. It requires a careful, clear statement of the problem underlying the questionnaire. Otherwise, ambiguity and misinterpretation will invalidate the findings (p. 92).*

The instrument used to gather data consisted of statements concerned with (1) suggested reasons for teacher/principal mobility, (2) school board practices, and (3) personal, biographical information about the respondents.

The instrument was derived from selected questions used by Stonebrook (1965), Lall (1967), and McCune (1970). These questions
were modified to suit this particular study. Next, a pilot study of
the questionnaire was made. Five Canadian students at Andrews Uni-
versity and four Canadian school board members critiqued the ques-
tionnaire for clarity and relevance of the statements.

Collection of Data Procedures

On May 6, 1977, a package of material was sent to each principal of the forty-two schools selected for this study. In the package were the following:

1. A letter to the principal explaining the study and suggested pro-
cedures for administering the questionnaire.

2. A supportive letter from M. S. Graham, associate director of
education for the Canadian Union Conference.

3. Questionnaires with instructions for each board member, teacher,
and principal.

4. A computer optical scanning form (answer sheet) for each
respondent.

5. One large, self-addressed envelope for the return of the optical
scanning answer sheets from each school.

The school principals were requested to distribute the ques-
tionnaires and direct their completion. It was suggested that teachers
complete theirs immediately, if possible, and board members be given
theirs at the nearest upcoming board meeting. The principals then
returned all of the answer sheets together in the envelope provided
for return mail to the researcher.

Because of the summer recess for schools, a total of six
months was allowed for the returns. Four reminder letters were sent.
Table 1 shows the number of schools contacted with questionnaires, the number who responded with completed questionnaires, and the percentage of participation by conferences.

**TABLE 1**

**NUMBER OF SCHOOLS CONTACTED, NUMBER WHO RESPONDED, AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE**

(By Conferences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Number Contacted</th>
<th>Number Responded</th>
<th>Percentage Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba-Saskatchewan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritimes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>78.57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hypotheses and Criterion

The hypotheses to be tested are here stated in the null form:

1. There is no significant relationship between the mean responses of the school faculty and the mean responses of the school board members as to the thirteen designated reasons for the mobility of principals.

2. There is no significant relationship between the mean responses of the school faculty and the mean responses of the school board members as to the twelve designated reasons for the mobility of teachers.

3. There is no significant relationship between the mean responses
of school board members and the mean responses of school faculty as to the fourteen proposed factors important to efficient school board operation.

The following will be described: (1) an analysis of SDA school boards, school board members, teachers, and principals according to their biographical structure; (2) an analysis of principal and teacher mobility rates in five conferences of the Canadian Union of Seventh-day Adventists during 1970-78; and (3) a comparison of the percentages of responses to ten of the proposed school board practices in Canadian SDA schools.

The criterion for rejection of the three hypotheses will be the .05 (\(\alpha = .05\)) level of significance.

**Statistical Method**

In evaluating different statistical procedures which might be used to analyze the data for this study, it seemed most appropriate to use the method which had the capacity to compare responses from two groups of different size.

One of the considerations was the choice between a parametric and nonparametric statistical test. Siegel (1956) defined both tests:

A parametric statistical test is a test whose model specifies certain conditions about the parameters of the population from which the research sample is drawn (p. 31).

A nonparametric statistical test as a test model does not specify conditions about the parameters of the population from which the sample is drawn. Nonparametric tests do not require measurements so strong as that required for the parametric tests; most nonparametric tests apply to data in an ordinal scale; some apply also to data in a nominal scale (p. 31).

There were two reasons for choosing a nonparametric test for
this study. First, different populations were used (183 school board members, and 99 faculty members responded to the questionnaire), and as Siegel (1976, p. 31) pointed out, there are suitable nonparametric statistical tests for testing samples composed of observations covering different populations. Furthermore, Siegel (1976) stated that "none of the parametric tests can handle such data without requiring seemingly unrealistic assumptions" (p. 31).

Welkowitz (1976) agreed with Siegel, and gave a second advantage of nonparametric methods:

... they require less computation than the parametric methods. Thus they may be used to provide quick and generally good approximations to the results that would be obtained by testing comparable null hypotheses using the parametric t or F tests (p. 259).

Item Identification

The initial purpose of this procedure, item identification, was to identify the degree of influence or importance that each questionnaire statement had on the topics considered: teacher mobility, principal mobility, and efficient school board operation. A five-point scale was given from which the respondents might choose their answers, to indicate their feelings according to degree. For statements 1-25 concerned with teacher/principal mobility, respondents were asked to evaluate each statement according to whether they felt it had great influence, moderate influence, little influence, no influence, or if they did not know—then "don't know" was marked.

For statements 26-39 concerned with factors important to efficient school board operation, the respondents were asked to mark their answers according to what degree they felt these factors were
important; that is, whether the statement had great importance, moderate importance, it made no difference, little importance, or no importance.

The mean responses of the two groups of respondents were ranked to identify which statements had greater or lesser degrees of importance. The mean rather than the median measure was used in this study because it offers a more accurate evaluation of weighted measures, as Ferguson (1976) explained:

The mean has the property that for most distributions it is a more accurate, or more efficient, estimate of the population mean than other measures of central location, such as the median and mode, are of the population values they purport to estimate. It is subject to less error. This is one reason why it is the most frequently used measure of central location (p. 51).

Testing the significant responses of two groups

Welkowitz (1976) stated that "the statistic most frequently used to describe and to test hypotheses about the relationship between ranks is the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient" (p. 181). Since it was the purpose of this study to identify factors that cause high mobility of teachers and principals in Canadian SDA schools by investigating the relationship of opinions between school board members and faculty members on three topics: principal mobility, teacher mobility, and efficient school board operation, as stated in the hypotheses, the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was chosen to describe and test the hypotheses.

Ferguson (1976) stated that "nonparametric methods are appropriate for nominal and ordinal data, parametric methods for interval and ratio data" (p. 382).
Ferguson (1976) explained that "the power of a statistical test is the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when that hypothesis is false" and he continued, "the power of a statistical test depends on the level of significance, the alternate hypothesis H₁, and the sample size" (p. 385).

In this study the data was ordinal in nature. Mean responses from the two groups of respondents were calculated, then ranked. The statistical test to test whether there was a correlation between the ranked mean responses of the board members and the faculty members was the t test; that is, \( H_0: \rho = 0 \), \( H_1: \rho \neq 0 \). If the calculated t was greater than the critical value for t (obtained from a table of the t-distribution), then the null hypothesis (that there was no correlation between mean responses of the board members and faculty members) was rejected.

Ferguson (1976) showed the usual way of writing Spearman's coefficient of rank correlation which was used in this study:

\[
\rho = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}
\]

(p. 366).

Ferguson (1976) also showed the t test for testing the significance of Spearman's coefficient of rank correlation, Spearman's \( \rho \):

\[
t = \rho \sqrt{\frac{N - 2}{1 - \rho^2}}
\]

(p. 368).

The computer at Andrews University, in Berrien Springs, Michigan, analyzed the questionnaire data and yielded the statistical information reported in this study, and shown in the tables (the mean; the median; Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient--commonly
called "rho", the Greek letter, \( \rho \); t test values; and percentages of responses).

In addition to the professors of the Andrews University, Department of Mathematical Sciences, the statistical analysis in this study was critiqued for validity by professors in the Department of Mathematical Sciences of the following institutions in Ontario, Canada: the University of Toronto; McMaster University; and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Department of Measurement, Evaluation, and Computer Application.

The data for this study is described in chapter 4, "Analysis and Evaluation of Data."
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF DATA

Chapter 4 presents the analysis and evaluation of the questionnaire responses. The three topics to be considered are: (1) mobility rates of teachers and principals in Canadian SDA church school, (2) reasons for principal/teacher mobility, and (3) school board practices in these schools.

Only five of the seven conferences in the Canadian Union were selected for this study. These had similar school systems and are listed in table 1. As explained previously, in the delimitations of this study, Quebec, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island were not included.

The analysis is based on the responses from 25 school principals, 74 teachers, and 183 school board members of thirty-two schools who willingly participated in the study. All of the schools had been in operation for at least five consecutive years during the 1970-78 period studied.

The analysis and evaluation of data begins with a presentation of the mobility rates of school faculty for each conference studied, and the total average mobility rate in the five conferences. The tenure, average number of years a teacher or principal spends in a particular school before moving, is also shown.

Responses of teachers, principals, and school board members
to statements 1-39 of the questionnaire (appendix A) are considered next. These statements are grouped into three categories: (1) reasons principals move, (2) reasons teachers move, and (3) proposed factors important to efficient school board operation as compared to actual board practices. The significant differences or consensus of the two groups of respondents (school faculty members and school board members) are then presented.

The biographical characteristics of SDA school boards, board members, teachers, and principals as revealed in their responses to statements 42-69 of the questionnaire are shown last.

**Mobility Rates and Tenure of Teachers and Principals**

A compiled list of teachers and principals at each school in a conference over the 1970-78 period was obtained from the education directors of the five participating conferences. From these lists, tabulations have been made to indicate the average mobility rate and tenure of teachers and principals (appendix E).

*Mobility rate* in this study refers to the frequency of moves from school to school or place to place by teachers and principals. The mobility rate of teachers and principals was calculated by counting the number of new teachers at each school each year. The total number of new teachers was divided by the total number of teachers for that school. Thus, a yearly teacher mobility rate for each of the five conferences was established. The eight-year teacher mobility rate of 38 percent was determined (from the weighted percentages) for the combined five conferences.
Yearly mobility rates shown in table 2 indicate that the conferences had mobility rates ranging from 0 percent to 72 percent (the Maritimes showed this as the greatest variance).

**TABLE 2**

**AVERAGE MOBILITY RATES OF TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS IN CANADA**
*(By School Years)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>41.93</td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>30.35</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>42.42</td>
<td>44.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>39.28</td>
<td>42.85</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>38.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba-Saskatchewan</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>34.61</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>34.12</td>
<td>51.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritimes</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>72.72</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total average</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>34.82</td>
<td>43.41</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>41.29</td>
<td>41.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the average mobility rates and tenure of principals and teachers for the 1970-78 period. Total average mobility rate was 38 percent. The average tenure of principals was 2.39 years, and for teachers it was 2.00 years.

**British Columbia.** Table 3 shows that the average teacher mobility rate for British Columbia during 1970-78 was 38 percent. While this conference had the highest number of schools and teachers of the five conferences studied (see appendix E), it had the third highest mobility rate of its school faculty. Its principals had a 2.16 year tenure. By comparison, its teachers had a 1.92 year tenure.

**Alberta.** Of the conferences studied, Alberta had the third greatest number of schools. Its school principals had an average...
tenure of 2.08 years as shown in table 3. This was the shortest tenure for principals of the five conferences. While teachers had a 1.76 year tenure, only the Maritime teacher ranked lower at 1.51 years. Alberta's average teacher mobility rate was 43 percent.

Manitoba-Saskatchewan. This conference had the least number of schools and teachers of the conferences studied. The principals in Manitoba-Saskatchewan had a 2.47 year tenure, but teachers had the longest tenure of all the schools studied, 3.48 years, as table 3 shows.

TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Average Mobility Rate in Percentage</th>
<th>Average Tenure in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>37.73</td>
<td>1.92 2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>42.79</td>
<td>1.76 2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba-Saskatchewan</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>3.48 2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>1.90 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritimes</td>
<td>49.15</td>
<td>1.51 2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total average</td>
<td>38.37</td>
<td>2.00 2.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ontario. Ontario's total average faculty mobility rate average was 33 percent during 1970-78. Its school principals had the highest tenure, 3.00 years, but its teachers moved every 1.90 years. The second largest number of schools and teachers was found in Ontario (appendix E).
The Maritimes. Table 3 shows the Maritime Conference with the highest average mobility rate, 49 percent, for school faculty in the five conferences studied. Maritime principals had a 2.50 year tenure, and as was already mentioned, their teachers moved every 1.51 years on the average.

**Reasons Principals Move**

Table 4 shows a ranking of the combined mean responses of school board members, teachers, and principals in Canadian SDA church schools, to statements 1-13 of the questionnaire.

**TABLE 4**

**RANKING OF COMBINED MEAN RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENTS 1-13, REASONS WHY PRINCIPALS MOVE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Combined Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Discipline problems with students</td>
<td>3.3194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The board's decision regarding his/her poor performance as an administrator</td>
<td>3.1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personality clash with parents</td>
<td>3.0980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Choosing another SDA school</td>
<td>3.0134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personality clash with board members</td>
<td>3.0099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other reasons, such as personal family</td>
<td>2.8516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personality clash with teachers</td>
<td>2.5736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Choosing further education</td>
<td>2.4306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Choosing non-denominational employment</td>
<td>2.2679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Choosing to be a classroom teacher only</td>
<td>2.2453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Choosing to accept a conference position</td>
<td>2.2358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The board's decision regarding his/her poor financial management of the school</td>
<td>2.1498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Choosing to enter the ministry</td>
<td>2.0667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Of the reasons given for principal mobility, discipline problems with students obtained a 3.3194 mean on the five-point scale, and thus constituted the greatest difficulty for principals. The next highest mean, 2.1090, was calculated for statement 12, the board's decision regarding his/her poor performance as an administrator. This was the second basic reason given for principals' leaving. Personality clash with parents, statement 3, followed in third place.

Table 5 shows the statistical correlation of the mean responses of board members and faculty members to statements 1-13 of the questionnaire. Using Spearman's coefficient of rank correlation, a rho score value of .783 was achieved. To test the significance of Spearman's rho, a t test was administered. A t value of 4.175 was obtained. This value was then compared to the critical t value, 2.201, and the null hypothesis was rejected. The alternative hypothesis was retained; that is, a significant relationship did exist between the mean responses of the school board members and faculty members regarding the thirteen reasons for principal mobility.

Statements 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 12, and 13, shown as having mean response values greater than 2.5 by both groups of respondents, indicated that the factors in these statements had influence on principal mobility. Less than a 2.5 mean response for statements 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 indicated that the following factors had no influence on principal mobility: choosing further education, choosing to enter the ministry, choosing to be a classroom teacher only, choosing non-denominational employment, choosing to accept a conference position, or the board's decision regarding poor financial management of the school by the principal.
TABLE 5
A CORRELATION OF MEAN RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENTS 1-13, REASONS WHY PRINCIPALS MOVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean Responses**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personality clash with teachers* 2.5504 (7)</td>
<td>2.5692 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Personality clash with board members* 2.8571 (4)</td>
<td>3.3607 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personality clash with parents* 2.7743 (5)</td>
<td>3.0000 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Discipline problems with students* 3.2397 (1)</td>
<td>3.4706 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Choosing further education 2.4648 (8)</td>
<td>2.3143 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Choosing another SDA school* 3.0699 (3)</td>
<td>2.9610 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Choosing to enter the ministry 2.0775 (13)</td>
<td>2.0506 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Choosing to be a classroom teacher only 2.2296 (9)</td>
<td>2.2838 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Choosing non-denominational employment 2.2041 (10)</td>
<td>2.3378 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Choosing to accept a conference position 2.1892 (11)</td>
<td>2.3333 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The board's decision regarding his/her poor financial management of the school 2.1844 (12)</td>
<td>2.0794 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The board's decision regarding his/her poor performance as an administrator* 3.0704 (2)</td>
<td>3.1970 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other reasons, such as personal family* 2.7742 (6)</td>
<td>3.0000 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The following statistical information should be noted:
Spearman's rho =.783; t test =4.175; critical t =2.201; H0 rejected, H1 retained.

*Significant factor influencing principal mobility. Mean value above 2.5.

**Numbers in parenthesis indicate the rank that statement had.
Reasons Teachers Move

A short number of years spent by a teacher in an individual school system should be of great concern to a community. Much time, money, and effort are expended each time a new teacher must be found and oriented. Conditions that encourage good teachers to lengthen their time of service in a community benefit both the teacher and the local school. Van Zwoll (1964) pointed out that "to look after the welfare of the individual and to give him the recognition that he needs is not merely nice, humanitarian, or even democratic; it is good business," and he explained that "increased instructional output . . . is the immediate dividend paid upon the capital investment of a practically based personnel policy and its administration" (pp. 10-11).

In this study of Canadian SDA church schools, 2.00 years was found to be the average teacher tenure for the five participating conferences. It would seem that 2.00 years could not allow a teacher to establish a program that rewarded community expectations satisfactorily. Table 6 shows the ranking of combined mean responses of school board members, teachers, and principals in Canadian SDA church schools, to statements 14-25 (reasons why teachers move).

Other reasons, such as personal family reasons, in statement 25 of the questionnaire, obtained the highest combined mean response, 3.4330, on the five-point scale used in this study. A wide variety of reasons could be encompassed here as affecting teacher mobility, but the literature indicated marriage, maternity, illness, transfer of
TABLE 6
RANKING OF COMBINED MEAN RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENTS 14-25, REASONS WHY TEACHERS MOVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Combined Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Other reasons, such as personal family</td>
<td>3.4330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Discipline problems with students</td>
<td>3.1126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Choosing employment at another SDA school</td>
<td>2.9774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The board's decision regarding his/her poor performance</td>
<td>2.7534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Personality clash with parents</td>
<td>2.6726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Choosing further education</td>
<td>2.4414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Personality clash with board members</td>
<td>2.4037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Personality clash with principal</td>
<td>2.3180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Personality clash with fellow teachers</td>
<td>2.2844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Choosing non-denominational employment</td>
<td>2.2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Choosing a principalship position</td>
<td>2.1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2?. Choosing to enter the ministry</td>
<td>2.0682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

spouse, retirement, and money as common reasons. Van Zwoll (1964) cautioned that while these are unavoidable reasons for personnel turnover, those "remaining causes for turnover, causes about which something can be done, causes which may be used diagnostically to correct disadvantageous working situations" should not be disregarded. And Van Zwoll (1964) continued:

"... both in industry and government, as well as in some school districts, it is recognized that the reason for leaving given at the time of separation is often a superficial, not the true, reason. It is therefore advocated that each separation be accompanied by an "exit interview." Even then it is recognized that the exit interview will be subject to considerable emotional overtones to such a degree that it is considered desirable to use either a post-exit interview or a questionnaire (or
both) at some time after the employee has been firmly established in a new job. The purpose of the follow-up is strictly the enlightenment of the personnel division so that remedial causes for the loss of competent personnel may be identified and removed (p. 312).

Discipline problems with students

Table 6 indicates that discipline problems with students obtained the second highest combined mean, 3.1126, on the five-point scale. Respondents felt that this factor affected mobility of teachers; similarly, they indicated that it affected principal mobility (in table 4).

Choosing employment at another SDA school

The teacher's choice to accept employment at another SDA school ranked third among the reasons why teachers move, with a combined mean response of 2.9774 on the five-point scale.

The board's decision regarding his/her poor performance

A combined mean response of 2.7534 for statement 24 indicates that a large number of teachers were forced to transfer to another school. The board's decision regarding his/her poor performance was listed as the fourth reason affecting teacher mobility.

Personality clash with parents

A combined mean response of 2.6726 to statement 17 indicates that personality clash of the teacher with parents of students affected teacher mobility. Since personality clash of the principal with parents was indicated as a factor affecting principal mobility, this factor along with discipline problems was common to both teachers
and principals in the Canadian SDA church schools studied. Stone (1970) reported why teachers leave the profession in the United States. In his study, ten significant factors were found—two of which were: lack of support by parents of students, and criticism by patrons.

**Factors rating no influence**

A mean response of less than 2.5 for any statement placed it into the category of "no influence". As the mean responses to statements 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 22, and 23 were below 2.5, it seems that the following were not factors toward promoting teacher mobility: personality clash with principal, personality clash with school board, choosing a principalship position, choosing non-denominational employment, choosing to enter the ministry, or choosing further education.

Table 7 shows the statistical correlation of mean responses of school board members and faculty members to questionnaire statements 14-25, reasons why teachers move. These statements were developed from previous studies on teacher mobility. Using Spearman's rho correlation formula, a rho value of .909 was achieved. A t test was applied, and the critical value of t was compared. The obtained t value of 6.901 was found to be much greater than the critical t value, 2.228; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was retained—that is, there was a significant relationship between the mean responses of school board members and the mean responses of school faculty as to the twelve designated reasons for the mobility of teachers.
### TABLE 7
A CORRELATION OF MEAN RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENTS 14-25, REASONS WHY TEACHERS MOVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean Responses**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Personality clash with principal</td>
<td>2.3147 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Personality clash with board members</td>
<td>2.3333 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Personality clash with fellow teachers</td>
<td>2.3103 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Personality clash with parents*</td>
<td>2.6340 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Discipline problems with students*</td>
<td>3.0130 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Choosing a principalship position</td>
<td>2.0878 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Choosing non-denominational employment</td>
<td>2.1000 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Choosing employment at another SDA school*</td>
<td>3.0567 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Choosing to enter the ministry</td>
<td>2.0791 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Choosing further education</td>
<td>2.5411 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The board's decision regarding his/her poor performance*</td>
<td>2.6847 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Other reasons, such as personal family*</td>
<td>3.4211 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The following statistical information should be noted:
Spearman's rho = .909; t test = 6.901; critical t = 2.228; H₀ rejected, H₁ retained.

*Significant factor influencing teacher mobility. Mean value above 2.5.

**Numbers in parenthesis indicate the rank that statement had.
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Proposed Factors Important to Efficient School Board Operation as Compared to Actual Board Practices

Statements 26-39 of the survey instrument gave respondents opportunity to express to what degree they felt certain factors were important to efficient school board operation. The respondents considered all of the statements to have moderate importance apparently, since the combined mean responses to these statements were all between 3.5 and 4.5 on the five-point scale used in this study. Table 8 shows the ranking of combined mean responses of school board members and of faculty members to questionnaire statements 26-39, proposed factors important to efficient school board operation.

Spearman's coefficient of rank correlation formula was used to determine the significant correlation of the ranked mean responses of the school board members and school faculty on statements 26-39. A rho value of .675 and a t value of 3.167 were found to exist on these statements. Because the critical value of t, 2.179 was less than the t value, 3.167, the null hypothesis was rejected; the alternative hypothesis was retained—that is, there was a significant relationship of the mean responses of school board members and the mean responses of faculty members on statements 26-39, proposed factors important to efficient school board operation. Table 9 shows the statistical correlation of the mean responses of the school board members and faculty members.
Table 8: Ranking of Combined Mean Responses to Questionnaire Statements 26-39, Proposed Factors Important to Efficient School Board Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Combined Mean*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. A board policy book to read</td>
<td>4.4307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. A conference in-service seminar program in school management for principals</td>
<td>4.3956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. A comprehensive school evaluation by the local conference every three years</td>
<td>4.3723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Newly elected board members should assume office in July or August rather than in January so that the board term would be according to the school year, not the calendar year</td>
<td>4.3178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Signed contracts for teachers and principals</td>
<td>4.2632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Written job descriptions for each teacher and principal</td>
<td>4.0909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The principal should prepare a written evaluation of teaching personnel in his school each year</td>
<td>4.0508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. An in-service seminar program for board members</td>
<td>4.0232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. School principals should be board members but not voting members</td>
<td>3.8750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. A maximum of two hours allowed for each board meeting</td>
<td>3.8538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. A three-year term of service for all board members</td>
<td>3.8480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Church pastors should be board members but not voting members</td>
<td>3.8326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Agendas distributed at least four days before each board meeting</td>
<td>3.8203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Only five to seven members on the board</td>
<td>3.6557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A combined mean value of 3.5 to 4.5 indicates that the respondents felt that this factor had "moderate importance".
### TABLE 9

**A CORRELATION OF MEAN RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENTS 26–39, PROPOSED FACTORS IMPORTANT TO EFFICIENT SCHOOL BOARD OPERATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statements</th>
<th>Mean Responses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Only five to seven members on the board</td>
<td>3.6903 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. A three-year term of service for all board members</td>
<td>3.8707 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Agendas distributed at least four days before each board meeting</td>
<td>3.7375 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. A maximum of two hours allowed for each board meeting</td>
<td>3.6199 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. An in-service seminar program for board members</td>
<td>3.8650 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. A board policy book to read</td>
<td>4.3846 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Newly elected board members should assume office in July or August rather than in January so that the board term would be according to the school year, not the calendar year</td>
<td>4.2699 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Church pasters should be board members but not voting members</td>
<td>3.8857 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. School principals should be board members but not voting members</td>
<td>3.9549 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Written job descriptions for each teacher and principal</td>
<td>4.1595 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Signed contracts for teachers and principals</td>
<td>4.3690 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. A conference in-service seminar program in school management for principals</td>
<td>4.3793 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 10 shows that 84 percent of the respondents felt that a comprehensive school evaluation by the local conference every three years had moderate importance. Seventeen percent of the respondents...
reported that there had been a conference evaluation of their school in the last three years. It appears that there have been few com-pre-

### Table 10

A COMPARISON OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE STATEMENTS 26-39: TO WHAT DEGREE ARE THESE FACTORS IMPORTANT TO EFFICIENT SCHOOL BOARD OPERATION? AND STATEMENTS 40-69: ACTUAL SCHOOL BOARD PRACTICES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Considered**</th>
<th>Percentage Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Importance</td>
<td>Actual Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School evaluation by the local conference (39 &amp; 56)</td>
<td>84.32</td>
<td>17.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A board policy book (31 &amp; 66)</td>
<td>83.63</td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members assuming office in July or August (32 &amp; 58)</td>
<td>74.22</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed contracts for teachers and principals (36 &amp; 49)</td>
<td>73.52</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service seminar programs for board members (30 &amp; 68)</td>
<td>68.99</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher evaluation in writing by the principal (38 &amp; 55)</td>
<td>68.29</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agendas distributed four days before board meetings (28 &amp; 62)</td>
<td>63.43</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-year term of service for board members (27 &amp; 57)</td>
<td>62.02</td>
<td>18.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum of two hours for board meetings (29 &amp; 61)</td>
<td>60.63</td>
<td>17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only five to seven members on the school board (26 &amp; 47)</td>
<td>52.26</td>
<td>24.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean percent</strong></td>
<td>69.09</td>
<td>13.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only ten "proposed factors" out of statements 26-39 qualified for comparison with "actual practices" in statements 40-69.

**Numbers in parenthesis indicate which questionnaire statements contained the factor considered.
hensive school evaluation programs conducted. Perhaps school board members have not had reports of the evaluations.

**Statement 31 compared to statement 66:**
**School board policy book or manual**

Developing written school board policies has been the subject of considerable research in recent years. In this study it was found that almost 84 percent of the respondents felt that a policy book should be made available for board members, yet table 35 shows that 67 percent of the board members reported that they have not read any of the General Conference school board manual; table 36 shows that 64 percent reported having read none of the Canadian Union Education Code. That the manuals are available was indicated by 10 percent who had read all of the General Conference school board manual and 17 percent who had read all of the Canadian Union Education Code.

**Statement 32 compared to statement 58:**
**Board members assuming office in July or August**

In actual practice, again referring to table 10, 6 percent of the board members reported assuming their office in the months of July or August. Forty-six percent said that their boards begin work in the months of September or October, but it was noted that 41 percent reported changing terms with the calendar year, in January or February (see table 27).

**Statement 36 compared to statement 49:**
**Signed contracts for teachers and principals**

As table 10 indicates, signed contracts for teachers and principals were considered to be important by 74 percent of the respond-
ents. While 23 percent of the board members and principals reported that their schools were actually using them, written contracts have generally not been used in the Canadian Seventh-day Adventist church schools. Respondents indicated that contracts would be advisable for teachers and principals, however.

Statement 30 compared to statement 68: In-service seminar program for board members

According to table 10, 5 percent of the respondents indicated that an in-service training program was available for board members during that year, but as shown in table 37, 98 percent of the board members reported that during the last five years they had not attended a minimum of two hours of an in-service seminar.

That orientation to their duties was almost nonexistent was also reported by the board members. Table 34 shows that 79 percent reported having had no orientation. As shown in table 10, 69 percent of the respondents felt that in-service seminar programs for board members was important to efficient school board operation.

McCune (1970) in his study of private and parochial school boards in California (many of which were SDA schools incidentally) reported:

Approximately 80 percent of the members indicated that they felt the following aids would have been of genuine assistance to them:
1. Formalized orientation activities.
2. An orientation board session.
3. An invitation to join a local or national school board association.
4. Detailed brochure for new members.

Seventy-seven percent of the members indicated that they would have appreciated an invitation to observe a school board meeting before actually assuming membership.

It seems that new board member orientation has not been
a strong feature of private school boards, and members apparently sense a need of providing a more thorough acquaintance with the position and its responsibilities (p. 104).

This study in Canada concurs with McCune that more needs to be done to acquaint school board members with efficient board procedures and with the responsibilities of the individual board member.

**Statement 38 compared to statement 55:**
Teacher evaluation in writing by the principal

Sixty-eight percent of the respondents, as table 10 indicates, felt that one of the duties of the principal should be to give each teacher a written evaluation of the teacher's work once each year. It was reported by 7 percent of the respondents that this was an actual practice. One possible reason for the low percentage may come from the fact that many of the church schools are small (one or two rooms) and may have the principal as the sole teacher for that school.

**Statement 28 compared to statement 62:**
Agendas distributed four days or more before the meetings

Less than 5 percent of the respondents indicated that the written agenda was distributed at least four days prior to that board meeting at the time of the completion of the questionnaire. Table 31 shows that 61 percent of the respondents reported that no written agenda had been distributed to them. Twenty-eight percent reported that agendas were distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

Sixty-three percent of the respondents felt that a written agenda should be distributed at least four days prior to each board meeting (see table 10).
Statement 27 compared to statement 57:
Three-year terms for board members

Respondents felt by a mean strength of 3.8480 (see table 8) that a longer term than one year for board members was important to efficient school board operation. Sixty-two percent felt that a three-year term of service would be desirable, as shown in table 10.

In actual practice, 19 percent of the respondents reported that their boards did observe the longer terms (see table 26). McCune (1970) found that 28 percent of the board members surveyed in his study had served ten years or more. He found that the median length of service for board members was eight years. The study in Canadian SDA church schools indicated that most board members served only one year at a time and that each year members were reelected or a change occurred.

Statement 29 compared to statement 61:
A maximum of 2 hours for board meetings

In this study it was found that 61 percent of the respondents felt that the work of the board can effectively be completed in less than two hours per meeting (see table 10). It was reported by 18 percent that their last board meeting had lasted approximately two hours. Table 8 indicates, from the combined mean response of 3.8538, that the respondents felt a moderate degree of importance to limiting board meetings to the two-hour maximum time.

It seems that the school boards have not followed the practice of limiting the length of board meetings. Table 30 shows that 59 percent of the respondents indicated that the last board meeting was two and one-half hours or longer.
Statement 26 compared to statement 47:
Only five to seven members on the board

McCune (1970) found that 74 percent of the members of private and parochial high school boards served on boards with fifteen members or more, and that the median number of members was twenty-two (p. 92). According to a 1969 study of American school boards by Burris (1969, p. 13), five to seven members was the average number on the boards. This agreed with a study in 1964 by the National Education Association where seven members was the median number of members discovered to be serving on local boards (NEA, 1964, p. 63).

In the Canadian SDA schools, this researcher found that 24 percent of the board member respondents were serving on boards having five to seven members (see table 10) and that 52 percent felt that this number of members on a board had moderate importance to the operational efficiency of the school board.

Biographical Characteristics of Seventh-day Adventist School Boards, Board Members, Teachers, and Principals in Canada

An investigation of biographical characteristics of the school board members, principals, and teachers of the SDA schools, respondents in this study, was made for the purpose of gathering supplementary information that may lead to the identification of intrinsic or other factors that affect teacher and principal mobility rates in these schools. Such characteristics as level of education, experience, professional involvement, and personal background were examined. The literature indicated that certain biographical characteristics influence the effectiveness of school board members, and thus the school board—an ineffective board may influence teacher/principal mobility.
Statements 40 and 41 on the questionnaire, regarding the position held by the respondent, and in which conference he was located, were included for expediency of computer analysis of the data and are not further discussed here. Statements 42-69 completed the questionnaire and the biographical survey of the respondents; each item is shown in the tables with percentages calculated for each group of respondents separately, to permit comparisons of similarity or diversity between the groups.

Age of school board members

The median age of the school board members studied in the five conferences of Canada was found to be 41.22 years, shown in table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Board Members</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 or less</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-39</td>
<td>34.43</td>
<td>29.73</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or more</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Board Members</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>41.22</td>
<td>35.70</td>
<td>35.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McCune (1970, p. 61) reported 50 years as the median age of the board members he studied in California.

**Age of teachers**

The median age of the seventy-four teacher respondents was found to be 35.7 years. Table 11 shows that approximately 19 percent were below age 25; 7 percent were above 60 years of age.

**Age of principals**

The median age of the twenty-five principals who responded is shown to be 35.5 years in table 11. Thirty-two percent of the principals were under 30 years of age, and 16 percent were over 50 years.

**Sex of school board members**

According to the data received from the 183 school board respondents in this study, 63 percent of them were men; and as table 12 further indicates, 34 percent were women. This portrays a larger percentage of women serving on the school board than previous studies.

**TABLE 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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McCune (1970) reported 19 percent women board members in the parochial and private schools, and 14-18 percent in the public schools; thus, it appears that a larger percentage of women are placed on the SDA church school boards in Canada and are involved in the decision making. No studies reported whether men or women members were more effective, however, as members; each sex excelled in certain performances but neither was generally superior according to Whalen (1954, p. 393).

Sex of teachers

In the five conferences studied in Canada, 69 percent of the teachers were women, and 31 percent were men (see table 12). Two conferences, Manitoba-Saskatchewan and the Maritimes, were diverse from this. Manitoba-Saskatchewan had an 85 percent female teacher population, while in the Maritimes it was fifty-fifty. This concurs with other studies revealing that the teaching positions in the elementary schools have to a large extent been filled by women.

Sex of principals

Eighty percent of the principals in Canadian SDA schools associated with this study were men. In Alberta there was ratio of fifty-fifty—as many female principals as male principals.

Marital status of school board members

Ninety-five percent of all board members responding to this item reported that they were married. Two percent were single, and the remaining 3 percent indicated being either separated, divorced, or widowed. These findings, presented in table 13, are consistent with those of most major studies on the marital status of board members.
### TABLE 13
MARITAL STATUS OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>95.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marital status of teachers**

Nearly 72 percent of the teacher respondents indicated that they were married. Ontario had the highest percentage of single teachers, 35 percent, for any of the conferences polled.

**Marital status of principals**

In four of the five conferences incorporated in this study, 100 percent of the principals indicated that they were married. Only the Maritime Conference differed by reporting single status for 40 percent of the principals.

**Education level of school board members**

The questionnaire was structured so that each respondent might indicate his highest level of education. More than 26 percent of the school board members reported having less than a high school diploma,
while 35 percent had a senior college diploma or had done some graduate work (see table 14).

A study by Albert (1962, p. 55) indicated that 4 percent of the public school board members he studied had achieved less than a high school diploma, while 72 percent were college graduates.

The educational level of school board members in Canadian SDA schools, presented in table 14, appears to be considerably lower than that reported by Albert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level (Completed)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>26.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduation</td>
<td>35.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior college</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior college</td>
<td>19.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's degree</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education level of teachers

Table 14 indicates that 66 percent of the teacher respondents were college graduates with 11 percent of these having master's degrees. This compares favorably with Canadian public elementary and
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secondary schools. Statistics Canada (1977, pp. 58-59) reported for 1974-75 and 1975-76 that 61.2 percent of the educators in these schools had bachelor's degrees; 7.3 percent had master's and doctorate degrees.

**Education level of principals**

Of the principals who responded, 88 percent reported having a senior college degree; 12 percent of these also had master's degrees. This compares favorably with similar studies done elsewhere, except for the 12 percent who indicated having a high school graduation or less (see table 14).

**Citizenship of school board members**

Respondents were asked to indicate their citizenship. Their responses are shown in table 15.

**TABLE 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Board Members</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>82.51</td>
<td>81.08</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Citizenship of teachers

Similar to the board members, 81 percent of the teachers reported having Canadian citizenship (see table 15). Fourteen percent indicated having citizenship from the United States. Ontario had the highest number of non-Canadians in their teaching positions.

Citizenship of principals

Seventy-six percent of the principals working in the Canadian SDA church schools studied were Canadian citizens, as shown in table 15. Sixteen percent were American, 4 percent were European, and 4 percent were other. As with teachers, Ontario also had the highest number of principals from the United States.

Number of members on the school board

The questionnaire was designed so that board members, teachers, and principals might indicate the features which were characteristic of the structural organization of their school board. Twenty-nine percent reported that they had an eight- to ten-member board; another 29 percent said that they had eleven to fourteen members on the board; 17 percent had fifteen or more board members; and 24 percent had seven or less members on the board.

Previous studies (McCune, 1970, pp. 89-90) indicated that the average number of members on private school boards was 18, while parochial schools averaged 24 members per school board. Five to seven members per board was the trend in public schools in the United States in the 1960s (McCune, 1970, p. 35). Table 16 shows that 53 percent of Canadian SDA school boards had less than 11 members.
TABLE 16
NUMBER OF MEMBERS ON SCHOOL BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Members</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>24.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>28.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>13.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or more</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of churches represented on school board

Table 17 indicates that 40 percent of the schools were sponsored by only one church, 21 percent by two churches, and 11 percent

TABLE 17
NUMBER OF CHURCHES REPRESENTED ON BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Churches</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>40.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>21.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>13.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>9.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by six or more churches of the five Canadian conferences surveyed. McCune (1970, p. 89) indicated that Protestant parochial schools appear frequently to have "multiple sponsoring churches or other agencies, thus tending to have considerably larger school boards than do Catholic or private non-sectarian schools."

Signed contracts for teachers and principals

Of the 282 total respondents participating in this study, 23 percent indicated that the teachers had signed contracts. More than 70 percent said that no signed agreement had been made with their teachers or principals (see table 18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contracts Provided</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a comparison study of the responsibilities of boards of education of public and church schools, Stonebrook (1965, p. 103) found that less than 40 percent of the school board manuals "included provisions on contracts for teaching personnel or for other employees; five out of the seven being in the public school board manuals." He found that "only one of the Catholic manuals mentioned the use of
contracts." Stonebrook (1965) went on to say:

There was some indication that the hiring of teachers was to be in the hands of the chief administrator but contracts were to be signed by the board. Other coverage included the duration of the contracts and the provisions (p. 103).

Thus, it seems that private and parochial schools generally have been hesitant to enter into signed contracts with their teachers.

Table 19 shows the experience as a teacher for school board members, teachers, and principals.

School board members' experience as teachers

Thirty-eight percent of the board members stated that they had no teaching experience; 16 percent indicated having had one year of experience; and 25 percent of the board members did not respond.

| TABLE 19 |
| EXPERIENCE AS A TEACHER FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>16.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four to five</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to ten</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven or more</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>38.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>24.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers' experience as teachers

Seventy-seven percent of the teacher respondents indicated having four or more years of experience as a teacher. Table 19 also shows that 60 percent of the teachers had six or more years of experience; 36 percent had eleven or more years. Only 2 percent reported having less than three years of experience as teachers.

Statistics Canada (1977) reported that in Canadian public elementary and secondary schools the "median teaching experience for all staff in the 1975-76 school year was 8.00 years." For elementary teachers it was 7.6 years "(7.0 for males and 8.0 for females)," and "at the secondary level the median teaching experience was 8.0 years (9.0 for men and 6.0 for women)" (pp. 26-27).

Principals' experience as teachers

Fifty-two percent of the principals reported having had eleven or more years of experience as teachers, and 84 percent said they had had at least four years (see table 19). Only 4 percent of the principals reported having had no experience as a teacher.

School board members' experience as a principal

Table 20 shows the experience as a principal for school board members, teachers, and principals. Twenty-eight percent of the board members did not respond to this item. Forty-four percent reported having no experience as principals; 17 percent had one year of experience; and 2 percent reported having eleven or more years of experience as principals.
Teachers' experience as principals

Table 20 shows that 58 percent of the teacher respondents reported having had no experience as principals; 18 percent indicated having had one year.

Principals' experience as principals

The principals, in the Canadian SDA schools studied, had a range of experience as principals as follows: 4 percent reported one year; 12 percent had two years; 16 percent had three years; eight percent had four to five years; 16 percent had six to ten years; and 36 percent had eleven or more years (see table 20).

**TABLE 20**

EXPERIENCE AS A PRINCIPAL FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>16.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four to five</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to ten</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven or more</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>44.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>27.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School board members' experience as school board members

Table 21 presents the experience as a school board member for school board members, teachers, and principals. The school board members' experience on a school board was generally distributed from one to eleven years in this study. About 52 percent of the board members had served from one to three years on a board; 24 percent had served four to five years, and 20 percent had served longer than five years.

Teachers' experience as school board members

Fifty-one percent of the teacher respondents reported having no experience as school board members; 19 percent had only one year.

| TABLE 21 |
| EXPERIENCE AS A SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>19.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>19.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four to five</td>
<td>24.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to ten</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven or more</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Principals' experience as school board members

In this study of Canadian Seventh-day Adventist church schools it was found that principals are generally school board members also. Thirty-six percent of the principals reported having had eleven or more years of experience as board members (see table 21), and eleven or more years of experience as principals (see table 20).

Number of job moves for board members, 1970-78

The respondents were given the opportunity to indicate the number of job moves they had made during the 1970-78 period. Their responses are presented in table 22. While 53 percent of the board members indicated no job moves, 21 percent had moved once.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Moves</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>20.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>10.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of job moves for teachers, 1970-78

Thirty-six percent of the teachers indicated no job moves during the eight-year period since 1970, as shown in table 22. Twenty-eight percent of them moved only once, and 22 percent indicated having moved twice.

Number of job moves for principals, 1970-78

Twenty-four percent of the principals indicated no job moves during the 1970-78 period. Forty percent reported only one move.

Total number of job location transfers for school board members

Table 23 indicates the total number of job location transfers of the respondents. Twenty-seven percent of the board members had never moved from their job location; 42 percent reported having moved less than six times throughout their entire working life. Sixteen percent had moved six to twenty times; only 1 percent reported having moved twenty-one or more times.

Total number of job location transfers for teachers

Twenty-three percent of the teachers reported having never moved; 53 percent had moved less than six times since they started full-time employment. Those who had moved six to twenty times comprised 23 percent. None reported having moved twenty-one or more times.
Total number of job location transfers for principals

Twelve percent of the principals indicated that they had never moved; 52 percent had moved less than six times; 36 percent reported having moved from six to fifteen times. None had moved more than fifteen times, as table 23 indicates.

### TABLE 23

**TOTAL NUMBER OF JOB LOCATION TRANSFERS FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Job Location Transfers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>42.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or more</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>26.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written evaluations of the teachers' work by the principal

Table 24 indicates that 57 percent of the respondents said that there had been no written evaluations of the teachers' work by the principal during the school year in which the questionnaire was completed. Twenty-eight percent marked that they did not know if the principal had given written evaluations to the teachers in that school year.
TABLE 24
WRITTEN EVALUATIONS OF THE TEACHERS' WORK
BY THE PRINCIPAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluations Given</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>27.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Official written evaluations of schools by the local conference

Regarding official written evaluation of schools by local conferences during the three years preceding this study, table 25 shows that 36 percent of the respondents did not know if there had been any. Forty percent indicated that there was no evaluation; 17 percent said that a written evaluation had been made during this period.

TABLE 25
OFFICIAL WRITTEN EVALUATION OF SCHOOLS BY LOCAL CONFERENCES IN LAST THREE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Made</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>35.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of ex officio board members, and length of term for elected members

Only school board members and principals were directed to complete statements 57 through 69 of the questionnaire. These dealt with actual board practices. Table 26 shows that the respondents had been elected for their terms as follows: 56 percent for one year; 11 percent for two years; and 19 percent for three years. Fourteen percent of the board members were ex officio members, thereby served on the school board by virtue of another position which they held.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Term</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One year</td>
<td>55.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years</td>
<td>11.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three years</td>
<td>18.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four years</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex officio</td>
<td>14.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hall (1957) reported that the majority of school board members in the United States are elected for terms ranging from three to six years, and that board members improve in effectiveness up to and past six years. In agreement with this was Reeves (1954), who had stated that the effectiveness of a school board increases as the years of experience of its board members increase.
In what months do board members assume office?

The questionnaire provided for each board member to show in what month of the year he began serving on the board. It was found that 41 percent of the members began a new term in the months of January or February; 46 percent began in September or October; and 6 percent began in July or August. Other studies revealed that in public schools, the election of board members occurred in April and May, and board terms began in July.

From this study in Canada, it was determined that 48 percent of the board member respondents began their terms at times other than the months of July to October, and that the same percentage followed the practice of the school board term coinciding with the school year. Table 27 shows the board members' responses in percentage for the various months in which their board terms began.

TABLE 27
THE MONTHS IN WHICH BOARD MEMBERS ASSUME OFFICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months Terms Begin</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January-February</td>
<td>40.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-April</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-June</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-August</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-October</td>
<td>46.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November-December</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Frequency of regular and emergency board meetings

School board members were asked to indicate whether their boards had regularly scheduled meetings, and how many emergency meetings they had held in the preceding six months to the time of reply to the questionnaire. Their responses are shown in tables 28 and 29.

TABLE 28
FREQUENCY OF REGULAR BOARD MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Schedule</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No regular schedule</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>78.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a month</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a quarter</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No regular schedule for meetings was reported by 17 percent of the board members, while 79 percent stated that their board met once a month. This report of once-a-month meetings parallels McCune's (1970, p. 93) findings where nine board meetings per year was the median for private and parochial schools which he studied. School boards usually did not meet in summer.

The number of emergency board meetings in six months as was reported by the respondents is shown in table 29. Thirty-seven percent indicated one emergency meeting; 30 percent reported two; and 9 percent reported more than five emergency meetings in six months.
TABLE 29
NUMBER OF EMERGENCY BOARD MEETINGS
IN SIX MONTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Meetings</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>36.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>30.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>18.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than five</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of the last board meeting

Table 30 shows the various amounts of time that board members reported were spent at the last board meeting prior to the one in which they completed the questionnaire. Adding the percentages, one

TABLE 30
LENGTH OF THE LAST BOARD MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Meeting</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 hour or less</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1½ hours</td>
<td>18.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ hours</td>
<td>30.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>19.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 hours</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
discovers that 41 percent reported meetings of two hours or less, while the other 59 percent indicated meetings that were longer than two hours; in fact, 9 percent reported more than three hours for the last board meeting.

At what time was the written agenda distributed to board members?

Table 31 presents the time when the written agenda had been distributed to the board members, for the meeting at which they answered the questionnaire. Eleven percent of the board members reported that the agenda was distributed at least one day in advance of the board meeting. Twenty-eight percent said that the agenda had been distributed at the beginning of the board meeting, but 61 percent reported that no written agenda was distributed to them.

TABLE 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Distribution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four days before meeting</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to three days before meeting</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the beginning of the meeting</td>
<td>27.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No written agenda</td>
<td>61.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Membership in years on this board to the nearest year

Thirty-four percent of the board members responded that they had served less than one year on the present board. Thirty-three
percent had served two years. Twenty-three percent had served from three to four years. Only 11 percent had served more than five years. Table 32 presents membership in years on the board where the members were serving at the time of completing the questionnaire.

**TABLE 32**

MEMBERSHIP IN YEARS ON THIS BOARD TO THE NEAREST YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one</td>
<td>33.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>32.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>23.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than six</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hall (1957) and Reeves (1954) were in agreement that the effectiveness of a school board increases with the years of experience its members have. Reeves found one school board where 17 percent of the members had served only one year; but another board had an eight-year median of service for its members, with 28 percent of the members having served more than ten years on that particular board. Previously in this study of Canadian SDA church schools (see table 21) it was found that only 19 percent of the board members have served more than five years on any school board, and 20 percent of the board members had only one year of experience as board members. It was felt by Morphet (1974) that "overlapping board terms of three to six years" (preferably six) ensured "reasonable continuity" (p. 310).
Number of board meetings missed in the last six months

Table 33 shows the percentage of board member responses indicating the number of board meetings they had missed in the approximate six-month period preceding completion of the questionnaire. It is shown that 35 percent had missed at least one meeting. Thirty-seven percent had not missed any meetings during this time; 5 percent had missed four or more meetings.

TABLE 33
NUMBER OF BOARD MEETINGS MISSED IN LAST SIX MONTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings Missed</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>34.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>8.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>36.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orientation of school board members

Board members were requested to give approximately how much orientation time was provided when they began to serve as board members. Table 34 shows their responses. Seventy-nine percent said that they had no orientation to boardmanship, and a further 7 percent had less than one hour of introductory instruction. The availability of an in-service seminar for board members seemed to be almost non-
existent, according to table 38. A further lack is realized where a closed door policy exists at school board meetings—that is, only board members are allowed. In places where local public school boards maintain open-board meetings, teachers and the community have opportunity to attend and may participate in discussions (see appendix F).

**TABLE 34**

**AMOUNT OF ORIENTATION TIME PROVIDED FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>78.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one hour</td>
<td>7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to four hours</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to eight hours</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight hours or more</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reading of the school board manual and education code book

School board members and principals were asked how much of the General Conference manual for school board members, and the Canadian Union Education Code they had read. Tables 35 and 36 show their responses. Sixty-eight percent indicated having read none of the General Conference board manual, and 10 percent with having read all of it. Sixty-four percent had read none of the Education Code, and 17 percent had read all of it. These percentages may suggest that the General Conference board manual, The School Board of Seventh-day Adventist Elementary Schools, and the Canadian Union Education Code
have not been promoted as mediums of instruction for school board members. Tables 35 and 36 present the distribution of responses to the two statements regarding the reading of school board manuals.

**TABLE 35**

**READING OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE SCHOOL BOARD MANUAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Read</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All of it</td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of it</td>
<td>15.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just browsed through it</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of it</td>
<td>67.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 36**

**READING OF THE CANADIAN UNION EDUCATION CODE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Read</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All of it</td>
<td>16.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of it</td>
<td>12.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just browsed through it</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of it</td>
<td>64.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In-service seminars for school board members during the last five years, and during this year

Table 37 presents the responses of school board members to the questionnaire inquiry regarding the number of times they had
attended a minimum of two hours of an in-service seminar for school board members during the last five years. Ninety-eight percent indicated that they had not attended an in-service seminar in this time.

TABLE 37

IN-SERVICE SEMINARS FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS DURING THE LAST FIVE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Times Attended</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>98.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than three</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps the data shown on table 38 is the reason that the majority of board members have not attended a seminar.

TABLE 38

AVAILABILITY OF IN-SERVICE SEMINAR FOR BOARD MEMBERS THIS YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seminar was available</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38 indicates that 95 percent of the board members responded that there had not been an in-service seminar available for
board members during that school year. The foregoing data indicate that Canadian SDA school board members have not become involved in professional education experience.

McCune (1970, pp. 83-88) found in the California private and parochial high schools he studied that only 6 percent of the board members had membership in a state, local, or national school board association. Thirty-one percent did belong to an educational organization, however. While 50 percent of the board members in McCune's study reported having attended one or more educational conferences during the previous year, only 5 percent reported having attended five or more such conferences in that year. Because 28 percent of the board members had served for more than ten years, and the median term of service was eight years (with several members having reported serving that board for over thirty years, it was a higher than average median), McCune felt that the members did have a deep interest in their local educational program, but that they "evidenced a rather detached view of American education as a whole" (p. 88).

In contrast to this, Reber reported (in a study of California public school board members) that 93 percent of the respondents had membership in professional educational organizations.

**Summary**

During the 1970-78 period in which this study was made, the average length of stay (tenure) of teachers in Canadian SDA church schools in the five conferences studied was 2.00 years. The principals' average tenure was 2.39 years during this same period. There was very little difference between the participating conferences as
to the mobility rates of their teachers and principals. The average mobility rate of teachers in the combined five conferences for the 1970-78 period was 38 percent.

The 282 respondents reported that three significant factors in common were affecting principal and teacher mobility rates. These factors were: (1) discipline problems with students, (2) the school board's decision regarding the poor performance of the teacher or principal, and (3) personality clash with parents of students.

While respondents agreed that all of the proposed factors important to efficient school board operation were of moderate importance, the board members and principals reported that their boards were not generally carrying out these practices.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to identify factors that cause high mobility of teachers and principals in Seventh-day Adventist church schools of Canada by investigating the relationship of opinions between church school board members and the faculty members as to: (1) reasons why principals move, (2) reasons why teachers move, and (3) efficient school board practices.

In addition, the study sought to examine some actual school board practices, and some biographical characteristics of school board members, teachers, and principals in these schools, to provide supplementary information that may lead to further identification of intrinsic or other factors that affect teacher and principal mobility rates. Such characteristics as level of education, experience, professional involvement, and personal background were examined.

The literature indicated that certain biographical characteristics influence the effectiveness of school board members, and thus the effectiveness of the school board. Could an ineffective school board influence teacher/principal mobility rates?
Procedures

The following procedures were utilized in conducting the various phases of the study:

1. A thorough review of the current related literature and research was conducted in order to establish a sound basis for evaluating (a) reasons for principal and teacher mobility, (b) efficient school board practices, and (c) various biographical features of the respondents studied.

2. A check-type questionnaire was developed to facilitate rapid completion and preserve anonymity. When the statements had been refined, a pilot study was initiated with five Canadian students at Andrews University and four Canadian school board members, who critiqued the questionnaire for clarity and relevance of the statements. The questionnaire was then modified in accordance with their suggestions, and those received from consultations with the researcher's committee.

3. Forty-two Canadian schools were chosen for this study. These were selected from the local conference education directors' lists of the sixty-four existing SDA non-boarding church schools who had a record of five years of continuous operation since 1970. The schools that were excluded, as a result of being atypical to the rest of Canada in their education systems, were those located in Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and Quebec.

4. On May 6, 1977, each of the selected schools was sent a packet of materials addressed to the principal. Included in the packet were: (a) a letter explaining the study (b) a letter of support...
for the study by the Canadian Union Education Department, (c) instructions for the principal who would coordinate the project in each school, (d) sufficient questionnaires to enable all teachers, school board members, and principals to participate, (e) sufficient Opscan General Coding Forms on which respondents should mark their responses to the questionnaire statements, and (f) a prepared manilla envelope in which the principal would return all of the completed coding forms to the researcher.

5. Four follow-up letters were sent to the principals during the six months allowed for their responses, and in the last month several long-distance telephone calls were made regarding the missing returns.

6. By November 15, 1977, the predetermined cutoff date, returns from thirty-two of the forty-two schools had been received, and thus a 76 percent participation by schools was realized. Altogether, 282 respondents participated in this study. There were 183 school board members, 74 teachers, and 25 school principals who had completed the questionnaire.

7. The raw data, marked on the Opscan General Coding Forms, were checked for clarity of impression to insure accurate transfer by the Opscan equipment at the Andrews University Computer Center which was utilized to process the analysis.

8. Analysis of the questionnaire data by computer yielded such statistical information as the mean, the median, Spearman's rho values, t test values, and percentages of responses to the various items under investigation. Tables were made according to the printout provided by the computer.
The findings

In the elementary and secondary, non-boarding, SDA church schools of the five Canadian conferences studied, the average mobility rates of teachers and principals during 1970-78 were reported as follow: British Columbia, 38 percent; Alberta, 43 percent; Manitoba-Saskatchewan, 37 percent; Ontario, 33 percent; the Maritimes, 49 percent; and for the combined five conferences it was 38 percent.

The average tenure in years for teachers was 2.00, and for principals it was 2.39 for the combined five conferences.

Reasons for principal mobility

Discipline problems with students was found to be the primary reason given for a principal's transfer. The board's decision regarding his/her poor performance as an administrator was next, followed by personality clash of the principal with parents of students. Two other factors also had a mean response greater than 2.5, thus had some influence on principal mobility. These were: choosing another SDA school, and personality clash with board members.

Factors with less than a 2.5 mean response, signifying "no influence" were: the principal's seeking further education, seeking non-denominational employment, leaving administration for teaching only, or accepting a conference position (such as departmental director, or local pastor).

Reasons for teacher mobility

The primary reason given for teacher mobility was categorized under "other reasons, such as personal family," statement 25 on the
questionnaire. Next to this reason was discipline problems with students. Other factors found to affect the mobility of teachers (mean response greater than 2.5) were: the teacher's choosing to go to another SDA school, the teacher's transfer due to the board's decision regarding his/her poor performance, and personality clash with parents.

Reasons rated by respondents as having "no influence" on a teacher's leaving were: choosing further education, personality clash with board members, personality clash with principal, personality clash with fellow teachers, choosing non-denominational employment, choosing a principalship position, or choosing to enter the ministry.

Factors important to efficient school board operation as compared to actual board practices

Ten factors which respondents considered to be important to efficient school board operation were compared with the reported actual practices of the boards. It was found that while respondents agreed that all of the proposed factors were important to efficient school board operation, the board members and principals reported that their boards were generally not carrying out these practices.

The factors considered to be more important by the board members (listed in the order of higher to lower mean response) were: (1) a comprehensive school evaluation by the local conference every three years, (2) a board policy book to read, (3) a conference in-service seminar program in school management for principals, (4) signed contracts for teachers and principals, (5) newly elected board
members should assume office in July or August rather than in January so that the board term would be according to the school year, not the calendar year, (6) written job descriptions for each teacher and principal, and (7) the principal should prepare a written evaluation of teaching personnel in his school each year. Continuing according to the ranked order of the mean responses, the following factors were also considered to be important by the board members (but the mean response was slightly lower than those listed above): (8) school principals should be board members but not voting members, (9) church pastors should be board members but not voting members, (10) a three-year term of service for all board members, (11) an in-service seminar program for board members, (12) a maximum of two hours allowed for each board meeting, (13) agendas distributed at least four days before each board meeting, and (14) only five to seven members on the board.

According to the ranking of their mean responses, faculty members considered the list to be important in the following order: (1) a board policy book to read, (2) a conference in-service seminar program in school management for principals, (3) newly elected board members should assume office in July or August rather than in January, (4) a comprehensive school evaluation by the local conference every three years, (5) an in-service seminar program for board members, and (6) signed contracts for teachers and principals. Again, continuing with factors according to ranked mean responses (but slightly lower than the above six), faculty members considered the following also to be important: (7) agendas distributed at least four days before each meeting, (8) written job descriptions for each teacher and principal,
(9) a maximum of two hours allowed for each board meeting, (10) the principal should prepare a written evaluation of teaching personnel in his school each year, (11) a three-year term of service for all board members, (12) church pastors should be board members but not voting members, (13) school principals should be board members but not voting members, and (14) only five to seven members on the board.

Biographical characteristics of SDA school boards, school board members, teachers, and principals in Canada

**Age.** The median age of the respondents was found to be: 41.2 years for board members, 35.7 years for teachers, and 35.5 years for principals.

**Sex.** Respondents reported that about one-third (34 percent) of the board members were women; 69 percent of the teachers were women, and 80 percent of the principals were men.

**Marital status.** Ninety-five percent of the board members, 72 percent of the teachers, and 68 percent of the principals reported being married. Amongst the respondents a very small percentage reported that they were divorced. Four percent of the teachers said that they were widowed. Thirty-five percent of the respondents indicated single status—24 percent of the teachers, 8 percent of the principals, and 2 percent of the school board members.

**Educational level.** A senior college degree was the level of education reported by 20 percent of the board members, 55 percent of the teachers, and 76 percent of the principals. In addition to these, a master's degree was reported by 10 percent of the board members, 11 percent of the teachers, and 12 percent of the principals. The
education level of teaching personnel in SDA church schools compares favorably with that reported of public school elementary and secondary teaching staff in Canada.

Citizenship. Canadian citizenship was reported by 83 percent of the board members, 81 percent of the teachers, and 76 percent of the principals. The next most frequent citizenship reported was of the United States of America (between 13-16 percent) by all three groups of respondents.

Board size. Eight members was the median reported for the number of members on the school board. Seven or fewer members on the board was reported by 24 percent of the respondents, while fifteen or more members on their board was reported by 16 percent. Other studies reported 22 as the median number of members on private and parochial school boards, while 5 to 7 elected members was the trend in public schools. In the parochial and private schools there were almost as many ex officio and appointed members as there were elected members—McCune (1970) reported 27 percent appointed by a sponsoring agency, 28 percent ex officio, and 45 percent duly elected (in the selected private and parochial high schools he studied in California—many of which were SDA academies, incidentally) p. 81. The larger board size seemed to be due to multiple sponsoring churches or other agencies related to Protestant parochial schools (p. 89), McCune reported.

Church representation. In the Canadian SDA non-boarding church schools studied, 40 percent of the respondents reported that their school was sponsored by one church, and 22 percent indicated two sponsoring churches, thus more than 62 percent of the respondents reported that their school board had only one or two churches repre-
presented. Thirty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that their schools were sponsored by more than two churches; in fact, 11 percent reported that six churches were represented on their school board.

**Signed contracts.** While 23 percent of the respondents reported that teachers and principals had signed contracts, 70 percent indicated that there were no written agreements for teachers.

**Teaching experience.** Board members generally reported having had little teaching experience, although 16 percent of them did indicate having had one year. Seventy-seven percent of the teacher respondents reported having had more than three years of teaching experience; 84 percent of the principals also reported having had more than three years of teaching experience. This seems to compare favorably with statistics for Canadian public elementary and secondary school teachers.

**Principalship experience.** Experience as school principals was reported by all three groups of respondents. Only a year of experience was reported by 17 percent of the board members, 18 percent of the teachers, and 4 percent of the principals. Sixty percent of the principals have had more than four years of experience, and 36 percent of them reported having more than eleven years.

**Board membership experience.** Fifty-five percent of the school board members reported having more than three years of experience on a school board, while 39 percent indicated having one to two years. While 51 percent of the teachers reported having had no experience on a school board, 42 percent reported some experience. Principals reported having almost an equal amount of years of experience as board members as they reported for principalship experience. Apparently
this reflects the fact that the school principal is usually a member of the school board.

Job moves. The questionnaire responses showed that 53 percent of the board members have never moved from their jobs during the last eight years. Thirty-six percent of the teachers also reported that they have not changed jobs in that time. Twenty-four percent of the principals reported having remained the full eight years in administration in one place.

One to five job moves since starting full-time employment was reported by 42 percent of the board members, 52 percent of the principals and 52 percent of the teachers. Indicating having never changed job locations were 26 percent of the board members, 23 percent of the teachers, and 12 percent of the principals.

Evaluation of teachers. Eighty-four percent of the respondents reported that the principals had not given written evaluations of the teachers' work to the teachers that year, or they did not know whether such evaluations had been given.

Evaluations of schools by local conferences. Forty percent of the respondents indicated that there had been no official written evaluation of their school by the local conference in the preceding three years and 36 percent indicated that they did not know if there had been an evaluation.

Board elections. Fifty-six percent of the respondents indicated that their school board members were elected for a one-year term of office. Fifteen percent of the board members indicated that they had ex officio status. Trends reported in the literature indicated that school board members in the United States are elected for
terms of three to six years—longer terms and overlapping terms are preferable. It was generally agreed that increased experience on the board by its members improved the board's effectiveness on the whole.

**Time of assuming office for board members.** Forty-one percent of the board members were elected to begin their term of service in January or February, it was reported, while 46 percent were to begin in September or October. Thus, only about one-half of the school boards coincided their term beginning with a new school year.

**Board meeting schedules.** Regular meetings each month were reported for their school board by 78 percent of the respondents. No regular meeting schedule was reported by 17 percent. Emergency meetings held in addition during the previous six-month period were reported as follow: one meeting by 37 percent, two meetings by 30 percent, three meetings by 18 percent, and more than five emergency meetings by 9 percent.

**Length of board meetings.** Respondents reported that their last board meeting had lasted anywhere from less than one hour up to more than three hours. Fifty-eight percent indicated that their meeting had lasted two and one-half hours or more, while 6 percent reported that their board had met for one hour or less.

**Written agendas.** Regarding written agendas for the board meeting, the respondents reported the following: 61 percent indicated that no written agenda had been given to them; 28 percent received the agenda at the beginning of the board meeting; 6 percent reported receiving the agenda one to three days before the meeting, and 5 percent reported having the agenda four days before the meeting.
Number of years on present board. Less than two years of service on the present board was reported by 66 percent of the board member respondents, while 11 percent had served more than five years.

Meetings missed. Thirty-seven percent of the board members indicated that they did not miss a meeting in the previous six months, while 35 percent had missed one meeting during that time.

Orientation. Seventy-nine percent of the board members indicated that they had no orientation program to board membership prior to assuming their duties with the board, but respondents indicated earlier in the questionnaire that they felt in-service seminars for board members had moderate importance to efficient school board operation.

School board manual. Sixty-seven percent of the board members reported that they had never read the General Conference school board manual; likewise, 64 percent had not read the Canadian Union Education Code.

In-service training. It was reported by 98 percent of the board members and principals that they had never attended a minimum of even two hours of an in-service seminar for school board members during the last five years. Only 5 percent indicated that there had been an in-service seminar available to their board during the year that this study was made. Members indicated feeling that in-service seminars were moderately important to efficient school board operation.

Statistical method. Since it was the purpose of this study to identify factors that cause high mobility of teachers and principals in Canadian SDA church schools by investigating the relationship
of opinions between school board members and faculty members on the topics: principal mobility, teacher mobility, and efficient school board operation (as stated in the hypotheses), the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient was chosen to describe and test the hypotheses. Mean responses from the two groups of respondents (school board members and school faculty members) were calculated, then ranked. The statistical test to test whether there was a correlation between the ranked mean responses of the board members and the faculty members was the t test. If the calculated t was greater than the critical value for t (obtained from a table of the t-distribution), then the null hypothesis (that there was no correlation between mean responses of the board members and faculty members) was rejected. As a result, the alternative hypothesis would be retained because a statistical significance at the .05 level did exist between the mean responses of the school board members and the faculty members.

The above statistical devices were used with the mean responses to statements 1-39 of the questionnaire.

Table 4 shows the ranking of the combined mean responses to statements 1-13, reasons why principals move. Table 5 shows the statistical correlation of the mean responses to statements 1-13. Using Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient, a rho score value of .783 was achieved. To test the significance of Spearman's rho, a t test was administered. A t value of 4.175 was obtained. This value was then compared to the critical t value, 2.201. The null hypothesis was rejected. The alternative hypothesis was retained—that is, a significant relationship did exist between the mean responses of the board members and the faculty members regarding
statements 1-13, reasons why principals move. In other words, the school board members, teachers, and principals agreed on the reasons given for why (or why not) a principal moved.

Table 6 shows the ranking of combined mean responses to statements 14-25, reasons why teachers move. Table 7 shows the statistical correlation of the mean responses to statements 14-25. Using Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient, a rho score value of .909 was achieved. The critical value of t at the .05 level was 2.228. Since the t value was 6.901, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was retained—that is, a significant relationship did exist between the mean responses of the board members and the faculty members regarding the reasons why teachers move.

Table 8 shows the ranking of the combined mean responses to questionnaire statements 26-39, proposed factors important to efficient school board operation. Table 9 shows the statistical correlation of the mean responses to statements 26-39. Using Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient, the rho score value was .675; the critical value of t (at the .05 level) was 2.179. The t value of 3.167 resulted in a decision to reject the null hypothesis. The alternative hypothesis was retained—that is, a significant relationship did exist between the mean responses of the board members and the faculty members regarding statements 26-39, proposed factors important to efficient school board operation.

Conclusions

The following conclusions have been drawn from this study of Canadian SDA church schools during the 1970-78 period in the five con-
ferences of British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba-Saskatchewan, Ontario, and the Maritimes:

1. Teacher and principal mobility rates in Canadian SDA church schools are considerably higher than teacher and principal mobility rates in the Canadian public school system.

2. The three statistically-significant common factors which affect the mobility of teachers and principals in the SDA church schools are: (a) discipline problems with students, (b) the school board's decision regarding the poor performance of the teacher or of the principal, and (c) personality clash of the teacher or principal with parents of students.

3. The SDA church school boards are not generally following the practices which the school board and faculty respondents indicated were moderately important to efficient school board operation. The factors considered were (in the order of highest combined mean response to the lowest combined mean response):
   (a) a board policy book to read
   (b) a conference in-service seminar program in school management for principals
   (c) a comprehensive school evaluation by the local conference every three years
   (d) newly elected board members should assume office in July or August rather than in January so that the board term would be according to the school year, not the calendar year
   (e) signed contracts for teachers and principals
   (f) the principal should prepare a written evaluation of teaching personnel in his school each year
(g) an in-service seminar program for board members
(h) school principals should be board members but not voting members
(i) a maximum of two hours allowed for each board meeting
(j) a three-year term of service for all board members
(k) church pastors should be board members but not voting members
(l) agendas distributed at least four days before each board meeting
(m) only five to seven members on the board

Recommendations

Whereas, principal and teacher mobility rates in the SDA elementary-secondary non-boarding church schools studied in Canada have been found to be higher than the principal and teacher mobility rates reported for the public elementary and secondary schools in Canada; and whereas, the factors found to affect teacher and principal mobility involve student discipline, teacher/principal performance as decided by the school board, and teacher-parent conflicts; and whereas, the school boards are not generally following certain practices considered to be important to efficient school board operation (as judged and reported by the school board members, and school faculty members); therefore, it is recommended:

1. To the Canadian Union Conference Department of Education, to develop plans (utilizing the services of Andrews University Department of Education) for implementing:
   (a) in-service training seminars for school board members
(b) in-service training seminars in school management for school principals

c) written contracts and job descriptions for school faculty

2. To the local conference departments of education, in cooperation with the Canadian Union Conference Department of Education, to implement:

(a) the in-service training seminars for school board members and principals

(b) comprehensive school evaluations

(c) signed contracts and written job descriptions for teachers and principals

3. To the local school boards, to implement:

(a) orientation of new school board members

(b) innovations as necessary (in cooperation with their local sponsoring church communities) such as the following:

(1) hold school board elections in April or May

(2) coincide school board terms so that they begin when a new school year begins

(3) limit the size of the school board to less than ten elected members, preferably five to seven members

(4) have the pastor of the church and the school principal to serve as ex officio members on the school board, but not as voting members

(c) fulfillment of the duties of the school board as outlined in the various available school and school board manuals published by the General Conference Department of Education, as well as the Canadian Union Education Code.
4. **To the school principals, to implement:**

   (a) written evaluations of teachers' work (in multi-room schools), discussing the individual evaluation with the respective evaluator in order to avoid any misunderstanding between the principal and the teacher

   (b) fulfillment of the duties of the school faculty members as outlined in the various school manuals published by the General Conference, as well as the Canadian Union Education Code.

**Guidelines and suggestions for implementing the recommendations**

A few guidelines and suggestions for implementing the above recommendations follow:

1. For the orientation and in-service training of school board members, it is suggested that a packet of information concerning the responsibilities of boardmanship be supplied to every school board member, especially all new board members. This packet could contain a board policy book; a summary of the duties of a board member; a copy or summary of the Canadian Union Education Code; a list of possible sources of information relevant to boardmanship—such as, bibliography of national, provincial, and local educational association and school board association journals, as well as SDA denominational resource books, journals of education, and compilations from the area of education as found in the writings of Ellen G. White.

2. Regarding school board elections, if elections occurred in April or May, new board members might be requested to visit one school board meeting before the old school year closed, as an effort
toward beginning orientation. New board members could begin serving in their elected capacity as soon as the old school year closed. This would permit time for orientation of new board members, and would not interrupt the continuity of board structure once the school year is underway, as is the case when new members begin serving in January.

3. Regarding board term length, if members were elected for overlapping terms of three years at a time, this would insure reasonable continuity of operation. Experience as a board member would be built up. Since the experience of a board member affects school board efficiency as a whole, according to previous studies, this would be an effort toward improving board efficiency.

4. Regarding board size, with large boards it is difficult to have a close, working relationship between the board and the school faculty. A large board produces insecurity for the school administration of a small school.

5. Orientation of new school board members, given at the beginning of a new board term, and the beginning of a new school year, should be at least one hour of scheduled time to permit explanations in the areas of role expectations of board members and the process of effective boardmanship as it relates to the efficiency of the total board.

6. In-service education for board members could be supplemented with subscriptions to school board journals, and with mailed informational materials from the local conference department of education between the times when seminars were held.

7. School board leadership training would benefit the school board
chairman, and the school principal (the principal often serves as secretary to the school board). Items that could be studied might include: (a) the making of agendas, (b) the preparation of supportive material for items on the agenda, and planning for distributing agendas in advance of scheduled meetings to allow time for members to become knowledgeable of issues at hand, (c) how to limit the time spent at board meetings, and how to make the best use of that time, (d) the writing of minutes, and (e) other aspects of leadership training necessary for conducting efficient school board meetings.

8. After making comprehensive school evaluations, the evaluations should be written, then explained to the school board of each particular school.

9. Regarding whether or not the pastor and the principal should vote at board meetings, consider the position of a board member, who feels that he should be "loyal" to each of these persons because of the professional positions which they hold, yet if there is a diversity of opinions between the principal and the pastor, how should the board member vote to avoid embarrassment? In this respect, the suggestion of other studies to not have any ex officio board members can be better understood. Reeves (1954, p. 14) brought this principle to the fore (although referring to a slightly different situation, yet it seems relevant) when he said that an ex officio board member may not realize it but he may use his position for personal political purposes and that this problem was considerably aggravated in the case of private schools who feel that their very existence may hinge on the approval of these ex
officio board members. Also, as was stated in the 1976 *SDA Encyclopedia* about the church pastor— he "is an ex officio member of any committee, but directs his church by influence rather than by any authority vested in him" (p. 1083).

10. Job descriptions and written contracts would lend security to the participants of the agreement—in this case, to the teaching personnel and the local conference which pays the teachers' salaries.

**Implications for further research**

The following is a list of suggestions for further research:

1. A study of the methods of public school operation and how they differ from SDA church school operation.

2. A study of the effectiveness of school board members in the SDA school system as compared to the effectiveness of board members in the public school system.

3. A study of the expectations held for school board members, principals and teachers in SDA schools, by the conference education department, and by the local church.

4. A study of the leadership behavior of school principals in small SDA schools, and the role expectations of the principal by the school board members, other teachers in the school, and by the parents of students.

5. A study of conference education directors regarding role expectations of the director by the constituency he serves, and whether conference education directors influence the mobility rates of school personnel.

6. A study of the role expectations of teachers in SDA schools as held by the teachers, principals, and the constituency they serve.
APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS AND QUESTIONNAIRE
To the Principals:

Your help in coordinating this survey is much appreciated.

Instructions for Administering the Questionnaire

1. The questionnaire is to be completed anonymously by the school principal, all teachers, and the school board members connected with your school. It is suggested that the principal and teachers do their questionnaires at the school, and that the board members be given theirs at the next board meeting. It is urgent that this be done before the close of the 1976-77 school year. Please arrange this with your school board chairman.

2. Teachers and principals will use the questionnaires first, marking their responses on the General Coding Forms. The principal will collect the questionnaires for redistribution at the next school board meeting when board members will be given their questionnaires. They will also anonymously mark their responses on the General Coding Forms.

3. Responses to the questionnaire will be tabulated by computer. It is, therefore, necessary that all responses be marked in pencil on the General Coding Forms that are enclosed. Do not use pen and ink because the computer does not pick up ink.

4. The General Coding Forms only will need to be collected and returned in the self-addressed envelopes by mail to Mr. Kuhn. The questionnaires themselves may be destroyed following administration to the school board members.

5. Teachers need to complete only sections I and II of the questionnaire, questions 1-56. Principals and board members are requested to complete the entire questionnaire. Please ask all respondents to write the name of the school only on the lower right hand corner of the General Coding Form.

6. Please go over the instructions with the teachers and board members before they begin to answer the questions. A supply of #2 pencils may be necessary.

7. If you have any questions that seem urgent, you may call me collect. Telephone No. (616) 471-6806. Thank you.

Sincerely,

L. R. Kuhn, Doctoral Candidate
Andrews University
This questionnaire is part of a study on why principals and teachers move from one job to another, and on how school boards operate in the Canadian Union. Teachers will complete only Sections I and II, while principals and board members will complete the entire questionnaire.

Note: Use only pencils to mark your answers on the General Coding Forms. This is necessary for computer processing. Thank you.

SECTION I (To be completed by principals, teachers, and board members)

Parts A and B of this section are prepared to get your evaluation on the reasons why teachers and principals have moved from your school.

Directions:
Do not mark your responses on the questionnaire itself. Use the General Coding Form. See EXAMPLE below.

On your General Coding Form draw a line (with pencil) through:

- Numerals 5 if this statement had great influence
- Numerals 4 if it had moderate influence
- Numerals 3 if it had little influence
- Numerals 2 if it had no influence
- Numerals 1 if you don't know

The numerals "0", "8", and "9" will never be used on the General Coding Form in this questionnaire.

EXAMPLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Coding Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-8-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-9-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Question No. 1, the numeral "2" is marked if you decide that personality clash with teachers had no influence on the reason why the last principal left the school.

Part A. The last principal left this school because of:

1. Personality clash with teachers
2. Personality clash with board members
3. Personality clash with parents
4. Discipline problems with students
5. Choosing further education
6. Choosing another Seventh-day Adventist school
7. Choosing to enter the ministry
8. Choosing to be a classroom teacher only
9. Choosing non-denominational employment
10. Choosing to accept a conference position
11. The board's decision regarding his/her poor financial management of the school
12. The board's decision regarding his/her poor performance as an administrator
13. Other reasons, such as personal family

Part B. The last teacher left teaching in this school because of:

   (If more than one teacher left at the same time, choose one for consideration in your answers)

14. Personality clash with principal
15. Personality clash with board members
16. Personality clash with fellow teachers
17. Personality clash with parents
18. Discipline problems with students
19. Choosing a principalship position
20. Choosing non-denominational employment
21. Choosing employment at another Seventh-day Adventist school
22. Choosing to enter the ministry
23. Choosing further education
24. The board's decision regarding his/her poor performance
25. Other reasons, such as personal family

Part C, on school board operation, follows. It has been prepared for evaluation by principals, teachers, and board members.
Part C. To what degree are these factors important to efficient school board operation?

(To be completed by principals, teachers, and board members)

Directions:

On your General Coding Form draw a line through:

- Numeral 5 if the statement has great importance
- Numeral 4 if it has moderate importance
- Numeral 3 if it makes no difference
- Numeral 2 if it has little importance
- Numeral 1 if it has no importance

26. Only five to seven members on the board
27. A three year term of service for all board members
28. Agendas distributed at least four days before each board meeting
29. A maximum of two hours allowed for each board meeting
30. An inservice seminar program for board members
31. A board policy book to read
32. Newly elected board members should assume office in July or August rather than in January so that the board term would be according to the school year, not the calendar year
33. Church pastors should be board members but not voting members
34. School principals should be board members but not voting members
35. Written job descriptions for each teacher and principal
36. Signed contracts for teachers and principals
37. A conference inservice seminar program in school management, for principals
38. The principal should prepare a written evaluation of teaching personnel in his school each year
39. A comprehensive school evaluation by the local conference every three years

Section II follows and is to be completed by principals, teachers, and board members.
SECTION II BIOGRAPHICAL
To be completed by principals, teachers, and board members

Directions:
Choose only one answer to each question and draw a line through the corresponding numeral on your General Coding Form

40. Your position: (1) teacher, (2) principal, (3) board chairman, (4) pastor, (5) secretary of board, (6) board member, (7) principal/teacher of a school with three or fewer teachers

41. In what conference are you: (1) Maritime, (2) Ontario, (3) Manitoba-Saskatchewan, (4) Alberta, (5) British Columbia

42. Your age: (1) 25 or less, (2) 26-30, (3) 31-39, (4) 40-49, (5) 50-59, (6) 60 or more

43. Sex: (1) male, (2) female

44. Current marital status: (1) single, (2) married, (3) separated, (4) divorced, (5) widowed

45. Present highest level of education: (1) less than high school graduation, (2) high school graduate, (3) Jr. college graduate, (4) senior college degree, (5) master's degree, (6) doctor's degree

46. Present citizenship: (1) Canadian, (2) U.S.A., (3) European, (4) Latin American, (5) Asian, (6) Other

47. How many members are on your school board? (1) seven or less, (2) 8-10, (3) 11-14, (4) 15-20, (5) 21 or more

48. How many churches are represented by members on your board? (1) one, (2) two, (3) three, (4) four, (5) five, (6) six or more

49. Do your teachers and the principal have signed contracts? (1) Yes, (2) No

50. Your total number of years of experience as a teacher: (include this school and other places you have been in your answers for 50, 51, & 52) (1) one or less, (2) two, (3) three, (4) four to five, (5) six to ten, (6) eleven or more, (7) none

51. Your total number of years of experience as a principal: (1) one or less, (2) two, (3) three, (4) four to five, (5) six to ten, (6) eleven or more, (7) none

52. Your total number of years of experience as a school board member: (1) one or less, (2) two, (3) three, (4) four to five, (5) six to ten, (6) eleven or more, (7) none

53. Number of job moves since 1970: (1) I have not moved, (2) one move, (3) two moves, (4) three moves, (5) four moves, (6) five or more
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54. Total number of transfers from one job location to another since you started full time employment? (1) 1-5, (2) 6-10, (3) 11-15, (4) 16-20, (5) 21 or more, (6) none

55. Has the principal given written evaluations of the teachers' work to the teachers this year? (1) Yes, (2) No, (3) I don't know

56. Has your school had an official written evaluation by the local conference during the last three years? (1) Yes, (2) No, (3) I don't know

This concludes Sections I and II. Thank you, teachers, for your help.

Section III, following, should be completed by board members and principals.

SECTION III Biographical. Use the same directions used in Section II.

To be completed by board members and principals

57. Your current elected term as a school board member is (1) one year, (2) two years, (3) three years, (4) four years, (5) ex officio


59. How often are your regular board meetings held? (1) no regular schedule, (2) once a month, (3) twice a month, (4) once a quarter, (5) other,

60. How many "emergency meetings" (those scheduled in addition to regular meetings) have you had since January 1, 1977? (1) one, (2) two, (3) three, (4) four, (5) five, (6) more than five

61. How long was your last board meeting? (Choose the nearest time) (1) 1 hr. or less, (2) 1½ hrs., (3) 2 hrs, (4) 2½ hrs., (5) 3 hrs., (6) more than 3 hrs.

62. When was the written agenda for this board meeting given to you? (1) 4 or more days ago, (2) 1-3 days ago, (3) at the beginning of this meeting, (4) no written agenda for each member

63. How many years have you been on this board to the nearest year? (1) less than 1 yr., (2) 1-2 yrs., (3) 3-4 yrs., (4) 5-6 yrs., (5) more than 6 yrs.

64. Number of board meetings you have missed since January 1, 1977: (1) one, (2) two, (3) three, (4) four, (5) five or more, (6) none

65. How much orientation to your duties as a school board member did you have? (1) none, (2) less than 1 hour, (3) 1-4 hrs., (4) 5-8 hrs., (5) more than 8 hrs.
66. How much have you read of the General Conference school board manual? 
   (1) all, (2) part, (3) just browsed through, (4) none

67. How much have you read of the Canadian Union Education Code? 
   (1) all, (2) part, (3) just browsed through, (4) none

68. How many times have you attended a minimum of 2 hours of an inservice 
    seminar for school board members during the last five years? 
    (1) none, (2) one time, (3) two times, (4) three times, 
    (5) more than three times

69. Has an inservice seminar been made available to your board this 
    year? (1) Yes, (2) No

This concludes Section III and the questionnaire complete.
Thank you very much for your participation.
Please write the name of your school only on the bottom right corner of 
your General Coding Form before returning it to the principal for 
mailing to Andrews University. Do not fold the General Coding Form.
APPENDIX B

CANADIAN UNION CONFERENCE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT LETTERS

Letter to the Associate Director of Education
Letter of Support from the Associate Director
Memo from the Associate Director
Dear Elder Graham:

Currently I am working on a study dealing with the composition and effectiveness of Seventh-day Adventist school boards in the Canadian elementary and secondary schools, as part of my doctoral program requirements at Andrews University.

To make this study as comprehensive as possible I am writing to each of the Conference Education Directors for permission to use the school board members, principals, teachers, and pastors in their conference as samples for whom anonymous responses might be received through a questionnaire.

I believe you would want to recommend such a study and that, hopefully, worthwhile recommendations regarding the upgrading of the school board structure and greater effectiveness of the board will result.

May I ask your assistance? I would appreciate a list of all the schools in the Canadian Union with their addresses. This is to be used as a check list for each of the conferences. Also, could you send me any school board orientation or policy books that are being used in the Union or local conferences?

Thank you in advance for your cooperation in sending this list and any school board booklets as promptly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

Lloyd R. Kuhn, Doctoral Candidate

Bernard L. M. Hall, PhD
Professor of Education and Student Advisor

LK:ek
April 1, 1977

To Whom It May Concern

Mr. Leroy R. Kuhn is a Canadian student at Andrews University where he is pursuing a doctoral study program in Educational Administration and Supervision. He has previously served as a teacher and principal in our schools in Canada. In addition, Mr. Kuhn has directed and developed education programs overseas.

Mr. Kuhn's research project is pertinent to the Seventh-day Adventist program of Christian education in Canada. I trust that you will assist Mr. Kuhn in providing information by completing questionnaires which may be sent to you. Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,

M. Graham
Associate Director of Education

MG:1
MEMO: RE. L. R. Kuhn's statement on Teacher Mobility

(1) Rapidly expanding education programs have contributed to added teacher mobility and turnover from the fact that, percentage wise, considerable numbers of new teachers have been added from year to year and appear as one-year teachers. At the same time, longer term teachers have been called to start some new schools and to serve the needs of expanding programs in existing schools.

(2) Several conferences are attempting to upgrade teaching staff by hiring teachers who are more professionally qualified in order to meet the demands of education programs today.

(3) Teachers also sometimes prefer relocation to areas where their own children can have opportunity to continue their education on the secondary and/or college level.

(4) Considerable interest is shown in Canadian teachers in respect to teacher appointments to the mission field.

(5) The cost of living, especially housing costs, sometimes plays a role in teachers seeking relocation.

(6) Until recently, the stabilizing influence of full-time education superintendents and secretaries, specific handbook and conference level Education Code books, specific employment policies, and policies to encourage teachers' professional growth and long-term residency at a particular school have not been fully appreciated.

Oshawa, Ontario
October 27, 1977

M. S. Graham
APPENDIX C

LETTERS OF INTRODUCTION

Letter to Principals, Teachers, and Board Members
Letter to Conference Education Directors
School Principals, Teachers, and Board Members
Canadian Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists

Dear Principals, Teachers, and Board Members:

Currently we are engaged in a study to determine the mobility rates of teachers in the Canadian Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, and the operation of school boards.

The study involves the administering of a questionnaire to teachers, principals, and school board members in fifty-five schools across Canada. The school principal of each school is requested to administer the questionnaires and return the enclosed General Coding Forms with responses, as soon as possible. We realize that you are extremely busy at this time, however, we request that you complete and return the coding forms before the close of the current (1976-77) school year.

Mr. Graham, the Associate Director of Education of the Canadian Union Conference, has given his support for this study and a letter from him is enclosed. Information concerning the results of this study will be sent to the Conference and Union Conference Education Directors.

We appreciate your cooperation and are indebted to you for contributing to the success of our research study.

Thanking you in advance for your support.

Sincerely,

Leroy R. Kuhn
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Education

Dr. Bernard M. Lall
Professor of Educational Administration

May 6, 1977
May 6, 1977

Conference Education Directors of the
Canadian Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists

Dear Education Directors:

You have been very helpful in sending the lists of teachers and principals from 1970-1977 in your conferences. Thank you very much. The enclosed questionnaire, for your own perusal, is a sample of those sent to each of the schools in your conference. Hopefully, the data received will be helpful to our educational program in Canada.

The questionnaires are being completed by teachers, principals, and school board members during these next few weeks before school is out. This research is to determine the mobility rate of teachers and principals in the Canadian Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, and the operation of school boards. We will keep you informed on the results of the survey.

Your support and encouragement for this research is much appreciated. Any suggestions or information that would make this research more meaningful is welcome.

Sincerely yours,

Leroy Kuhn
Leroy R. Kuhn, Doctoral Candidate
Andrews University Department of Education

cc: N. O. Matthews, Director of Education, Canadian Union Conference
M. Graham, Associate Director of Education
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APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTERS

Letters to Principals: May 20, 1977; June 17, 1977; September 7, 1977; and November 10, 1977 (with enclosure on mobility rates)
May 20, 1977

School Principals
Canadian Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists

Dear Principals:

Two weeks ago we sent you a packet of questionnaires that are part of a study to determine the mobility rates of teachers in the Canadian Union Conference, and the operation of school boards.

We realize that you are extremely busy at this time, however, may we impose upon your good graces and remind you that the completion of the coding forms by you, your teachers, and your school board members is requested before the closing of the current (1976-77) school year, and returned to us at your earliest convenience?

The information, to be used for statistical purposes, will not reveal the identity of either you or your school individually.

Thank you very much indeed, for your assistance in this project. If your coding forms are already in the mail, please disregard this letter, and accept our thanks.

Yours sincerely,

Leroy R. Kuhn, Doctoral Candidate
Department of Education

Dr. Bernard M. Lall, Professor of Educational Administration
June 17, 1977

School Principals
Canadian Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists

Dear Principals:

Thank you very much for your responses thus far to the questionnaire concerning teacher and principal mobility in the Canadian Union. We are sorry that some of the packets to you were unduly delayed in the mail. Because some of you did not receive them in the time we had planned, we are writing to let you know that we are still very interested in your responses and will appreciate receiving them whenever you are able to get them completed.

We apologize for any inconvenience this has imposed upon you at this busy time of the year. We hope, however, that it was possible for the teachers to complete their questionnaires before any of them left for the summer because the study will be more accurate if all teachers and board members participate.

May we ask for your further assistance in finalizing the collection of data by answering the following questions:

1. Name of your school _________________________________

2. The exact number of members on your school board _____

3. The school principal is a member of your school board? Yes ___ No ____

4. The completed General Coding Forms for the questionnaire have already been sent to Andrews University. Yes ___ No ____

5. The General Coding Forms will be completed and sent to Andrews University by the following expected date? ____________________

(Please tear off this portion of the page with questions you have answered and return it to us in the enclosed self-addressed envelope)

Thank you again for your participation in this survey.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Leroy Hubbard
September 7, 1977

TO THE PRINCIPALS OF ALL SCHOOLS IN CANADA

Dear Principals:

Last May a questionnaire concerning teacher mobility was sent to you. It was to arrive the middle of May, but unfortunately was delayed and arrived too late to be completed before school closed.

Twenty schools have already responded and as the new school year is about to begin we hope that the rest of the schools will also complete the questionnaires and return them to me. In order for the analysis of the data to be more accurate, we would like to have every school involved in this questionnaire. We appreciate your taking some time to complete the questionnaire so that it can be included in our study.

Enclosed are the stamps to cover the cost of mailing the coding forms. I was unable to get Canadian stamps until the opportunity came to me to come to Canada and purchase them.

Thank you for your coding forms at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Leroy Kuhn
Doctoral Candidate
Andrews University

LK/jfb
Dear Fellow Colleagues:

Enclosed for your perusal is a partial report of the first part of my study on the mobility rates of teachers and principals in Canadian Seventh-day Adventist Schools. During the eight year period study on the mobility rates of teachers and principals in Canadian Seventh-day Adventist Schools. During the eight year period from 1970-1978 it appears that the average turnover rate was approximately forty percent. This percentage was calculated from the six conferences studied in the Canadian Union (see the

Your responses to the questionnaire will help to finalize the second part of the study regarding possible factors contributing to these mobility rates. I very much appreciate the good cooperation you have given.

The results of this study will be available to you by contacting your local conference office education department when the study is completed. This final analysis can only be made as soon as we hear from those schools who have not yet responded.

Thank you again for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Leroy R. Kuhn

P.S. ☐ To date I have received the responses from your school.

☐ To date I have not received the responses from your school.
### PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS ACCORDING TO LENGTH OF SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 yr.</th>
<th>2 yrs.</th>
<th>3 yrs.</th>
<th>4 yrs.</th>
<th>5 yrs.</th>
<th>6 yrs.</th>
<th>7 yrs.</th>
<th>8 yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - S</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>31.42</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>47.66</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritimes</td>
<td>53.94</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nfld</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>25.29</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

470 TEACHERS
CONF. AVERAGE 46.17% 23.62% 12.34% 6.8% 5.32% 1.91% .85% 2.34%

### TEACHER TURNOVER RATES BY YEAR IN PERCENTAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>71-72</th>
<th>72-73</th>
<th>73-74</th>
<th>74-75</th>
<th>75-76</th>
<th>76-77</th>
<th>77-78</th>
<th>8 Year Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>55.87</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td>58.40</td>
<td>41.48</td>
<td>26.24</td>
<td>51.19</td>
<td>51.42</td>
<td>45.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>27.98</td>
<td>58.93</td>
<td>37.67</td>
<td>45.05</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>40.95</td>
<td>42.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.04</td>
<td>30.83</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>44.15</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>31.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>39.58</td>
<td>35.12</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>48.24</td>
<td>34.44</td>
<td>48.88</td>
<td>32.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritimes</td>
<td>61.11</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>61.11</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nfld</td>
<td>43.61</td>
<td>44.82</td>
<td>26.95</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>32.38</td>
<td>35.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CANADIAN TURNOVER RATE BY YEAR 38.03% 42.63% 37.68% 40.89% 46.77% 39.97% 33.8% 40.09%

### LENGTH OF STAY OF TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS BY CONFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Years in One Place Before Moved</td>
<td>No. of Years in One Place Before Moved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - S</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritimes</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nfld</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADIAN AVERAGE</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX E

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 39: Mobility Rates and Tenure of Teachers and Principals in British Columbia
Table 40: Mobility Rates and Tenure of Teachers and Principals in Alberta
Table 41: Mobility Rates and Tenure of Teachers and Principals in Manitoba-Saskatchewan
Table 42: Mobility Rates and Tenure of Teachers and Principals in Ontario
Table 43: Mobility Rates and Tenure of Teachers and Principals in The Maritimes
TABLE 39
MOBILITY RATES AND TENURE OF TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS
IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>Mobility Rate in Percentage</th>
<th>Average Tenure in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.71</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>32.29</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34.39</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>41.43</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighted average 37.73 1.92 2.16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>Mobility Rate in Percentage</th>
<th>Average Tenure in Years</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Teachers</td>
<td>For Principals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.43</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>42.25</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.22</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>40.46</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>55.95</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted average</td>
<td>42.79</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 41

MOBILITY RATES AND TENURE OF TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS
IN MANITOBA-SASKATCHEWAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>Mobility Rate in Percentage</th>
<th>Average Tenure in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Teachers For Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>8.00 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>2.00 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>36.90</td>
<td>1.92 2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>2.00 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted average</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>3.48 2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 42

MOBILITY RATES AND TENURE OF TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS IN ONTARIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>Mobility Rate in Percentage</th>
<th>Average Tenure in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.42</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>42.85</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>47.57</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted average</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.90</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Number</td>
<td>Mobility Rate in Percentage</td>
<td>Average Tenure in Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted average</td>
<td>49.15</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

A PUBLIC STATEMENT TO THE RESIDENTS OF THE
BERRIEN SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT
IN MICHIGAN, 1977
To the Residents of the Berrien Springs School District:

It is the responsibility of the Board of Education as the duly elected representatives of the citizens of the Berrien Springs Public School District to make decisions concerning policy and finance in the best interest of quality education for all of our students. We are to represent all of the residents of the school district as opposed to being the servants of any small group which seems to have ulterior or selfish motives. This Board of Education does not intend to be influenced or coerced into any position on the basis of unsolicited, emotionally charged opinion polls either now or in the future so long as our responsibility remains intact. If we desire information which can be cleared from an opinion poll, we will authorize an instrument to be developed on a scientific basis so as to be objective, and it will be handled in such a manner that there can be no doubts as to the results. We will not do it to prove some preconceived point of view. We cannot and will not be responsible to surveys from unidentified sources whose motives cannot be established.

At each and every regular meeting conducted by this Board of Education, ample opportunity has been given to visitors to address their concerns about any items on the agenda or to express their views on other subjects. After careful consideration, some ideas have been implemented, some modified, and some rejected. None have been ignored! We seek and respect the advice and counsel of all persons, individuals and groups, who are genuinely interested in improving the quality of educational opportunities offered to our students. However, we must refuse advice given by persons who remain anonymous. It is impossible to accurately assess or deal meaningfully with the thinking of people who choose to hide their identity.

We do not want to see our community divided as it has been in the past with such disastrous consequences for our students. However, we must make our decisions based on our perception of what represents the majority opinion of the total population of our school district.

William Boyd
President
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Publications of the Government, Learned Societies, and Other Organizations


Stapley, Maurice E. School Board Studies. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957.


Periodicals


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


Unpublished Materials


Smart, L. E. "A Brief History of the Seventh-day Adventist Church Schools in the Dominion of Canada." Term paper, University of Toronto, 1954.

Watson, Norman E. "The In-service Training of Members of Boards of Education in Selected Communities." Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1943.


VITA

NAME: Leroy Raymond Kuhn

DATE OF BIRTH: January 26, 1936

EDUCATION:

1958 B.A., Walla Walla College  
   (Major: Zoology; Minor: Theology)

1967 M.A., Walla Walla College  
   (Educational Administration)

1978 Ed.D., Andrews University  
   (Educational Administration)

POSITIONS HELD:

1958-59 Elementary teacher/principal, Vernon Junior Academy,  
       Vernon, British Columbia, Canada

1959-60 Elementary teacher/principal, Sidney Junior Academy,  
       Sidney, British Columbia, Canada

1960-61 Secondary teacher, Okanagan Academy, Rutland, British  
       Columbia, Canada

1961-65 Headmaster/education director, Gimbie Mission School/  
       West Ethiopia Mission, Gimbie, Wollega, Ethiopia

1965-66 Secondary and college teacher, Ethiopian Adventist  
       College, Shashamani, Arussi, Ethiopia

1967-71 Principal/education director, Wollega Adventist Academy/  
       West Ethiopia Mission, Dongoro, Wollega, Ethiopia

1971-73 Academy and elementary principal/teacher, Okanagan  
       Academy, Rutland, British Columbia, Canada

1973-76 Academy and elementary principal/teacher, Beirut Overseas  
       School, Beirut, Lebanon

1977- Collegiate secondary school president, Kingsway College,  
       Oshawa, Ontario, Canada