



A comparison of the effectiveness of teaching and non-teaching principals in Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools
by Karen Joyce Ballard

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education
Montana State University
© Copyright by Karen Joyce Ballard (1992)

Abstract:

This study investigated the perceived effectiveness of "teaching" and "non-teaching" principals in the Seventh-day Adventist secondary educational system. Perceived effectiveness was provided by teachers who worked for randomly selected principals and by the selected principals themselves. The study hypothesized that there is no difference in perceived effectiveness between teaching and non-teaching principals as rated by the teachers who teach for them and as rated by the principals themselves. Use of The Audit of Principal Effectiveness, designed by Michael L. Bowman and Jerry W. Valentine, allowed for evaluation of perceived principal effectiveness, of the dependent variable, in three separate domains: organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development. Independent variables were highest academic degree completed by the principal, years of principal experience, highest academic degree completed by the teacher, years of teaching experience for the teacher, years of teaching experience with the current principal, and teacher gender.

The study surveyed 840 teachers and 66 principals from 66 randomly selected Seventh-day Adventist academies. Selected teachers and principals completed a mailed survey instrument. The response rate from the principals was 78 percent and 70 percent from the teachers.

Based on one-way and two-way ANOVA, the following conclusions were drawn. Both principals and teachers perceived teaching and non-teaching principals to be equally effective in organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development without regard to years of experience of the teacher or principal, the number of years the teacher had worked for the current principal, or the highest degree completed by the teacher or principal. Male teachers who worked for non-teaching principals perceived their principal to be more effective in educational program development than did female teachers who worked for non-teaching principals, while male and female teachers who taught for teaching principals perceived their principal to be more effective in educational program development than did female teachers who taught for non-teaching principals.

A COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING AND
NON-TEACHING PRINCIPALS IN SEVENTH-DAY
ADVENTIST SECONDARY SCHOOLS

by

Karen Joyce Ballard

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Education

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

November 1992

D378
B2126

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Karen Joyce Ballard

This thesis has been read by each member of the graduate committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

12 Nov 92
Date

Leroy P. Casagrande
Chairperson, Graduate Committee

Approved for the Major Department

11/12/92
Date

Dwaine Mellinger
Head, Major Department

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

11/10/92
Date

Rh Brown
Graduate Dean

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. I further agree that copying of this thesis is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for extensive copying or reproduction of this thesis should be referred to University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom I have granted "the exclusive right to reproduce and distribute copies of the dissertation in and from microfilm and the right to reproduce and distribute by abstract in any format."

Signature Karen Joop Ballard

Date November 5, 1992

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to the members of my graduate committee: Dr. Leroy Casagranda, Dr. Douglas Herbster, Dr. Eric Strohmeier, Dr. Duane Melling, Dr. William Hall, and Dr. Sara Jayne Steen. Each of the members has been very willing to give of their time to guide me through this process. I especially want to thank my chairperson, Dr. Leroy Casagranda, for his direction, encouragement and support.

Special thanks is extended to Dr. Gilbert Plubell, North American Division Director of Seventh-day Adventist Education, for his verbal and written support of this project.

Appreciation is given to the teachers and principals who took the time to respond to the survey. Without their support, this study would not have been concluded.

Special appreciation is given to my secretary, Janice Dopp, who helped greatly with the many mailings that this study required.

Finally, I wish to express appreciation to my friend, Stephen Pawluk, who encouraged me toward this degree, and who was the inspiration for the topic of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	ix
ABSTRACT	xv
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Conceptual Framework for Study	1
Statement of the Problem	3
General Questions to Be Answered	4
Population and Sampling	6
Independent Variable Data Collection	6
Measurement of Dependent Variables	6
Limitations and Delimitations of Study	7
Site Visits	8
Definition of Terms	8
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	12
The Teaching Principal	12
The Principal as Instructional Leader	16
Effective Principals	18
3. PROCEDURES	25
Introduction	25
Population Description	26
Sampling Procedures	27
Principal Effectiveness and Survey Identification	27
Statistical Hypotheses	30
Methodology for Data Collection	32
Analysis of Data	36
Additional Survey Information	39
Student Questions	40
Teacher Questions	41

TABLE OF CONTENTS--(Continued)

	Page
4. ANALYSIS OF DATA	43
Introduction	43
Description of Sample	43
Principal Frequencies	44
Teacher Frequencies	45
Statistical Analyses of Hypotheses	47
Hypothesis 1	47
Domain: Organizational Development.	47
Domain: Organizational Environment	48
Domain: Educational Program Development	49
Hypothesis 2	50
Domain: Organizational Development	50
Domain: Organizational Environment	50
Domain: Educational Program Development	51
Hypothesis 3	52
Domain: Organizational Development	52
Domain: Organizational Environment	53
Domain: Educational Program Development	53
Hypothesis 4	54
Domain: Organizational Development	54
Domain: Organizational Environment	55
Domain: Educational Program Development	56
Hypothesis 5	57
Domain: Organizational Development	57
Domain: Organizational Environment	58
Domain: Educational Program Development	58
Hypothesis 6	60
Domain: Organizational Development	60
Domain: Organizational Environment	61
Domain: Educational Program Development	61

TABLE OF CONTENTS--(Continued)

	Page
Hypothesis 7	62
Domain: Organizational Development	62
Domain: Organizational Environment	63
Domain: Educational Program Development	64
Hypothesis 8	65
Domain: Organizational Development	65
Domain: Organizational Environment	66
Domain: Educational Program Development	67
Site Visit Data	68
Student Questions and Responses for Teaching Principals	69
Teacher Questions and Responses for Teaching Principals	70
Student Questions and Responses for Non-Teaching Principals	73
Teacher Questions and Responses for Non-Teaching Principals	75
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	80
Introduction	80
Summary	80
Background and Purpose	80
The Problem and Procedure	81
Conclusions	83
Recommendations	85
REFERENCES	86

TABLE OF CONTENTS--(Continued)

	Page
APPENDICES	91
Appendix A--Letter Granting Permission to Use <i>Audit</i> <i>of Principal Effectiveness</i>	92
Appendix B--Letter from National Adventist Educational Director, Support for the Study	94
Appendix C--Survey Instrument	96
Appendix D--Demographic Response Sheet--Teacher	101
Appendix E--Demographic Response Sheet--Principal	103
Appendix F--Cover Letter from Dr. Gil Plubell, National Education Director	105
Appendix G--Contact Letter (Principal), Initial Mailout	107
Appendix H--Contact Letter (Teacher), Initial Mailout	109
Appendix I--Survey Response Sheet	111
Appendix J--Postcard Follow-Up	113
Appendix K--Contact Letter, Second Mailout	115
Appendix L--Contact Letter, Third Mailout	117

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Table of specifications for <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Development	29
2. Table of specifications for <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Environment	29
3. Table of specifications for <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Educational Program	29
4. Sample table for one-way ANOVA	38
5. Sample table for two-way ANOVA	38
6. Sample table for summary of ANOVA means	38
7. Principal frequencies: highest degree completed	44
8. Principal frequencies: years of experience as a principal	45
9. Principal frequencies: teaching or non-teaching principal	45
10. Teacher frequencies: principal is teaching or non-teaching	45
11. Teacher frequencies: teacher gender	46
12. Teacher frequencies: years of experience as a teacher	46
13. Teacher frequencies: highest degree completed	46

LIST OF TABLES--(Continued)

Table	Page
14. Teacher frequencies: years taught for current principal	47
15. One-way ANOVA for the difference between teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness in organizational development of teachers whose principals teach and teachers whose principals do not teach as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , (N=523)	48
16. One-way ANOVA for the difference between teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness in organizational environment of teachers whose principals teach and teachers whose principals do not teach as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , (N=520)	48
17. One-way ANOVA for the difference between teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness in educational program development of teachers whose principals teach and teachers whose principals do not teach as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , (N=533)	49
18. One-way ANOVA for principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Development, (N=46)	50
19. One-way ANOVA for principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Environment, (N=44)	51

LIST OF TABLES--(Continued)

Table	Page
20. One-way ANOVA for principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Educational Program Development, (N=50)	51
21. Two-way ANOVA for principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Development, according to highest academic degree completed by teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=46)	52
22. Two-way ANOVA for principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Environment, according to highest degree completed by teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=44)	53
23. Two-way ANOVA for principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Educational Program Development, according to highest degree completed by teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=50)	54
24. Two-way ANOVA for principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Development, according to years of experience as a principal by teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=46)	55
25. Two-way ANOVA for principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Environment, according to years of experience as a principal by teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=44)	56

LIST OF TABLES--(Continued)

Table	Page
26. Two-way ANOVA for principals' perceptions of their effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Educational Program Development, according to years of experience as a principal by teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=50)	56
27. Two-way ANOVA for teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Development, according to teacher gender and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=523)	57
28. Two-way ANOVA for teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Environment, according to teacher gender and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=519)	58
29. Two-way ANOVA for teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Educational Program Development, according to teacher gender and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=532)	59
30. Table of means for teacher gender and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=532)	59
31. Two-way ANOVA for teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Development, according to teacher's years of experience and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=523)	60

LIST OF TABLES--(Continued)

Table	Page
32. Two-way ANOVA for teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Environment, according to teacher's years of experience and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=520)	61
33. Two-way ANOVA for teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Educational Program Development, according to years of experience as a teacher and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=533)	62
34. Two-way ANOVA for teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Development, according to highest academic degree completed by teachers and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=505)	63
35. Two-way ANOVA for teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Environment, according to highest academic degree completed by teachers and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=504)	64
36. Two-way ANOVA for teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Educational Program Development, according to highest academic degree completed by teachers and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=515)	64

LIST OF TABLES--(Continued)

Table	Page
37. Two-way ANOVA for teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Development, according to number of years a teacher has worked for the current principal and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=523)	65
38. Two-way ANOVA for teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Organizational Environment, according to number of years a teacher has worked for the current principal and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=520)	66
39. Two-way ANOVA for teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness as rated on the <i>Audit of Principal Effectiveness</i> , Domain: Educational Program Development, according to number of years a teacher has worked for the current principal and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=533)	67
40. Table of means for number of years a teacher has worked for the current principal and teaching and non-teaching principals, (N=533)	68

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the perceived effectiveness of "teaching" and "non-teaching" principals in the Seventh-day Adventist secondary educational system. Perceived effectiveness was provided by teachers who worked for randomly selected principals and by the selected principals themselves. The study hypothesized that there is no difference in perceived effectiveness between teaching and non-teaching principals as rated by the teachers who teach for them and as rated by the principals themselves. Use of *The Audit of Principal Effectiveness*, designed by Michael L. Bowman and Jerry W. Valentine, allowed for evaluation of perceived principal effectiveness, of the dependent variable, in three separate domains: organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development. Independent variables were highest academic degree completed by the principal, years of principal experience, highest academic degree completed by the teacher, years of teaching experience for the teacher, years of teaching experience with the current principal, and teacher gender.

The study surveyed 840 teachers and 66 principals from 66 randomly selected Seventh-day Adventist academies. Selected teachers and principals completed a mailed survey instrument. The response rate from the principals was 78 percent and 70 percent from the teachers.

Based on one-way and two-way ANOVA, the following conclusions were drawn. Both principals and teachers perceived teaching and non-teaching principals to be equally effective in organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development without regard to years of experience of the teacher or principal, the number of years the teacher had worked for the current principal, or the highest degree completed by the teacher or principal. Male teachers who worked for non-teaching principals perceived their principal to be more effective in educational program development than did female teachers who worked for non-teaching principals, while male and female teachers who taught for teaching principals perceived their principal to be more effective in educational program development than did female teachers who taught for non-teaching principals.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Conceptual Framework for Study

The terms "head teacher" and "principal teacher" were initially used to refer to the teacher who was given administrative responsibilities in addition to his/her teaching responsibilities. The use of the word "principal" appeared as early as 1841 in a report by Horace Mann where he made reference to a "male principal" in his annual report (Pierce, 1935).

An increased number of students and the introduction of grading in the schools are two factors, according to Pierce, which influenced the "teaching principal" role. In its earliest stages, a teaching principal spent most of his/her time teaching since there were few administrative duties to perform. However, the introduction of "supervision of instruction" to the administrative duties led to the elimination of the teaching component of administration because of the time constraints of supervision of instruction (Pierce, 1935).

After 1860, the principal, in large cities, began to shed his/her responsibilities of teaching. However, even in the 1990's in many places, especially

in rural and private education, teaching principals were still functioning in both administrative and teaching roles (Grady, 1990).

The concept of a teaching principal has been and still is an issue in the Seventh-day Adventist educational system. This educational system has faced unique and distinct budgetary constraints since its inception. Tuition and church subsidy have not kept pace with inflation, thus causing local school boards to seek ways to reduce cost and still maintain quality education. One answer, over the years, to balancing the budget has been to suggest, ask, or even require the principal of a secondary Seventh-day Adventist academy to teach one or more classes in addition to his/her administrative responsibilities. Because Seventh-day Adventist Boards of Education struggle with budget issues and because these same boards are pressured by various board members to hire teaching principals who will be "in touch" and "in tune" with student thinking and academic instruction, the concept of a teaching principal will not likely be eliminated in the Adventist educational system (Plubell, 1991).

The issue of whether or not a secondary principal in the Adventist school system should teach as well as administer, in terms of the principal's effectiveness, has not taken place up to this point. As Dr. Gilbert Plubell, Seventh-day Adventist Office of Education, K-12, Educational Director for North America, stated in his letter (Appendix B), "a study in this area would be most helpful to educational leadership of the Adventist school system" (Plubell, 1991). He noted that data from a study on teaching and non-teaching principals in the Adventist secondary system

would help employing boards make appropriate decisions in the hiring and budgeting process. Further, research data in this area would help the Adventist educational system nationally as educational policies are developed and administrative professional development programs are provided (Plubell, 1991).

While this study focused on the Seventh-day Adventist secondary educational system, the collected data could also impact other parochial educational systems and other private educational systems as well. This study could also have some bearing on rural public education, as, according to Marilyn Grady, teaching principals are not extinct in the public system (Grady, 1991). Dunn (1986) underscored her statement in an article on "double-duty" principalship by stating that because of tightened budgets across the United States more and more school districts are beginning to employ double-duty principals. Dunn defined a double-duty principal as a principal who teaches one or more classes or is assigned to more than one building.

Statement of the Problem

This research sought to determine if a secondary school "teaching" principal in a Seventh-day Adventist academy was perceived by the teachers who work for him/her and by the principal himself/herself as a more effective administrator in terms of organizational development, organizational environment and educational program development than a secondary school "non-teaching" principal. The independent variables were: (1) teaching and non-teaching principals, (2) highest

academic degree completed by the principal, (3) number of years the principal had worked as a principal, (4) teacher gender, (5) number of years teachers had taught, (6) highest academic degree completed by the teacher, (7) number of years the teacher had taught for the current principal. The dependent variables of interest were the principal's and teacher's perceptions of principal effectiveness in organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development.

General Questions to Be Answered

The following general questions were addressed in this study:

- (1) Did teachers who worked for non-teaching principals perceive their principal to be more effective in organizational development than teachers who worked for teaching principals?
- (2) Did teachers who worked for non-teaching principals perceive their principal to be more effective in organizational environment than teachers who worked for teaching principals?
- (3) Did teachers who worked for non-teaching principals perceive their principal to be more effective in educational program development than teachers who worked for teaching principals?
- (4) Did principals who taught perceive themselves to be more effective in organizational development than principals who did not teach?

- (5) Did principals who taught perceive themselves to be more effective in organizational environment than principals who did not teach?
- (6) Did principals who taught perceive themselves to be more effective in educational program development than principals who did not teach?
- (7) Were there significant differences in teachers' perceptions of their principal's effectiveness depending on the principal's highest academic degree completed?
- (8) Were there significant differences in principals' perceptions of their own effectiveness depending on the principal's highest academic degree completed?
- (9) Were there significant differences in teachers' perceptions of their principal's effectiveness depending on the principal's years of administrative experience?
- (10) Were there significant differences in principals' perceptions of their own effectiveness depending on the principal's years of administrative experience?
- (11) Were there significant differences in teachers' perceptions of their principal's effectiveness depending on the teacher's gender?
- (12) Were there significant differences in teachers' perceptions of their principal's effectiveness depending on the teacher's years of teaching experience?
- (13) Were there significant differences in teachers' perceptions of their principal's effectiveness depending on the number of years the teacher had taught for the current principal?

Population and Sampling

The population of this study included all Seventh-day Adventist academies listed in the *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook, 1991* (*Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook, 1991*). A random sample of 66 of the 80 academies listed was drawn. This sample size was the suggested number by Krejcie and Morgan in their article "Determining Sample Size for Research Activities." The sample provided a five percent sampling error and a 95 percent confidence level (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970).

Independent Variable Data Collection

The data for the independent variables were collected through the use of a demographic information sheet (Appendices D & E) that was sent to the selected principals and teachers with the survey and survey response form. This demographic sheet allowed the researcher to group responses for the independent variables of highest academic degree completed by the principal, teaching or non-teaching principal, years of principal experience, highest academic degree completed by the teacher, years of teaching experience for the teacher, years of teaching experience with the current principal, and teacher gender.

Measurement of Dependent Variables

The *Audit of Principal Effectiveness* (Appendix C) (Bowman & Valentine, 1987) was the instrument used to measure the dependent variable of principal

effectiveness. Selected principals and teachers responded to the instrument consisting of 80 questions which addressed perceived principal effectiveness in three domains: organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development. A nine point, Likert-scale method of measurement was used.

Limitations and Delimitations of Study

Limitations to the study were as follows:

- (1) The study considered only Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools which were listed in the *Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook, 1991*.
- (2) The study was limited to three domains of principal effectiveness: organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development.

Delimitations of the study were as follows:

- (1) The study considered only teachers who worked for the Seventh-day Adventist secondary system during the school year of 1991-92.
- (2) The study considered all teachers who worked in the randomly selected schools whether they taught part time or full time.

Site Visits

Four "on-site" visits were made to schools of similar size which had principals who were rated as highly effective. The purpose of the on-site visits was to gather additional information regarding the interactions and administrative procedures that effective principals utilized.

Definition of Terms

For purposes of this study the following definitions were given to the terms indicated:

- (1) Teaching Secondary School Principal--a principal who teaches one class during the school year.
- (2) Non-teaching Secondary School Principal--a principal who does not teach any classes.
- (3) Organizational Development--

... the ability of the principal to work with personnel inside and outside the school setting to establish processes and relationships which most effectively promote positive growth and change of the organization as a whole (Bowman & Valentine, 1987, p. 2).

This includes the principal providing direction for the school through "vision" and goal development, the principal acting as linkage agent between the school, community and other educators, and the principal using effective procedures in making decisions, effecting change and solving problems.

(4) Organizational Environment--

... the ability of the principal to nurture the on-going climate of the school through development of positive interpersonal relationships among members of the organization and effective day-by-day operational procedures for the school (Bowman & Valentine, 1987, p. 2).

This includes the principal developing effective working relationships with the staff through support, sensitivity and communication.

(5) Educational Program Development--

... the ability of the principal to serve as the educational leader of the school through active involvement in instructional leadership and curriculum development (Bowman & Valentine, 1987, p. 2).

This includes the principal functioning as an effective supervisor through his/her knowledge of effective and quality instruction as well as current curricular issues.

(6) Staff--teachers who answer to the principal.(7) Audit of Principal Effectiveness--an instrument which can be used to assess teachers' perceptions of principals' effectiveness (Bowman & Valentine, 1987).(8) Seventh-day Adventist Secondary School--a school which provides instruction for grades 9-12.(9) Seventh-day Adventist Academy--a school which provides instruction for grades 9-12.(10) Elementary School--a school which provides instruction for grades 1-8.

- (11) Organizational Direction--goal development, established expectations, and use of appropriate change process (Bowman & Valentine, 1987, p. 2).
- (12) Organizational Linkage--relationships between the school, the community and other educators and agencies working with the school (Bowman & Valentine, 1987, p. 2).
- (13) Organizational Procedures--use of effective problem-solving, decision-making and change process skills (Bowman & Valentine, 1987, p. 2).
- (14) Teacher Relations--the principal's working relationships with staff (Bowman & Valentine, 1987, p. 2).
- (15) Student Relations--the principal's working relationships with students (Bowman & Valentine, 1987, p. 2).
- (16) Interactive Processes--organizational expertise in terms of task organization, personnel alignment, communication of information to staff and students, rule development and discipline procedures (Bowman & Valentine, 1987, p. 2).
- (17) Affective Processes--encouragement by the principal for staff and students to express feelings, opinions, pride and loyalty through sensitivity, humor and personal example (Bowman & Valentine, 1987, p. 2).
- (18) Instructional Improvement--supervision of instruction, knowledge of effective teaching and learning and commitment to quality instruction (Bowman & Valentine, 1987, p. 2).

- (19) Curriculum Improvement--promotion of a quality curriculum through study of student needs and continual program evaluation and change (Bowman & Valentine, 1987, p. 2).
- (20) Boarding School--a Seventh-day Adventist secondary school which houses students in dormitories on the campus.
- (21) Day School--a Seventh-day Adventist secondary school which does not house the students on the campus.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter contains a review of the current literature as it pertains to the issues of teaching principals, the principal as instructional leader, and effective principals. Each of these aspects was researched and produced the following information. First, this chapter explores the current literature on "teaching" principals. Secondly, "the principal as instructional leader" is reviewed in terms of existing literature. Finally, a review of the literature on effective principals is discussed.

The Teaching Principal

The researcher found a meager amount of literature that investigated teaching secondary principals and a small amount which investigated the effectiveness of an administrator who teaches. Marilyn Grady studied the characteristics and perceptions of contemporary teaching principals in 1990. Her research involved 70 teaching principals in Nebraska. A survey developed by Grady offered a 79 percent return. Of the returns 49 percent of the principals administered grades 7-12. The average number of students in these schools was 163 with a range of 50-402 students (Grady, 1990).

Grady's survey revealed eight reasons, given by responding principals, for accepting a position of teaching principal. The top three reasons given were: increased income, enjoyment of teaching, and opportunity to have an entry-level administrative position. Being required to accept the position without choice was offered as the last reason.

Grady's survey also gave advantages and disadvantages of being a teaching principal as cited by the respondents. Knowing the students better was the top reason given followed by camaraderie, maintaining teaching skills, awareness of classroom activities, rapport with parents, and enjoying the position.

The main disadvantage of being a teaching principal according to 73 percent of the respondents was lack of time. Other disadvantages included frequent interruptions, meetings, pressures of the dual role, and teachers feeling ignored (Grady, 1990).

Ninety-three percent of the principals who returned the survey stated that they were asked to leave their teaching responsibilities and take care of administrative tasks an average of two times per week. The primary reason identified for leaving their teaching responsibilities was to answer telephone calls. Discipline and parental concerns were the second and third reasons given for leaving their teaching responsibilities (Grady, 1990).

Grady concluded that the teaching principalship will likely continue in the small school. Her conclusion was underscored by 63 percent of the respondents to

the study. Eighty percent of the respondents seemed content in their dual role (Grady, 1990).

R. J. Dunn (1986), in his article "How to Survive a Double-Duty Principalship," indicated that principals filling more than one role need to possess certain qualities in order to survive. Of the survival qualities suggested, some significant skills include strong organizational skills, the ability to delegate, and exceptional communication skills.

An article by D. Denneberg (1984) concerning principals who administered more than one school concluded that principals were unable to be two places at once, and thus each aspect of the job assignment suffered when the principal was unavailable because of other responsibilities. Denneberg felt that the practice of principals administering more than one school short-changed the educational process. He further stated that no matter how strong the support staff was, there was no substitute for the principal being on site.

Helen Harper Cole (1981) conducted a study to determine the perceived "effectiveness" of teaching principals in the East Tennessee Development District.

She concluded that:

1. Staff members tended to disagree in their perceptions of the leadership behavior of their superiors as assessed on the 12 original dimensions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form XII.
2. Teaching principals perceived themselves to be more effective leaders in both analyses than their staff members perceived them to be.

3. The perceptions of the supervising principals did not differ significantly from the perceptions of them held by their staff members.
4. Teaching principals did not significantly disagree with supervising principals in their self assessments (p. iii).

Cole concluded from her findings:

1. Both teaching and supervising principals tended to see themselves as more effective leaders than their staff members saw them to be.
2. Teaching principals and supervising principals tended to see themselves as equally effective in their leadership.
3. Teachers of teaching principals tend to see their principals more as teachers than principals.
4. In the theory and research of administrator leadership behavior, little attention has been given to the administrator's role in curriculum development and evaluation (p. iii).

Archie W. Bates (1982) also conducted a survey of parents, teachers, and principals in the Department of Defense Dependents Schools, Europe, to determine the perceptions regarding the role of teaching principals. He concluded:

1. Parents, teachers, and principals hold negative views toward the idea that principals who teach are more effective administrators, and
2. Parents, teachers, and principals were in greatest agreement with the concept that a teaching principal inhibits the administrative function of the principalship (p. 132).

The two studies by Cole and Bates dealt primarily, however, with elementary teaching principals rather than secondary teaching principals.

The literature (Grady, 1990) on teaching principals discussed the drawbacks and advantages of filling both roles. It also discussed characteristics and skills that the authors felt added support to carrying the dual role. The dissertation by Cole specifically addressed the effectiveness of teaching principals in the East Tennessee Development District. There was no literature found which addresses the effectiveness of teaching principals and non-teaching principals at the secondary level.

This study addressed the issue of effectiveness of teaching and non-teaching principals at the secondary level and adds a new dimension to the literature on secondary principals who carry dual roles.

The Principal as Instructional Leader

The literature surveyed supported the concept that the principal is expected to be an instructional leader. Gersten, Carnine and Green (1982, p. 48) stated that one key to effective education is having a principal who functioned as an instructional leader. They further stated that the principal was not always viewed as an instructional leader by his/her teachers and that it was difficult to define "instructional leadership" in terms of specific functions.

Cornell Thomas and James A. Vornberg forecast that the '90s will place an even greater emphasis on the principal as an instructional leader as he/she functions "in planning the school's mission and in making changes in the school's program" (Thomas & Vornberg, 1991, pp. 63-64).

Thomas Petrie, in his article "A Return to the Principalship: Professor Relates Plans for Change," states that those who wish to be "better" principals must learn more about "how to be an instructional leader." He further concluded that any problems that existed within the school are all secondary to the challenge of instruction and learning. Finally, he stated that ". . . principals must first know and demonstrate responsibility for teaching and learning" (Petrie, 1991, pp. 50-51)

The "Effective Schools Research" published a five-factor model of school effectiveness. Included in this paradigm was emphasis on the principal as a strong instructional leader (Stoel & Schreerens, 1988). Studies on the principal as an instructional leader indicated effective administrators shared three characteristics:

1. Communicating and monitoring reasonable expectations to the staff;
2. Conducting frequent, substantive classroom observations; and
3. Actively participating in the instructional program (Gibbs, 1989, p. 10).

Robert J. Hanny (1987, p. 209) stated:

In the role of instructional leader, the principal must know something about curriculum development, teaching and instructional effectiveness, clinical supervision, staff development, and teacher evaluation.

In a recent study by the National Association of Secondary School Principals on *High School Leaders and Their Schools. Volume II: Profiles of Effectiveness*, principals themselves indicated that their role as instructional leader was to be a "model" as a classroom educator (Pellicer et al., 1990, p. 30). The word "model" is

defined as "a person or thing considered as an object for imitation" (*New Webster's Dictionary*, 1990). Modeling effective instruction would, therefore, indicate that the principal would not simply fulfill Gibbs' stated roles, but would also function as an instructor in some area of the school curriculum.

The literature (Gibbs, 1989) on the principal as instructional leader defined the role and assignments that needed to be performed by the instructional leader. It also expounded on characteristics and qualities that contributed to the principal being an effective instructional leader.

A study on the effectiveness of a teaching and non-teaching principal will discuss further the instructional leader as a model in terms of modeling quality instruction through teaching.

Effective Principals

Ray Cross (1991) in his article "What Makes an Effective Principal?" reminded the readers that in 1923 Ellwood P. Cubberley told principals that wished to be effective that they should be able to make rapid and quick decisions, that they should be teaching virtuosos, and that their personal life and habits should be without question. In his conclusions in this article Cross did not suggest that Cubberley's suggestions were incorrect, but rather he concluded that "effective" principals are effective if they possess the characteristics which will make them effective in the situation in which they find themselves. He further indicated that the right principal in the right place makes the difference.

Cecil G. Miskel in his article "Principal's Perceived Effectiveness, Innovation Effort, and the School Situation" underscored Cross's perception by stating that "effectiveness is not an absolute concept; it varies with differing requirements as the school conditions change" (Miskel, 1977, p. 31). His premise revealed that different aspects of the school's environment affected the perception of the principal's effectiveness. For example, Miskel stated that a positive interpersonal climate at the school will cause the teachers to perceive the principal as being highly effective. He concluded that if a principal is going to be evaluated in terms of his/her effectiveness, the instrument should measure "situational factors" that exist at the school. Ultimately, Miskel concluded that a principal's past performance could help predict his/her effectiveness in situations which consider similar factors.

Cross's and Miskel's conclusions notwithstanding, there are others who believed that there are certain skills and characteristics that a principal must possess in order to be effective. Certainly a "good match" is important in terms of the community, location, and personalities. The most recent synthesis on "Effective Schooling Practices" published by Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory stated that an effective leader who guides the instructional program will:

- have confidence in the students' ability to learn

- believe that a school makes the difference between success and failure

- have a clear understanding of the school's mission and hire people who understand and support it

- know and apply effective learning principles

seek out and encourage innovative curricular programs and use of latest curricular standards and guidelines

protect learning time and environment

evaluate student progress

encourage excellence in student and teacher performance through incentives and rewards

provide adequate resources for effective instruction

promote parental involvement by communicating frequently and effectively

supervise instruction

promote improved instructional programs

understand the change process when implementing an innovation (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1990, pp. 18-19)

Robinson and Block concluded that the principal is a key player in school effectiveness (Robinson & Block, 1982). Some research supported the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory studies in that it inferred that a set of performance standards for the principal could, if met, help maximize student learning (Duke, 1982).

Catherine Baltzell and Robert Dentler (1983) stated that school effectiveness was aided by principals who were best equipped to demonstrate instructional and supervisory leadership and who could match the teaching resources with the students' learning needs.

Don Fuhr also supported the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory synthesis by stating that an effective leader must have a vision or a mission along with well defined plans for the attainment of that vision in the future. He further suggested that an effective leader should be courageous in terms of making tough decisions, honest, communicative and caring (Fuhr, 1989, pp. 53-54).

Jerry Valentine and Michael Bowman studied the effectiveness of principals at some of the schools selected for the Department of Education's School Recognition Program compared with schools which were not recognized. They concluded that "clearly, the teachers of the recognized schools perceived their principals as more effective than teachers of the randomly selected schools. The pattern of differences between the perceptions of the teachers surveyed in their study supports the belief that more effective schools are administered by more effective principals" (Bowman & Valentine, 1991, p. 7).

Gordon Cawelti (1991, p. 325) states that a rational study of the skills an effective principal must possess would reveal the following:

- * Skill at building consensus among diverse viewpoints
- * Skill at flexible programming to accommodate a variety of student needs
- * Confidence in instructional improvement strategies that offer hope of getting results
- * Organization development skills--relieving the pathology almost all organizations have
- * Improved management skills

In a study performed over the past five years, Cawelti learned that principals perceived most of their attention to be devoted to the following:

- * Motivating teachers to accept new ideas (always number 1)
- * Communication (whatever that may be)
- * Getting things accomplished without authority to do so
- * Being too directive; asserting my views too strongly
- * Involving others in decisions
- * Filling out forms
- * Discipline (Cawelti, 1991, p. 325)

Cawelti further proposed a program for helping principals to become more effective. This program, among other skills, placed emphasis on training in instructional leadership. He reiterated that if principals worked to improve their skills in "instructional leadership" one could expect an increase in the number of effective schools.

Robert Wentz (1989) advocated the theory of an effective principal being a man/woman of vision. He stated that a man/woman of vision would understand that his/her role is to create, facilitate, encourage, motivate, manage by participation, share decision making and encourage potential.

Arthur Blumberg and William Greenfield studied the effectiveness of eight different principals. After studying and analyzing the work of these principals, the authors stated that there are three elements of effectiveness that each of the eight principals possess--vision, initiative and resourcefulness. While each principal had a

different approach to demonstrating the possession of these effectiveness tools, the authors indicated that each principal, in order to be effective, in their opinion, must possess these tools. Further, Blumberg and Greenfield stated that the principal's success in realizing organizational goals seemed to be related to:

1. Their individual commitment to the realization of a particular educational or organizational vision,
2. Their propensity to assume the initiative and to take a proactive stance in relation to the demands of their work-world environment, and
3. Their ability to satisfy the routine organizational maintenance demands in a manner that permits them to spend most of their on-the-job time in activities directly related to the realization of their personal vision. They do not allow themselves to become consumed by second-order priorities. (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980, p. 208)

Raymond Calabrese (1988) contended that an effective principal is also an ethical principal. In his article "Ethical Leadership: A Prerequisite for Effective Schools," he suggested ten guidelines that an effective principal must follow in order to be viewed as ethical and therefore effective. The ten guidelines included statements that an effective principal should develop a vision based on sound educational philosophy and not on emotion or intuition, apply strong moral leadership, condemn discriminatory practices, view effective teaching as a duty, build community, balance all groups' rights, and communicate ethical behavior.

In discussing the issue of effective principals and instructional leaders, Aretha Pigford (1989) asserted that effective instructional leaders and effective

principals are likely two different people. She further stated that effective principals should be:

. . . people who have vision, who are risktakers, who have effective interpersonal skills, who can motivate and influence people, who can plan and implement change effectively, and who have a strong commitment to the total school program (p. 127).

Approaching effectiveness from the dimension of teaching experience, Scott Thomson (1989) supported the thesis that an effective leader, whether he/she teaches or not, relies on his/her experience as a teacher when performing tasks in areas of leadership responsibility. These areas included employing teachers, supervising instruction, leading and managing teachers, understanding and working with students, and conferring with parents.

Joseph Murphy and his colleagues, in studying evaluations of principals in "effective districts" concluded that the evaluation of student achievement is heavily relied upon in determining a principal's effectiveness (Murphy, Hallinger & Peterson, 1991).

Given all of the characteristics, duties and skills that appear to be necessary in order to be an effective principal, Campbell and Williamson (1991, p. 115) concluded that principals do not have enough time to do it all.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

Introduction

To determine whether or not a "teaching" secondary school Seventh-day Adventist Academy principal was perceived by himself/herself and the teachers who teach for him/her as more effective than a "non-teaching" principal was the problem of this study. Independent variables of highest academic degree completed by the principal, years of principal experience, highest academic degree completed by the teacher, years of teaching experience for the teacher, years of teaching experience with the current principal, and teacher gender were the variables of interest in this study. The dependent variable of principal effectiveness in the areas of organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development were used in this study. The following procedure was employed to answer the above stated problem:

- (1) population identification
- (2) population sample
- (3) areas of principal effectiveness and survey identification
- (4) statistical hypotheses determination

- (5) data collection methodology selection
- (6) data analysis
- (7) additional survey information

Population Description

The population of this study was the teachers and principals of the Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools. According to *The Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook, 1991*, the Seventh-day Adventist educational system in the United States had 80 secondary schools located in various states (*SDA Yearbook, 1991*). All Seventh-day Adventist secondary schools, whether boarding schools or day schools, were used in the population. Only the schools listed in *The Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook, 1991* were considered. No other restrictions were placed on population.

There were no restrictions placed on the teachers to be surveyed in terms of whether or not they were full time or part time teachers. This allowed a similar number of teachers to be surveyed at each school. Smaller schools in the Seventh-day Adventist secondary school system tend to have more part time teachers than the larger schools. Thus, if only full time teachers were surveyed, fewer responses would have been obtained from the smaller schools where the possibility of a teaching principal existed.

Sampling Procedures

For purposes of this study, a random sample of 66 of the 80 secondary schools was selected. The principal of each of the randomly selected schools was surveyed as well as each teacher in the selected schools.

This sample size is suggested by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) in their article "Determining Sample Size for Research Activities." The figure, taken from Krejcie and Morgan's table, provides a five percent sampling error, and a 95 percent confidence level.

Principal Effectiveness and Survey Identification

The *Audit of Principal Effectiveness* (Appendix C), an instrument developed by Jerry W. Valentine and Michael L. Bowman for purposes of evaluating principal effectiveness, contained items which were generated from an extensive review of the literature by Valentine and Bowman on the role of the principal. "Items included in the instrument are literature and research based, authenticated for validity by practitioners, statistically factored and tested for reliability" (Bowman & Valentine, 1986). The instrument contained three "domains" and nine "factors" which addressed the major areas of responsibility of the principalship. Each domain could be treated as a separate instrument in analyzing the various areas of responsibility of the principal. Each domain contained several factors which dealt with elements

of the principalship more specifically than the three general domains. The three domains, specific factors, and item numbers of the instrument are:

- I. Domain: Organizational Development (Items 1-27)
 - A. Factor: Organizational Direction (Items 1-7)
 - B. Factor: Organizational Linkage (Items 8-18)
 - B. Factor: Organizational Procedures (Items 19-27)
- II. Domain: Organizational Environment (Items 28-64)
 - A. Factor: Teacher Relations (Items 28-40)
 - B. Factor: Student Relations (Items 41-48)
 - C. Factor: Interactive Processes (Items 49-57)
 - D. Factor: Affective Processes (Items 58-64)
- III. Domain: Educational Program (Items 65-79)
 - A. Factor: Instructional Improvement (Items 65-72)
 - B. Factor: Curriculum Improvement (Items 73-79)

The Tables of Specifications illustrated in Tables 1-3 confirm the content validity of the instrument.

The coefficient alpha reliability for the total instrument is .9698. The domain of organizational development has a coefficient alpha of .9253 while the domains of organizational environment and educational program have a coefficient alpha of .9443 and .8894 respectively (Bowman & Valentine, 1987, p. 2-4).

Table 1. Table of specifications for *Audit of Principal Effectiveness*, Domain: Organizational Development.

DOMAIN #1			
Organizational Direction	Organizational Linkage	Organizational Procedures	No. of Items
1,2,3,4,5,6,7	8,9,10,11,12,13,14 15,16,17,18	19,20,21,22,23,24 25,26,27	27

Table 2. Table of specifications for *Audit of Principal Effectiveness*, Domain: Organizational Environment.

DOMAIN #2				
Teacher Relations	Student Relations	Interactive Processes	Affective Processes	No. of Items
28,29,30,31 32,33,34,35 36,37,38,39 40	41,42,43,44,45 46,47,48	49,50,51,52,53 54,55,56,57	58,59,60,61,62 63,64	37

Table 3. Table of specifications for *Audit of Principal Effectiveness*, Domain: Educational Program.

DOMAIN #3		
Instructional Improvement	Curriculum Improvement	No. of Items
65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72	73,74,75,76,77,78,79	15

Statistical Hypotheses

In order to determine if a teaching principal was perceived as being more effective by the teachers who taught for him/her as well as by the principal himself/herself than a non-teaching principal, the following hypotheses were tested. (All hypotheses refer to Seventh-day Adventist secondary education and are tested on the results of the *Audit of Principal Effectiveness*.)

1. There is no significant difference between teachers' perceptions of principal effectiveness in organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development of teachers whose principals teach and teachers whose principals do not teach.
2. There is no significant difference between principals' perceptions of their effectiveness in organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development of principals who teach and principals who do not teach.
3. There is no significant interaction among the two independent variables of highest academic degree completed by the principal and teaching and non-teaching principals with the dependent variable of perceived principal effectiveness in organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development.
4. There is no significant interaction among the two independent variables of years of experience as a principal and teaching and non-teaching principals

- with the dependent variable of perceived principal effectiveness in organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development.
5. There is no significant interaction among the two independent variables of teacher gender and teaching and non-teaching principals with the dependent variable of perceived principal effectiveness in organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development.
 6. There is no significant interaction among the two independent variables of teachers' years of experience and teaching and non-teaching principals with the dependent variable of perceived principal effectiveness in organizational development, organizational environment and educational program development.
 7. There is no significant interaction among the two independent variables of highest academic degree completed by teachers and teaching and non-teaching principals with the dependent variable of perceived principal effectiveness in organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development.
 8. There is no significant interaction among the two independent variables of number of years a teacher has worked for the current principal and teaching and non-teaching principals with the dependent variable of perceived principal effectiveness in organizational development, organizational environment, and educational program development.

