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ABSTRACT

PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS AND PRE- AND POSTSERVICE TRAINING
AMONG HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN MANITOBA

by Akapelwa Namwakili Mweemba

December 2007

Since the dawn of the effective schools movement in the early 1980s, stakeholders have sought to isolate those factors that account for effective schools. Much of the study efforts have recognized the critical roles of the principal, but have not taken into account myriads of factors and conditions that make any principal effective. This study examined what role adult education plays in principal training by investigating whether there is a statistically significant difference in perceived effectiveness between certified and noncertified principals in Manitoba. It also compared the principals’ self-perception of effectiveness and the teaching staffs’ perceptions of their principals’ effectiveness. Ancillary investigations attempted to isolate factors that might be significant predictors of principal effectiveness.

Conducted among public and funded private or independent schools in Manitoba, the study constituted a sample size of n = 38 principals and n = 149 teaching staff. Among the principals, 65.8% were certified while 34.2% were not certified. Participants were drawn from a cross section of Manitoba high schools, including large and small schools, urban and rural schools, young and old schools.

Using one-way Analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests, the study found no statistical significant difference in perceived effectiveness between certified and noncertified principals. The tests also revealed that the principals’ perception of their
effectiveness does not significantly differ from the staff's perception of their principals' effectiveness. In addition, stepwise linear regression analysis was conducted to isolate environmental factors and principals' demographics that might be used to predict perceived principal effectiveness. Principal experience entered the model, but only as a weak predictor (17%). Finally, a simultaneous linear regression analysis was used to investigate the extent to which the teaching staff's perceptions of principal effectiveness could be predicted using the staff's credentials and experience. The linear combination of the variables was not significant.

The study casts doubt on the effectiveness of pre- and postservice training among principals and their certification process. Certified principals do not seem to have any advantage over their noncertified colleagues, a situation which seems to acknowledge the impotence of certification. However, further studies are recommended to identify the factors that make certification attractive and worth pursuing.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Education is as crucial to human existence and survival as respiration is. Whether
tformal or informal, education has been an integral part of human history. Prehistoric
beings, living in isolated family units, initially transmitted accumulated knowledge and
information to subsequent generations informally through oral traditions (Agatucci,
2004). As organized communities developed, modern man’s existence centered around
communities whose culture was transmitted to subsequent generations through
formalized education. The invention of the printing press in the mid 1400s revolutionized
the dissemination of information and knowledge (Ament, 2005). Subsequently, the
written word assumed a position of prominence in formalized educational systems. The
concept of core curricula emerged, allowing for the domination of the fine arts, rhetoric,
and physical education (Webb, Metha, & Jordan, 2000).

Governments have relied on education to maintain power and the status quo as
defined through the concept of banking education (Freire, 1972). Early American history
is inundated with references to banking education. For example, settlers at Jamestown,
Virginia (1607) and Plymouth, Massachusetts 13 years later organized themselves into
learning, religious communities where teaching literacy was pivotal (Webb et al., 2000).
A literate citizenry would itself read the Bible, the fundamental book upon which
community principles were built, without undue reliance on the clergy for the
interpretation of its content. The rulers of each community ‘banked’ on this education to
create moral and orderly societies (Merriam & Brockett, 1987). With colonization and the
development of organized legislative structures years later, the intent was to inculcate
good citizenry in the population. In the decades that followed, scholars such as Dewey
(1916) and others (e.g., Fennell, 2002; Lipham, 1981) would eloquently describe democratization as the sole purpose of education. In Deweyan terms democracy does not define any particular form of government. Rather,

[I]t is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory. (Dewey, 1916, p. 130)

Recent literature has renewed dialogue on this issue. Even though the face of the democratic society may have changed over the years, the purpose of education has not. Writers discuss the need for democracy and good citizenry under the guise of improved test scores, disciplined learners in schools, and reduction of crime (Peng, 1987). Others call for schools to provide a moral compass through its leadership teams (Fullan, 2003). They have built upon Quintilian, the ancient educator’s philosophy, who advocated for an education engaging the whole person’s intellectual and moral being. He believed that the goal of education was to produce the effective moral man in life’s arena (Webb et al., 2000). In light of this, it is critical that good and effective schools exist to meet these pre-established societal demands and expectations in order to maintain civil, moral, and democratic societies.

Since the 1950s, governments and other bodies regulating education have implemented several programs in an effort to improve school performance. These include the development of new and improved curricula, the provision of additional staff training,
the identification of characteristics of effective schools and attempting to disseminate this information for less effective schools to adapt, and holding schools accountable for the education of their students (Brown, 2001).

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, educational researchers placed tremendous emphasis on how to measure the performance of classroom teachers as the nuclei of effective schools. Within the last two decades, however, focus has shifted to the principal, who has been recognized to occupy the most critical niche of school effectiveness. Subsequently, understanding this position and how it relates to effectiveness becomes the researcher’s intellectual obsession (Langston, 1999). The desire by educational stakeholders to improve the quality of education has imposed a new level of accountability by monitoring how well teachers teach and how much and how well students learn. As educational leaders, principals provide guidance to their schools despite the new challenges posed by an increasingly complex environment in which they operate. This includes new curriculum standards, high achievement benchmarks, demanding programmatic requirements, and other policy directives from many sources that generate complicated and unpredictable requirements for schools (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). Other factors have included pressure from political, social, religious, environmental, and economic forces wanting to redirect the direction of education to satisfy their agendas (Scott, 2002). Due to these unsettling realities, strong school leadership is a critical component of effective schools.

The focus of the majority of studies has been on the general characteristics of effective schools and the subsequent behaviors of their principals. To date, there seems to be a deficit of studies on objective evaluations with which to gauge the effectiveness of
principals. A number of previous studies have essentially focused on the effectiveness of
the school as an organization. Even though principals have been recognized as significant
cogs in the effective school engine, their performance has not been directly evaluated in
relation to effective schools (see Cammaert, 1995; Phillips, 1988; Renihan, Renihan &
Waldron, 1986; Reywid, 1999). Recent literature, however, has placed principals at the
centre of the effective school movement as the catalysts of this phenomenon (McEwan,
2003). The current study will not only investigate the characteristics of effective
principals, it will also provide reliable predictors by which principal effectiveness may be
determined.

Statement of the Problem/ Research Question

Principal efficacy or effectiveness will be understood as the ability of the high
school principal to attain predetermined goals; the capacity to organize and execute
leadership duties required to successfully accomplish a specific task in a particular
context (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy & Hoy, 1998); the “use of people and resources to carry
out essential operations in a way that minimizes cost without sacrificing established
standards of quality and safety” (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004, p. 14). Effective principals
will be those individuals who will rate high in the defined criteria of the researcher-
designed measuring instrument. The current study will address these questions from the
perspective of principal effectiveness.

1. Is there a statistically significant difference in perceived effectiveness between
certified principals and noncertified high school principals in Manitoba?

2. Which, if any, of the following principal’s demographic factors can
statistically significantly predict perceived effectiveness among principals in
Manitoba: years of experience as a principal, certification status, years of service at current school, and the location, size, and age of the school?

3. Do principals’ perceptions of their own effectiveness differ statistically from the perception held by their subordinates?

4. Can the teaching staff’s age, years of experience, years in current school, and highest degree attained by the teaching staff statistically significantly predict how they perceive the effectiveness of their principals?

Definition of terms

In this study, the following definitions will be applied:

Certified principal: an active high school principal holding either Level I or Level II certification issued by the certification department of Manitoba Education, Citizenship and Youth (MECY).

Correlates: common traits that correlate with effective schools, but do not describe cause and effect situations.

Continuing educational units (CEUs): formal educational opportunities undertaken by principals and other professionals for the purpose of upgrading their educational status.

Effectiveness (Principal efficacy or effectiveness): the ability of the high school principal to attain predetermined goals; the capacity to organize and execute leadership duties required to successfully accomplish a specific task in a particular context (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998); the “use of people and resources to carry out essential operations in a way that minimizes cost without sacrificing established standards of quality and safety” (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004, p.14).
Large school: a high school whose total student population is in excess of 600 (MECY, 2004).

Medium sized school: a high school whose total student population is from 150 to 600 (MECY, 2004).

Noncertified principal: an active high school principal not qualified to hold either Level I or Level II certification in Manitoba.

Postservice or Inservice training: formal training undertaken by a principal after assuming the principal’s role.

Preservice training: formal training undertaken by a principal prior to assuming the principal’s role.

Rural school: a school located in either a predominantly agricultural economy, or a country high school in a community with a population under 10,000 (Statistics Canada, 2005).

Small school: a high school whose total student population does not exceed 150 (Manitoba Education Citizenship and Youth, 2004).

Urban school: a high school located in either a predominantly industrial economy or a city high school in a community with a population in excess of 10,000 (Statistics Canada, 2005).

Delimitations
1. Only high schools in Manitoba will be investigated.
2. Only currently serving high school principals will be included in the study.
3. Only currently serving high teachers will be included in the study.
4. The study will investigate perceived effectiveness.
Assumptions

1. Respondents will provide reliable data.
2. The sample of principals and teachers will be representative of the Manitoba population.
3. Principals undergoing training leading up to certification will be reported as noncertified.

Justification of Study

Informal observation of school performances will reveal that some schools are more successful than others. MECY (1995) allows parents to exercise their freedom to choose which schools they wish their children to attend: “Every school board shall designate a school to which a resident student is entitled to attend. A student may choose not to attend his or her designated school” (p. 1). Parents have made their choices based on school effectiveness and the perception of which schools are better equipped to serve the needs of their children. Similarly, some principals are observed to be more effective leaders than others. Unfortunately, defining effective has remained elusive to researchers. Even though researchers identified common practices among successful principals, they failed to define the training that principals need to become effective leaders (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2004). Others acknowledge the fact that educational leadership programs make a difference. “Yet we really do not know whether what we do does, in fact, make a difference in practice” (Chenoweth, Carr, & Ruhl, 2002, p. 31). Therefore, it is imperative that research links the academic activities of university to effective practice of school principals (Chenoweth, Carr, & Ruhl, 2002).
Disparities exist in leadership success even among individuals who have undergone the same highly rated training. In other instances, what has been observed to be effective practice in one school has proven to be ineffective or even detrimental when transplanted into a new environment (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2004).

Most researchers agree, however, that at the center of every effective school, is strong leadership (National Education Association, 1986). Organizations will rise to the level of their leadership caliber. Accordingly, effective schools must have effective principals who lead their school teams: the faculty, staff, volunteers, students, parents, and other stakeholders in the community. In studying effective schools, therefore, one must invariably study the habits and character traits of their principals since the latter are the primary force behind the success (Barker, 2001; Brundrett, & Burton, 2003; English, Frase, & Arhar, 1992; National Education Association, 1986; Phillip & Murphy, 1985). It is the burden of this research to isolate some of the more prominent character traits contributing to principal effectiveness.

In Manitoba, principals are not obligated to possess administrator's certification to assume leadership roles. Countless advertisements will often add this caveat: “Principal’s certification is desirable but not required” (italics added). The Professional Certification Department of Manitoba Education, Citizenship and Youth (MECY), recognizes two levels of administrator certificates: Level I and II. The former is a general certificate for any school administrators such as vice or assistant principals, business managers, etc. Level II, called the Principal’s Certificate, is designed for school principals. While Regulation 515/88 of The Manitoba Education Administration Act recognizes these two levels of certification, “currently, these certificates are not required
[by the principal] in order to accept an administrative position” (MECY, 2004, p. 1). In a similar vein, Merriam and Brockett (1987) compared the field of administration to that of adult education: both have no credentialing mechanism that restricts who can practice. “The MBA degree, like a degree in adult education, does not guarantee entry into the field, nor does not having one prevent someone from being an administrator” (p. 81, italics not added). Common practice entails that principals lacking preservice training may seek postservice training through a variety of professional development opportunities, continuing education units (CEUs), or simply learning from various experiences on the job (Hickcox, 2002). Lack of preservice training may be a disorienting dilemma or source of cognitive dissonance (Mezirow, 1991) that may force principals to seek CEUs. This would support the assertion that “transitions in adult life are strongly linked to learning” (Merriam & Simpson, 1995, p. 62). Therefore, experience on the job and certification status may have a bearing on the level of effectiveness.

In a leadership development forum, Hickcox (2001) reported that while less than half of the principals in Manitoba were certified at either Level I or Level II, only 25% of all vice-principals held either of these certificates. In Winnipeg, the provincial capital, the figures were more encouraging: nearly half of principals and 30% of vice principals were certified practitioners. However, the data failed to confirm whether these certificates were obtained pre- or postservice. Hickcox (2001) also evaluated the extent to which advanced degrees were distributed among the administrators:

Approximately 14% of principals in Manitoba hold a Master’s Degree, although we do not know whether these degrees are in Educational Administration or a related field. Principals in Winnipeg have a higher percentage holding the
advanced degree, about 19%. Only about 9% of vice principals hold a Master’s Degree. In Winnipeg, the figure is 11%. We do not know whether the principals holding the Master’s Degrees also hold either the Level I or II certificate. (p. 4)

A person’s versatility and productivity is improved through education and training as knowledge and skills are acquired. This leads to an understanding that education and training develop higher human capital potential (Dean, Murk, & Del Prete, 2000; Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1983). This study will investigate whether there is a significant difference in perceived effectiveness between principals that have undertaken pre- or postservice training in leadership and administration and are subsequently certified practitioners, and those who have not. At the core of this study is the belief that in society’s effort to build effective schools, it is critical to “fill leadership positions with both qualified and quality candidates. It seems apparent that the current situation as revealed by the statistics is not particularly positive in terms of qualifications as measured by the incidence of either certification or advanced degrees” (Hickcox, 2001, p. 4).

The implications of this study are far-reaching. If no significant differences in perceived effectiveness were observed, the study would reflect negatively on the legitimacy of maintaining principal training programs in Manitoba. Recommendations for changes to the training programs would have to be made to improve their effectiveness. Institutions that do not meet the needs of the community are superfluous and are in dire need of restructuring. If, indeed, the training offered by the local institutions is not making a significant difference in the success of its educational leadership graduates, the wisdom of maintaining these programs would be questioned from a political, fiscal, and educational standpoint. On the other hand, if significant differences are to exist, the study
would argue a strong case for ensuring that preservice certification become a prerequisite for prospective candidates for the principalship. In addition, this would lend further credence to human capital theory thereby legitimizing stringent measures to recruit only qualified and quality personnel. The theory postulates that human potential may be realized and increased when individuals undergo training (Dean, Murk, & Del Prete, 2000), as evidenced by greater efficiency and higher productivity (Hickcox, 2001). The research will establish benchmarks of perceived effectiveness which will aid in deciphering whether training does indeed foster improved performance.

Ancillary questions will address other factors that might predict or influence effectiveness, including such variables as the principal’s age, gender, certification status, and experience, and the school’s size, age, and location. If any of these factors individually or collectively enhance effectiveness, governing bodies would face some pressure from the constituency to orchestrate appointments that would optimize the principal’s potential for success.

The study will also add to the literature on the evaluation of principals. Current evaluation practice is limited by subjective parameters and is often conducted with a punitive intent. What is required is a more realistic and holistic view of evaluation, recognizing its complexity and conducting it in ways that make school principals better practitioners, and subsequently improving the schools’ effectiveness (Reeves, 2004; Marcoux, Brown, Irby, & Lara-Alecio, 2003). Evaluation conducted with a punitive intent is counterproductive for all parties involved.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

In 1966, Coleman published a report that would shape educational research for decades. In their seminal work, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, the researchers sought to examine the role schools play in providing an environment in which its learners could succeed. Essentially, they examined what combination of school inputs effectively maximized student achievement, thereby defining a measure of school effectiveness. The report concluded that of the factors that influenced student achievement, school factors contributed only 10% of the variance. Playing a greater role were such factors as the students’ socioeconomic status. Subsequent works such as that of Jencks, Smith, and Banne (1972) corroborated these findings.

In subsequent years, the tide and focus of educational research shifted from the home to the school as researchers rejected Coleman’s conclusions (Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer & Wisenbaker, 1979; Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore & Ouston, 1979; Ryan, 1993). Home conditions were economically determined, which educators had limited direct powers to affect. As educators, they could influence the future socioeconomic status of their graduates, but not of their parents. Basic educational instincts, however, led researchers to believe that schools did make a difference in student success. As a result, discourse shifted towards investigating which factors within the school system enhanced student achievement. Thus was born the effective school movement. In general, these factors included those concerned with school management, the level of teacher performance in the classroom, and the student’s social milieu within and outside the school (Gamboa, 2004).
Effective Schools Research

The concept of effectiveness invokes two separate, yet related images: the effectiveness of the school, and the effectiveness of the principal. However, effective schools cannot normally exist without the catalytic effect of effective principals (Jones & Kilburn, 2005), even though such schools may continue to exist for a while after their principal is gone. Like an organism, such schools may continue to flourish through the 'conditioned reflexes' of residual success.

Understanding effectiveness of the principal cannot happen in isolation. It is imperative that the construct be understood in terms of the effective school first. As stated earlier, effective schools research stimulated by Coleman and his associates (1966) and established by Edmonds (1979), found common characteristics among effective schools. Also referred to as correlates, these traits became the defining concepts of effective schools.

First, effective schools have a strong leadership, which expounds a clearly outlined and readily accepted school mission. Without the roadmap of a mission statement, schools tend to flounder, attempting to become all things to all people, and ultimately becoming ineffective through overly stretched resources (Association for Effective Schools [AES], 1996; Hemond, 2000; Lashway, 2003a; Renihan, Renihan & Waldron, 1986; Rutherford, 1985).

In addition, effective schools have a high expectation for success. The general belief is that students will often perform to the level of expectation. Therefore, when staff place great faith and high expectations on the learners, the latter respond to meet and even exceed these expectations. The results will be evident through improved attendance
and test scores (Cuban, 2004; Richards, 1991). Such improvement requires several factors to intersect. For example, it is imperative that staff be adequately trained for the task of effectively assisting students to learn. The *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) legislation of the United States clearly emphasizes this need for the best-trained and most highly qualified personnel (NCLB legislation section 1119, paragraph a sect. 1). Recent reports lament the inadequate credentials of some schoolteachers despite the NCLB legislation. For example, the *Washington Post* (March 2005) reported that more than 25% of the D.C. school system teachers lacked certification in 2005. This translated to about 1400 improperly credentialed teachers, half of whom had never been certified, while the other half's certification was in process or had expired.

In effective schools, the principal is an instructional leader. Even though he or she may lack adequate training to teach specific subject matter in the classroom, the principal must be well versed in the areas of motivating and providing sufficient professional development to enhance the performance of the staff (Rallis & Goldring, 2000). In other words, the principal should be cognizant of, understand, and effectively apply the principles of pedagogical effectiveness in the management of the instructional programs (AES, 1996).

Frequent monitoring of student progress is also critical. Through this process, evaluation of the instructional program occurs consistently in order to prescribe necessary changes. Another aspect of monitoring has discipline at its core for ensuring a safe and orderly learning environment. In the wake of the Columbine massacre of 1990 and the Minnesota school shootings of 2005, physical safety in schools has become a pressing matter of immediate concern. Reacting to similar tragic events, commentators lamented...
the moral vacuum pervasive in the North American schools (Cuban, 2004; Nagy & Danitz, 2000). Students tend to perform poorly under conditions of looming threat to their physical, psychological, and emotional well-being. Effective schools provide “an orderly, purposeful, and businesslike atmosphere” (AES, 1996, p. 2) conducive to learning.

Effective schools also place a lot of emphasis on opportunities to learn and students’ time on task. Due to economic constraints, the academic school calendar in Manitoba has been shortened by five days since 2001 (MECY, 2004), thereby significantly reducing the amount of instructional time. Other commentators like Richards (1991) are advocates of increased instructional time for Math, English, Science, history and social sciences, foreign languages and fine arts, since these courses are considered part of the core curriculum. In addition, learners need an allotment of age-appropriate homework assignments and increased in-class writing assignments (AES, 1996).

Healthy home-school relations cannot be overemphasized. Stakeholders in the success of the school seize opportunities to become an integral part of the school’s fabric, without interfering in the general life of the school. At the centre of the stakeholders are the parents, the school’s central office, and local businesses whose workforce originates with the schools. The community serves as a resource base to provide expertise in related fields as its members discover opportunities to participate in the life of the school (AES, 1996).

Another trait of effective schools is the quality support of students with special needs. Concerning individual educational plans (IEPs) the Manitoba legislation stipulates
that schools are obligated to provide appropriate educational programs for all learners, including those with special needs and disabilities (Bill 13, An Amendment to the Public Schools Act, Appropriate Educational Programming, MECY, 2004). Similarly, the idea behind the United States’ original *Individuals with Disabilities Educational Act* (IDEA) legislation of 1990 and its subsequent amendments of 1997 and 2004 is to provide appropriate individualized educational programming for those with disabilities (IDEA, PL 101-476). With this reality, effective schools have adequately adjusted by integrating or accommodating special needs students in a harmonious learning environment.

Finally, the AES (1996) cites the level of student participation in extra-curricular activities as a gauge of effectiveness. When students come to enjoy learning, they tend to seize other educational opportunities. Effective schools tend to record high involvement in extra-curricular activities (Richards, 1991), ranging from the academically related activities like science fairs and debate clubs, to the less academic ones like sports and chess clubs.

The traits discussed thus far culminate in the narrow but adequate portrayal of school effectiveness in terms of the students’ achievement, satisfaction, and success. In broader terms, it also entails fiscal *savoir-faire* of the principal, who aims at reducing the cost of learning to students and increasing the average number of students accomplishing the established learning goals. The principal also works at increasing the overall ability of students to become more self-directed, lifelong learners proficient in problem-solving and other higher order thinking skills (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1986; Pellicer, Anderson & Keefe, 1990). Cohen (1981) best summarizes the characteristics of effective schools by identifying the essential ingredients as a strong administrative leadership; a
school climate conducive to learning; school wide emphasis on basic skills instruction; and high expectation of all teachers to meet the learning needs of every learner. Such schools also demonstrate a highly developed system of monitoring and assessing both learner and teacher performance. Without the presence of the effective principal to monitor progress and orchestrate the symphony of success, these characteristics would not exist.

In other studies, observers were interested in alternative contributors to school effectiveness. One such area of interest was the role the size of the school plays. Collins (2002) argued that school size becomes an issue only from the inclusion standpoint: “Finances aside, small schools have potential for many benefits including increased parental involvement, the much-needed ingredient in achieving and sustaining effective schools” (p. 435). Lunenburg and Ornstein (2000) expounded on the demerits of large schools, indicating that aimlessness, isolation, and despair were common among large schools. By contrast, small schools were more inclusive and provided their students with a strong sense of community. The authors’ views in favor of small schools are clear when they write:

Research now shows that oversized schools are actually a detriment to student achievement, especially for poor children. Even assuming that larger schools did equate to more fiscal efficiency, diverse curriculum, and extracurricular activities, those factors have rarely translated into better student achievement. In fact, the research is... clear on this point: smaller schools help promote learning.... [T]hey are able to offer a strong core curriculum... (p. 365-366)
In a similar vein, Hickcox (2002) believed that working conditions tended to be better for principals, staff, faculty, and students operating within small schools. Despite these positive views, both studies failed to define the parameters that define a small school.

When various factors are taken into consideration, the effective school becomes an institution where teachers “are not treated like semiskilled workers but as professionals who are the locus of the most essential knowledge about the instructional process” (Firestone, 1991, p. 4). Subsequently, empowering the staff to perform at their optimum becomes the principal’s mandate and responsibility.

As indicated earlier, existing research in the area of principal effectiveness is scanty and dated at best. The vast majority of the studies highlight teacher or school effectiveness more than they do principal effectiveness. However, a few of the studies more relevant to the current discussion are subsequently reviewed.

As early as 1990, Leithwood and others analyzed 135 empirical studies on school principalship conducted between 1974 and 1988. They concluded that while studies tended to reveal a lot about effective principal practices, there was little known about how these practices evolve (Education Administrative Abstract 26(2); Waters et al., 2004). With this conclusion, research should have focused on addressing the processes responsible for developing effective principals. Unfortunately, studies, especially in Canada, continued to pursue principal roles and responsibilities. For example, Isherwood and Achoka (1991) were interested in the role and responsibilities of the secondary school principal in Quebec. The study reviewed the morphing roles of the principal: from being “head” in the late 1960s, to being “manager” in the early 1970s, to being “policy
maker” in the late 1980s. In the final analysis, the study concluded that “the principal is indeed the orchestrator of the symphony, the person responsible for staff morale, the confidant of troubled students, and, at times, of troubled staff” (p. 43). The authors acknowledge that the principals’ leadership roles manifest themselves through management, decision-making, and problem solving.

Two years later, Isherwood and Achoka (1992) conducted another study among 40 principals in English schools in Quebec, Canada. Each principal had more than 18 years of experience. These principals provided invaluable insight into the role of the school principal. The authors concluded that, in general, principals play the “public servant” role: they have negligible involvement in curriculum development as well as supervision and evaluation of subordinates. However, “they remain responsible for carrying out policy, for managing the policy-making process, and for treating issues as they arise” (p. 7). The authors contend that “principals seem to be guided by a ‘service ethic’” (p. 7). Principals played the role of manager as opposed to educational leader.

One of the correlates of principal effectiveness is instructional leadership (Edwards, 2002; Leithwood, 1986; Lipham, 1981; Rutherford, 1985). Instructional leadership research took root in the early 1980s. In one study, a team of researchers from the University of Texas at Austin investigated the leadership skills of elementary and secondary principals. They concluded that effective principals as instructional leaders are vision casters, who translate these visions into goals for their schools to strive for, establish school climates that are conducive to success, continuously monitor progress, and intervene in a supportive and corrective manner (Rutherford, 1985).
Contrary to earlier findings, Archbald (1999) concluded that given the choice, principals would rather exercise less control over the curriculum: "The finding will be troubling to advocates of the ‘effective schools’ model that assumes the necessity of strong instructional leadership on the part of the principal" (p. 40-41).

Some studies outside North America have also made substantial contributions to the body of knowledge on school principals. One such study conducted among 152 principals in Hong Kong investigated leadership management difficulties between neophyte and veteran principals. Three main longevity groups were identified: 1-2 years; 3-5 years; and, 6 or more years. However, the most revealing statement of the study categorically indicated that there was no direct correlation between the length of experience and strength of leadership. However, the 3-5 year group portrayed the lowest leadership strength score, suggesting the existence of three stages of professional growth of high school principals, namely, the observing stage, the action stage, and the stability stage (Kwok et al., 1997).

Smart (2003) conducted another study worthy of note. Even though his concern was organizational effectiveness of colleges, his findings have a direct bearing on our understanding of effectiveness in educational institutions in general. The study supported the assertion that the actions of educational administrators were important predictors of effective institutional performance. Key predictors in this regard were the leader’s ability to manage the human and material resources, her strategic planning abilities, and her information management and analysis abilities. In addition, the leader’s style of leadership was also a strong predictor (Simkins, Sisum, & Memon, 2003).
In a survey by Kannapel and colleagues (2005), the aim was to discover the characteristics of high-performing, high-poverty schools in the United States. The study was prompted by the documented link between student socioeconomic status and low academic achievement. The study was very revealing and drew these conclusions:

High-performing, high-poverty schools seem to exhibit a number of common traits that differ significantly from practices in lower-performing, high-poverty schools, including a school wide ethic of high expectations; caring, respectful relations between stakeholders; a strong academic and instructional focus; regular assessment of individual students; collaborative decision-making structures and a nonauthoritarian principal; strong faculty morale and work ethic; and coordinated staffing strategies. (p. 14)

Despite the supportive evidence for the effective school correlates, the study did not find evidence for leadership contributing to the success of the school: “Low performing schools on leadership did not differ appreciably from those of high-performing schools” (Kannapel et al., 2005, p. 22), deviating from many other studies indicating the contrary (see Lipham, 1981; Persell & Cookson, 1982).

The final study worthy of note was one conducted by a group of journalists on effective schools across the United States. The criterion for inclusion in the study was a fairly consistent high achieving student body. The schools in the study were comparable in their student body composition. The study concluded that the principal was at the heart of differences observed. She set the focus, direction, philosophy, and tone of the school. As one journalist so succinctly put it, “effective schools have effective leaders” (Lipham, 1981, p. 4).
With this research, the critical role of the principal has become the crystallizing core of effective schools. Only the effective principal can maintain the momentum of effectiveness and overcome the inertia of mediocrity. This may be accomplished by the principal’s ability to demonstrate an unwavering commitment to academic goals (McEwan, 2003; Persell & Cookson, 1982). This commitment manifests itself in a variety of ways, including involvement in instruction and curriculum through instructional leadership, personnel or human management, resource acquisition and disbursement, and creating a climate of high expectation for the staff and students (McEwan, 2003; Persell & Cookson, 1982). Effective principals also tend to display leadership styles adaptable to their existing conditions. They are dynamic, visionary, and sensitive to the needs of their staff and students (Persell & Cookson, 1982).

Theoretical Foundations of Principal Effectiveness

A study of this magnitude hinges upon prior research and seminal studies that form a theoretical foundation. In view of this, principal effectiveness will be understood in terms of these theories: leadership theory, organizational effectiveness, human capital theory, change theory, and adult learning theory.

Leadership Theories

Leadership has played a significant role in human history. Reputable individuals such as Sir Winston Churchill, George Washington, Nelson Mandela, and Martin Luther King, Jr. rose to ranks of influence due to their exceptional leadership abilities. McCaslin (2001) viewed leadership as a high calling which lends a more spiritual overtone to the practice. The author contended that leaders were unique in that they were steadfast and
immovable in principle, while simultaneously unleashing hope, creativity, and empowerment to unrealized human potential.

In leadership discourse, it is necessary to distinguish between the terms ‘manager’ and ‘leader’. These words are not synonymous. As Bennis and Nanus (1985) so aptly put it, “[m]anagers are people who do things right, while leaders are people who do the right thing” (p. 21). Managers are more involved in the human and material resources aspect of the organization. Their concern is more with the assurance that company policy governs every action. In other words, the managers’ concern is the procurement, coordination, and distribution of human and material resources needed by the organization (Ubben & Hughes, 1987). According to Kotter (1990), management is about coping with complexity; it focuses on details, order and consistency, short-term results, eliminating risks, and on efficiency and bottom-line values. Leadership, on the other hand, is synonymous with influence. Harry Truman, former President of the United States, described a leader as an individual “who has the ability to get other people to do what they don’t want to do and like it” (Wallechinsky & Wallace, 1981). Therefore, leadership is the ability to influence and provide direction to an individual or group to accomplish a common goal (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003).

Many scholars and practitioners perceive leadership as being distinct from, and more valuable than, management. It may even seem that the two are mutually exclusive and would only inhabit an individual with a split personality because the “values and personality traits essential for leadership are incompatible with those essential for management (Covey, 1991). For example, “managers value stability, order, and efficiency, while leaders value flexibility, innovation, and adaptation” (Yukl &
Lepsinger, 2004, p. 9). However, effective principals need both leadership and managerial skills (Moorthy, 1992; Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004). In the words of Cawelti (2003), great leaders perform two main functions: deciding what needs doing, and seeking the support to accomplish it.

Over the past two decades, the base of knowledge on effective schools has been expanding. A common thread among these studies has been the link between successful schools and effective principals; the latter of whom were the key ingredients for the success of the former. The more effective the principal is, the more successful the school is likely to be (Hickcox, 2001; Simkins et al., 2003; Waters et al., 2004; Yukl, 1982). With these conclusive remarks, the focus naturally gravitated towards a comprehensive definition of effective leadership. However, defining this construct has remained as elusive now as it was two decades ago. Yukl (1982) stated that leadership effectiveness was usually defined in terms of such criteria as subordinate commitment to task objectives, subordinate satisfaction with the leader, and the success of the leader’s group or organization in performing its mission and accomplishing clearly defined objectives. Other observers concurred, indicating that the effective principal was the director and overseer of all aspects of the school, and subsequently, is responsible for any success the school experiences (Edwards, 2002; Waters et al., 2004). Based on this premise, it becomes clear that the definitions that emerge are fuelled by the researcher’s conception of leadership, operational definition of effectiveness, and the methodology adopted in the study. In this study principal effectiveness will be defined in terms of the principal’s ability to attain predetermined goals; the capacity to organize and execute leadership duties required to successfully accomplish a specific task in a particular context.
(Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998), and to run a school that is perceived to be effective through its high academic standard and conducive educational environment.

**Leadership Styles.**

According to Yukl (1982), leadership studies can effectively be categorized into four basic approaches: trait approach; power influence approach; behavior approach, and the integrative situational theories approach. Each of these approaches will clarify how each can contribute to principal effectiveness studies.

**Trait Approach.** The trait approach defines leadership in terms of latent, almost genetically defined leadership potential. In the right environment, individuals endowed with these traits develop and fill the leadership vacuum that may exist. From a research perspective, the challenge has been to identify what these definitive traits are (Elmore, 2000). Through analysis of research on managerial effectiveness, Yukl (1982) discovered the existence of certain traits common among effective managers: “self-confidence; need for socialized power; need for achievement; desire to compete with peers; respect for authority figures; tolerance for high stress; high energy level; interest in oral, persuasive activities; and relevant technical, conceptual, and interpersonal skills” (p. 2). By extension, he found evidence that these traits were valuable in the effective principal as well, even though they contributed to effectiveness in varying degrees. For example, possessing technical skill was found to be a significant contributor in this technological age. Also, unlike the classroom teacher, the principal did not need to possess expertise in a variety of academic subjects. Nevertheless, the principal’s expertise in pedagogical practice, curriculum planning, analysis of learning processes, and program implementation is vital (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003).
Some critics have argued that the trait theory is not only limited but misleading as well because of its emphasis on a latent genetic disposition to leadership. The theory denies the existence of leaders who evidently are not naturally endowed with leadership traits, but have learned what it takes to be effective leaders. A more acceptable tenet would be that leaders are not merely determined by genetics, but they can also be molded with training (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004).

**Power and Influence Approach.** The manner in which leaders wield power over subordinates is a reliable measure of effectiveness. Research findings suggested that “effective principals exercise power in a tactful, understanding, non-manipulative manner and provide calm, confident, and professional leadership” (Yukl, 2004, p. 3). Positional power and how it is exercised is not inconsequential for effectiveness. Principals have the ability to dispense rewards or punishments, offer or withhold assistance from subordinates, thereby eliciting a form of coercive allegiance from subordinates (Isherwood, 1973; Yukl, 2004). Even though this may yield the leader’s desired results, it extinguishes morale in the workplace, fosters mistrust, and rapidly breeds dissatisfaction.

**Behavior Approach.** This approach holds the view that effective principals display specific and predictable patterns of behavior. Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) found that “successful principals are able to efficiently satisfy routine organizational demands and allocate more time and effort to activities directly related to improving organizational performance, such as curriculum planning, teacher development, and so forth” (p. 4). Accordingly, Yukl (1982) identified the six most important functions performed by principals to be to develop institutional goals and vision; create structures to facilitate the accomplishment of goals; monitor and evaluate progress; acquire and distribute
resources; create a climate conducive to personal and professional growth and
development; and be an effective public relations officer for the school. The principal
discharges these duties with the assistance of delegated and competent subordinates.

After analyzing seventy studies on school effectiveness, Waters and colleagues
(2004) identified 21 key behaviors of the effective principal. First and foremost, the
principal must clarify the main objective of the school by mapping out a vision,
establishing clear goals, and maintaining the focus for the various interest groups, staff,
parents, and students (Rallis & Goldring, 2000). She fosters and builds a culture of
community and cooperation. She operates with order, and establishes a set of exemplary
standard operating procedures and routines. Maintaining order and discipline protects the
teacher from unnecessary disruptions of learning time. Additionally, the effective
principal furnishes the staff with the teaching material they need, as well as providing
opportunities for professional development for the successful execution of their jobs
(Waters et al., 2004).

Effective principals are also directly involved in the design and implementation of
curriculum, instruction, and assessment practice (McEwan, 2003). As a result of their
involvement in teaching, which is primarily the teachers' domain, effective principals
reciprocate by involving teachers in the design and implementation of important
decisions and policies. By observing the level of involvement, the principal can provide
contingent rewards by recognizing individuals making worthwhile contributions to the
overall mission of the school. It is also critical that principals be more willing to
acknowledge failures and celebrate accomplishments of the school. They encourage the
school community to celebrate such accomplishments. The principal also needs to be
more willing to acknowledge mistakes and failures. Regardless of its nature, every outcome provides fodder for further growth and development (McEwan, 2003).

Since the effective principal is primarily a change agent, she inspires and leads new and challenging innovations based on sound evaluation practices. She consistently evaluates every area of the school’s operation, from the teachers’ to her own performance and establishes how these performances impact student achievement (Waters et al., 2004). The effective principal also displays effective communication skills in her role as advocate for the school to various groups and stakeholders. On the school premises, she is highly visible through “management by wandering around” (Lorenzen, 2002, p.1), and engages in high-quality contact and interaction with both faculty and students (Frase & Hetzel, 2002).

As an individual, the effective principal cultivates healthy personal relationships with her subordinates. She is empathetic, flexible, and confident (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986). Her leadership style adapts to existing circumstances, and she is not immobilized by conflict. Her situational awareness enables her to be cognizant of the issues, details, and undercurrents in the operation of the school. She is then able to address potential problems and dissent more successfully (Waters et al., 2004).

Finally, the effective principal operates from a highly developed philosophy of leadership, demonstrated by her strong ideals and beliefs about schooling. She maintains her mental stamina and intellectual stimulation through immersion in current educational theory and practice. She also encourages her staff to engage in collegial discussion of these ideas, enabling verbal interaction at this level to become an integral part of school culture (Waters et al., 2004; Fullan, 2003).
Situational Leadership Theories

Researchers have come to a consensus that even though various leadership styles exist, no single style guarantees success. Rather, principal effectiveness is more a factor of a mélange of styles than a product of any single one. On this basis, researchers speak of situational leadership theories. The premise of these theories holds that the principal’s level of effectiveness depends on external factors such as school size, urban or rural location, new or established school, public versus private ownership of the school, and whether it is an elementary or secondary school (Yukl, 1981). Other factors such as the principal’s age, gender, and level of education attained are also taken into account.

Situational leadership theories are helpful in identifying the behavioral role requirements for the success of a principal in a particular type of school situation (Fidler, 1997; Yukl, 1981). According to the Yukl and Lepsinger’s (2004) Flexible Leadership Model, the effective principal will adapt leadership styles according to prevailing conditions. Other perspectives include such types as Hemond’s (2000) “transformational leaders” (p. 41), whose styles of leadership adjust with context, and “renaissance leaders” (Renihan & Renihan, 1992, p. 13), whose roles include those of facilitator, instructional leader, inspirer of vision, motivator, and coordinator of an educational team as it pursues excellence (Hemond, 2000; Renihan, Renihan, & Waldron, 1986). Isherwood and Achoka (1991) put it succinctly when they state that “the principal is the orchestrator of the symphony, the person responsible for staff morale, the confidant of troubled students, and, at times, of troubled staff” (p. 43). Others add that effective principals are visionaries, communicators of school purposes, “community spokespersons, personnel
leaders and managers, distributors of resources, and advocates for a healthy school environment” (English, Frase, & Arhar, 1992, p. ix).

Various commentators provide some depth to these theories of leadership since Hersey and Blanchard’s (1969) seminal work. None of these is particularly helpful in the current study, except as it provides a piece of the leadership jigsaw puzzle. However, Hersey and Blanchard’s work is premised on the notion that leaders adapt their leadership styles based on situational factors. Such factors as subordinate allegiance and resource availability become pivotal in the success of this style (Yukl, 1981). Effective leadership adopts one or more of these styles based on the prevailing conditions.

**Directive leadership**

Modeled after the corporate world’s Chief Executive Officer, the leader assumes sole leadership by being directly involved in the establishment’s enterprise. She issues directives exclusively, lays ground rules on modes of operation, and her authority cannot be questioned or challenged without repercussions. Leader directives are the fuel that drives the whole system (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; Vroom & Jago, 1988). The principal’s key role is managerial in nature.

**Participative leadership**

The essence of this leadership style is to engage subordinates in the decision-making process. Aiming at ownership of adopted policies, the leader consults with subordinates and they collectively arrive at decisions made (Gunter, 2004; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; see also Yukl, 1981). The leader elicits feedback from subordinates and reserves the right to either use the information or not. Subordinates have easy access to the leader and feel a certain amount of freedom to voice their concerns without fear of
reprisals (Vroom & Jago, 1988). The effective principal strikes a healthy balance between managerial and leadership roles.

*Achievement-oriented leadership*

At the heart of the organization is high achievement. The leader sets high expectations and challenges the subordinates to accomplish them. She establishes an atmosphere of trust and confidence in the group’s ability to succeed (House, 1971). This is the *modus operandi* of effective principals. The principal’s academic credentials play a major role in boosting the subordinates’ confidence in her (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004).

*Leadership responsibilities*

These theories of leadership play out in unique but identical ways in effective principals. Taking individual idiosyncrasies into consideration, the following is an eight-trait composite of the effective principal built upon the characteristics described by Lipham (1981) and collaborated by others.

*Goals of the school*

As was outlined earlier, the North American principal has had to cope with the myriads of change in the educational landscape. In some way, these obligatory goals have imposed confusing or even conflicting demands on the schools. Principals have had to debate over which one of the quartet of goals to emphasize: intellectual, social, personal, or productive goals (Lipham, 1981). Currently, principals have to deal with issues of ethnic and racial diversity due to an increase in immigration, as well as a change in family structure (Rallis & Goldring, 2000). In Canada, the national debate involves the Supreme Court’s efforts to redefine the meaning of ‘family’ (*CBC News*, December 10, 2004). Ideally, the goals would not cause tension to exist among practitioners. They
would interact in concert with one another to produce the effective school. In reality, however, resource constraints and societal demands often dictate to the contrary. Regardless of the conditions, however, principals are still charged with the responsibility of being the beacon that sets the school's focus, goals, direction, philosophy and vision (Johnson, 1989; Jones & Kilburn, 2005; Lipham, 1981; Wilmore, 2002). Fortunately, the principal does not engage in this activity in isolation. To create a more cohesive group, she involves her subordinates in the setting and achieving of these goals. Principal effectiveness abhors isolationist tendencies and the 'superhero' mentality (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004).

_Educational values_

Even though democracy is at the core of American education, the system has visibly emphasized other traditional values like equality of opportunity, success at work, future-time orientation, human perfectibility, individualism, and moral commitment (Gunter, 2004). However, in the last few years, the trend has shifted away from these traditional values to secular values of moral relativism, sociability, present-time orientation, and group conformity (Lipham, 1981; Sackney, Walker, & Mitchell, 1999). While it is not the intent of this study to evaluate which goals ought to be adopted, suffice it to say that the principal needs to possess the ability to clarify beliefs and attitudes that set parameters for the staff and students. He or she seeks consensus on which values to adopt and elicits support and commitment to those goals. Lipham (1981) describes the principals’ roles in these words:

> Principals serve simultaneously as values analysts, values modifiers, and values witnesses. As analysts [they] determine the value orientations and perceptions of
others; as modifiers they plan and implement activities to clarify and develop values of others; as witnesses, they model and mirror in their behavior a consistent set of values to be emulated. (p. 5)

In addition, principals in effective schools provide moral leadership (Cuban, 2004; Jeong & VanSickle, 2003), fuelled by their own abiding sense of moral purpose, integrity, and fair play (Cuban, 2004; Fullan, 2003; Wilmore, 2002). Yukl and Lepsinger’s (2004) concept of leader integrity relies on such traits as honesty, trustworthiness, and ethical behavior. Integrity in the principal manifests itself in three major ways: keeping promises and honoring commitments; verbalizing values which are consistent with her behavior; and, having the ability to take full responsibility for her actions and decisions. Without integrity, “leaders are unlikely to retain trust, loyalty, and support” (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004, p. 234) from subordinates, whose allegiance they desperately need to function effectively. They also need to cultivate courage to make hard decisions and take difficult action.

Organizational relationships

As a structured bureaucracy, the North American high school is composed of hierarchical roles. Staff, faculty and students report to the principal, who in turn reports to the superintendent at the central office. In terms of organization, schools are categorized as ‘loosely coupled’ entities rather than authoritarian bureaucracies (Lipham, 1981). Subsequently, effective principals enjoy a certain amount of autonomy and recognize the need to modify their leadership styles according to the situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). What this entails is resolving the tension that exists between the expenditure of
time in and out of the school. Both are valuable aspects of effective leadership as the principal cooperates with the central office (Lipham, 1981).

Leadership behavior

Effective principals strike a healthy balance between directive and supportive behavior. The National Association Secondary School Principals (NASSP, 2002) identified 12 dimensions possessed by effective principals: problem analysis, judgment, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity; range of interests, personal motivation, educational values, stress tolerance, oral communication skills, and, written communication skills (see also Accelerated School Administration Programs, [ASAP], 2004; Castle, Mitchell, & Gupta, 2002; Frase & Hetzel, 2002; Lipham, 1981).

Decision-making process

As discussed earlier, the effective principal shares the decision making process with subordinates. She decides the degree to which their involvement is needed. However, she avoids eliciting ideas if she has no intention of considering their value in the decision-making process (Gunter, 2004).

Instructional program

The principal's involvement in the instructional program of the school has generated the majority of the existing body of research. Lipham (1981) touted this as the single most important factor in determining success or failure. Others concur that effective principals focus on instructional excellence and place high expectations on their students and staff. As an instructional leader, the principal regularly monitors staff and student progress, engages in instructional improvement efforts, and rigorously guards against loss of instructional time (Cuban, 2004; Fletcher, 1986; Leithwood &

*Educational change*

Since principals are the key change agents, substantial change cannot occur without their total involvement. Principals can also have catalytic effects in the political arena by influencing political leaders to engineer suitable changes in the educational system (Cuban, 2004; Gunter, 2004). Once the changes are implemented, the effective principal is instrumental in evaluating and refining them (Fletcher, 1986; Lipham, 1981).

*External environment*

Effective principals determine what degree of insularity to adopt with regard to the external constituency. A certain level of autonomy is essential while simultaneously enabling robust home-school ties and community networks (Cuban, 2004). Lipham (1981) identifies four major issues with regard to the principal’s external publics: analysis, communication, involvement, and, resolution. First, the principal analyses issues to isolate affected individuals or groups in order to deal with the issues. Two-way formal and informal communication is critical for the success of this process. Involvement entails the invitation of parents and citizens at large to participate in the life of the school and to contribute to the concept of a learning community. Finally, if disagreements arise, and they will, the effective principal confronts them with the goal of attaining resolution (Lipham, 1981).

Interaction with the external environment is perceived to be an opportunity to network (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004), while the reality of multiculturalism should provide a rich resource base (Rallis & Goldring, 2000). Principal effectiveness is also governed by
the healthy working relationship between the principal and central office (Konnert & Angestein, 1990; Lipham, 1981). Time spent outside of the school at the central office should be viewed as an investment, rather than a liability. The central office has vested interest in the success of the school to enhance the success image of the district. Therefore, the central office assumes instructional leadership roles as well.

In an analysis of the major works on core competencies, the researcher identified six major sources. Three were based on individual authorship (Lipham, 1981; Portin, 2004; Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004), while the other three were based on organizational expectations (The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), 1996; Manitoba Education, Citizenship and Youth (MECY), 2001; National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), 2002). Table 1 summarizes the findings. All sources acknowledged instructional leadership and human resource development and management as critical elements. With the exception of MECY, other sources identified political constituency relations as important. Despite the emphasis on schoolwide leadership, however, ISLLC and MECY failed to identify these as critical elements to warrant independent status. Similarly, only Lipham and ISLLC mentioned ethical leadership. A new category of “other skills” highlighted NASSP’s commitment to assist the principal in self-reflection by identifying weaknesses and strengths. Even though the chart indicates that not all core competencies are reflected by these sources, close scrutiny of the underlying meanings will indicate that they are incorporated in the other elements. For example, ISLLC’s systemic leadership comfortably accommodates schoolwide leadership; while MECY’s leadership category is expandable to include school-
Table 1: A Summary Comparing High School Principals' Core Competencies from Selected Sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Programming</td>
<td>Instruction Programming</td>
<td>Standard 2: Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Instruction Leadership</td>
<td>Instruction Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School wide Leadership</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Standard 1: Systemic Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>• Organizational Ability</td>
<td>Cultural Leadership</td>
<td>People-Oriented Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Vision</td>
<td>Goals of School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Judgment</td>
<td>Strategic Leadership</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Development and Management</td>
<td>Organizational Relationships</td>
<td>Standard 4: Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>Management Personnel</td>
<td>Resolving Complex Problems</td>
<td>Managerial Leadership</td>
<td>Efficiency-Oriented Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and Constituency Relations</td>
<td>Educational Change External Environment</td>
<td>Standard 6: External Forces and Power Standard 3: Community and Political Leadership</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>• Oral Communication</td>
<td>External Development Leadership</td>
<td>Change-Oriented Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership Behavior</td>
<td>Standard 5: Interpersonal and Ethical Leadership</td>
<td>Developing Self and Others</td>
<td>• Understanding own strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>Micropolitical Leadership</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
wide leadership, political constituency relationships, and ethical leadership. However, the concept of ethical leadership is absent in the more recent models despite the call for renewed ethical conduct in leadership (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004).

Organizational Effectiveness

Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) identify one of the philosophies of adult education as organizational effectiveness. They argue that adults employed in both the private and public sectors are continually encouraged to be involved in educational programs designed to accomplish the goals of the organization. For the private sector, the goal is realizing larger profit margins, while the public sector aims at enhancing its service to the public. Human resource development through training, education and development are the means by which these goals may be realized. Such observations are consistent with the seminal work of Lefebvre (1970), as well as that of Nadler (1970). As Nadler (1970) pointed out, “human resource development [is] a series of organized activities, conducted within a specified time and designed to bring about behavioral change” (p. 65), in the hope of meeting the goals of the organization effectively and efficiently.

In more recent works, observers have concurred that besides leadership ability, principal efficacy is enhanced by organizational effectiveness (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004). Riddley and Mendoza (1993) define organizational effectiveness as “the strategic balancing of priority given to processes of survival and maximization of return over [the] long term. Essential to this endeavor is the differential allocation of organizational resources based on priority” (p. 172). As the definition so succinctly states, organizational effectiveness does not happen haphazardly: it demands “a kind of
innovative development or progressive evolution that sets an organization apart from the status quo” (p. 170). In addition, any organization experiencing organizational effectiveness must display the ability to change, develop, and adapt over time. Like an organism, organizations must adapt to prevailing forces in order to remain viable and effective. Similarly, Klein (1991) envisions organizational effectiveness from an “ecological” perspective, portraying it as the satisfaction of certain key environmental elements necessary for the organization’s survival (p. 224). The most comprehensive definition comes from van Kesterens (1996, p. 94), which has been translated into English from German by Scheerens (2000, p. 33-34):

Organizational effectiveness is the degree to which an organization on the basis of competent management, while avoiding unnecessary exertion, in the more or less complex environment in which it operates, manages to control internal organizational and environmental conditions, in order to provide, by means of its characteristic transformation process, the outputs expected by external constituencies. (p. 94)

If North American schools are to survive the changes and forces imposed on them, school principals are required to immerse themselves in the precepts of organizational effectiveness. Such conditions will be unique to each school, but what is of paramount importance to school survival is that principals are adaptable enough to effect organizational changes that perpetuate their tenure of success.

Organizational effectiveness is pivoted on four main concepts influenced by the business world: efficiency; process reliability; ability to adapt to the external
environment; and human relations and resources management (Yukl and Lepsinger, 2004).

Efficiency entails the “use of people and resources to carry out essential operations in a way that minimizes cost without sacrificing established standards of quality and safety” (p.14). Effective principals are well versed in fiscal matters and human resource management. Efficiency and efficacy work in harmony with each other. Therefore, efficacy demands the ability to attain predetermined goals (within a prescribed time frame) and the capacity to organize and execute leadership duties required to successfully accomplish a specific task in a particular context (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Process reliability deals with the production and delivery of products and services in the most efficient way to avoid unnecessary delays, errors, quality defects, or accidents (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004). Principals are not divorced from process reliability. They accomplish this role in their capacities as instructional leaders and in communicating effectively with the constituency.

Similar to Cuban’s (2004) concept of rallying for broad support, adapting to the external environment involves appropriate responses to threats and opportunities arising from pressures outside the school with regard to technology and customer needs and expectations (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004). Meeting the demands of the constituency as they relate to student high achievement remains the principal’s primary driving force and objective.

Finally, if the effective principal is to preserve the health of her school, knowledge of human relations and management principles should be at the forefront. This entails recruiting, developing, and retaining personnel with compatible skills,
personalities, and a commitment to maintain mutual trust and cooperation with others in the organization (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2004).

Using the research conducted by a consultation group among employees, Yukl and Lepsinger (2004) concluded that there were essentially eleven conditions that greatly influenced employee satisfaction and commitment to the organization. Employees were willing to stay in their jobs when they understood how their jobs fit with the overall organizational plans, vision, and strategy; had a job that was a good fit with their skills, and were on a strong team. It was also important for them to perceive their immediate supervisor as competent; that everyone was held to the same accountability standard; that decisions were made in a timely manner; and that the organization was committed to employee success. In addition, it was crucial for them to feel that they were treated with respect and courtesy; received regular feedback and appropriate recognition; and, had an opportunity to improve their skills. Finally, having a generous pay and benefits program was also a significant factor.

Human Capital Theory

Another contributing theory to principal effectiveness is human capital theory. A person’s versatility and productivity is improved through education and training as new knowledge and skills are acquired. This leads to an understanding that equates education and training to higher human capital potential (Dean, Murk, & Del Prete, 2000; Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1983; Sorensen, 2000). In the words of Mark Twain (1893), “Training is everything. The peach was once a bitter almond; cauliflower is nothing but cabbage with a college education” (p. 68). According to Fitzsimons (1999), Adam Smith’s The Wealth of Nations (1776) established the foundation upon which human
capital theory is based. For the next few centuries, scholars became polarized between two schools of thought; one distinguished between the acquired human capacities that were classified as capital while rejecting the other view that humans themselves were also capital.

The popular version of the human capital theory conceptualizes all human behavior as being based on the "economic self-interest of individuals operating within freely competitive markets" (Fitzsimons, 1999, p. 98). Furthermore, modern human capital theory has stressed the significance of education and training as the key to participation in the new global economy (Fitzsimons, 1999). With the proposed involvement of education in training, it becomes imperative that schools become effective in producing learners who are not threatened by, but rather, are willing to embrace globalization. With regard to principal training, Hickcox (2001) argued that the basic assumption was that systematic training and licensure requirements for Manitoba school principals increased their chances of high-level performance throughout the province. Therefore, investing in the training of school leaders is the pertinent and fiscally responsible course of action demanded by this viewpoint.

Despite the general optimism of the human capital theory, there is some concern about the value of administrator training programs. Lashaway (2003a) asserts that continual evaluation of such programs is essential to ensure that the programs are beneficial. The majority of administrator training programs lack credibility with the public. A recent survey concluded that 69% of principals and 80% of superintendents were of the strong opinion that principal training programs were not effectively equipping school leaders to be successful practitioners. The survey report further argued that the
crux of the matter rested on the entrance characteristics sought or not sought. In most programs, self-selection governed acceptance, coupled with inconsistent screening, and negligible attention to talented individuals. In the words of Southern Regional Educational Board official Gene Bottoms, “the process is based on the Graduate Record Exam, undergraduate GPA, and a check that doesn’t bounce” (Lashaway, 2003a, p. 2). Even more disturbing was the fact that education majors had lower GRE scores than majors in most other fields. Education administration majors ranked at the bottom of education majors. Surprisingly, with the current emphasis on instructional leadership, only 40% of the educational administration programs examined sought teaching experience as a requirement for entrance (Lashaway, 2003b). Given the reputation of these training facilities, it will require more evidence to the contrary to restore faith in them, thereby enabling hiring agencies to have confidence in new graduate administrators. Currently, institutions that statistically perform well produce graduates whose reputation will allow the new administrators to be competitive in the job market. This, in turn, produces more prestige for the institution.

Manitoba Education, Citizenship and Youth (MECY) requires principals seeking certification to be competent in the four core areas of Leadership, Instruction, Management, and Personnel. Candidates can take these courses from any approved university at the postgraduate level or through CEUs available through professional development opportunities (MECY, 2001). The requirements are consistent with the effective school literature highlighting the need for expertise in school leadership, human and resource management, and instructional leadership (McEwan, 2003). Portin (2004) expounds on the core competencies. First, principals must be strong instructional leaders...
whose main task is ensuring quality of instruction, modeling effective teaching practices, supervising curriculum, and ensuring the availability of quality teaching resources.

Effective principals also practice cultural leadership, as evidenced by the principal’s attention to the preservation of the school’s traditions, rituals, climate, and history. Another significant quality is managerial leadership, which involves overseeing school operations: its budget, schedule, facilities, safety and security, and transportation. Since principals have to interact with their subordinates, they must be effective human resource managers. Essential skills in human resource management include recruiting, hiring, firing, inducting, and mentoring teachers and administrators. It also involves developing leadership capacity and professional development opportunities (see also Rebore, 2003).

Effective principals must provide direction by promoting their schools’ vision, mission, and goals, and developing a means to reach them. Therefore, principals need to be strategic leaders. Additionally, external development leadership is an asset. Functioning outside of the school, this role requires the principal to represent the school in the community, develop capital, tend to public relations, recruit students, buffer and mediate external interests, and advocate for the school’s general interests. Finally, she must exhibit micropolitical leadership. The principal’s focus is inward; she works at maximizing fiscal and human resource management (Portin, 2004).

Change Theory

Another theory worth evaluating is change theory because the challenge to build effective schools directly requires principals to be innovative as they adjust to the social pressures to improve schools. Paradoxically, the very constituency advocating for change is the very constituency resistant to it. As a rule, people oppose change, unless the
proposed change is clearly going to improve their state of affairs at minimal personal cost (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000). Therefore, if the principal is to succeed in implementing the change necessary to create an effective school, she must have knowledge of change theory. This involves accomplishing leadership goals without disenfranchising subordinates (Griffiths, 1959; Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1990; March, 1984). For the principal, two major issues that emerge are causes of resistance to change, and ways of reducing it.

Even though organizational change usually infuses new life into a school and clearly helps in the effectiveness of the organization, the effort will elicit mixed reactions. Some will embrace change, while others will resist. The role of the principal is to alleviate the stress of change by understanding some of the barriers that exist. These would include “interference with need fulfillment, fear of the unknown, threats to power and influence, knowledge and skill obsolescence, organizational structure, limited resources, and collective bargaining agreements” (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000, p. 211). The courageous change agent will draw upon available leadership resources and shift the tide toward embracing change. To be successful, however, knowledge of Lewin’s (1951) force-field analysis theory is essential. He perceived two kinds of forces at work in any organization: driving forces and restraining forces. Driving forces push forward and initiate change and development. In industry, these would include such forces as pressure from a supervisor, incentive earnings, and competition from other companies. However, driving forces are limited by restraining forces whose roles are to decrease the effects of the driving forces. Apathy, hostility, and poor maintenance of equipment may be suitable industrial examples. In the school setting, lack of resources, poor morale, and hostility
toward leadership may be restraining forces. Invariably, equilibrium results when the sum of the driving forces equals the sum of the restraining forces, a balance which always describes currently existing conditions (Lewin, 1951). The role of the principal as a change agent is to increase the pressure from driving forces while simultaneously decreasing the restraining forces, without alienating any of her subordinates. This is not an easy task; it requires patience, tact, and the ability to empathize with others (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000).

**Adult Learning Theory**

The final theory deals with adults in learning situations. Efforts by principals to engage in postservice learning, especially through continuing education units (CEUs), fall squarely within the domain of adult education. CEUs are provided through various institutions, including postsecondary institutions. These institutions provide “systematic, organized events intended to bring about learning” (Merriam & Brockett, 1987, p. 6). Adult education will be understood within the all-encompassing framework of, and be defined as, “the process of adults learning [whereby] a set of organized activities [are] carried on by a wide variety of institutions for the accomplishment of specific educational objectives” (Knowles, 1980, p. 25). Merriam and Brockett (1987) shared the same views when they defined adult education as activities intentionally designed for the purpose of bringing about learning among those whose age, social roles, or self perception define them as adults” (p. 8, italics not added). In light of this definition, principals or other professionals engaged in postservice training are participating in adult education activities. In fact, the term “continuing education” has come to be associated with professionals keeping abreast of educational offerings and seeking credentialing.
Subsequently, the term ‘adult and continuing education’ as described by Schroeder’s Type II educational agencies, has been incorporated into the vocabulary of adult education (Merriam & Brockett, 1987).

Therefore, adult learning theory will have a bearing on the extent to which principals engage in CEUs, and minimizing its contribution would be negligent. Their self-motivation and self-directedness drives the principals to seek postservice credentialing and contributes to their success.

Knowles (1970) was one of the earliest to establish that adults learn differently than children. He used the term ‘andragogy’ to differentiate “the art and science of helping adults learn” from ‘pedagogy’ defined as “the art and science of helping children learn” (p. 37). Andragogy makes certain assumptions about the way adults approach an educational opportunity. These are diametrically opposed to pedagogical assumptions. According to Knowles (1970), andragogy is premised on four basic assumptions about how adults learn:

1. An adult’s self-concept moves from one of dependence to self-directing;
2. An adult’s accumulated experiences become an increasing resource for learning;
3. An adult’s readiness to learn becomes oriented increasingly to the developmental tasks of her social roles;
4. An adult flourishes in educational settings where she has immediate application of the knowledge gleaned.

Knowles continued to argue that the last premise viewed an educational enterprise as shifting from one of “subject-centerdness to one of problem-centerdness” (p. 39). In addition, self-directed learning has at its core “the development of the learner’s capacity
to be self-directed" (Merriam, 2001, p. 5). The earliest adult education proponents of self-directed learning, Knowles (1970) and Tough (1971), point to the intrinsic motivation that adult learners bring to a learning situation. They contend that motivation stems from the learners’ need to acquire new knowledge and skills for specific and immediate use.

The current study will assume that principals undergoing preservice training are exposed to more pedagogically inclined and less andragogically driven curricula. It can be argued that in university, professors are the wellspring of imparted knowledge; they decide what assignments must be completed, what body of knowledge to transmit, and what grades are issued, thereby directing most aspects of the learning process. This reflects Freire’s (1972) concept of banking education. Postservice training through continuing educational units on the other hand will be assumed to reflect SDL, since the training is not required to maintain the principalship. What motivates principals to seek out CEU opportunities is what Mezirow (1991) describes as a disorienting dilemma. Lack of preservice training may be a disorienting dilemma or source of cognitive dissonance that forces principals to seek new ways of compensating for the deficiency. This would support the assertion that “transitions in adult life are strongly linked to learning” (Merriam & Simpson, 1995, p. 62). The extent to which principals indicate their involvement in undertaking formal education towards certification would reliably indicate their disposition towards self-directed learning.

Chapter Summary

The research reviewed so far identifies the principal’s role in a school as one of the most significant determinants of a successful school. The effective principal displays certain character traits and behaviors emanating from proficiency in the areas of
instructional leadership, and human, resource and fiscal management. External factors playing a significant role include the characteristics of the school, the principal’s educational credentials, and the role of the central office. School principals seeking certification through MECY may follow an alternative to university academic training and augment their knowledge with CEUs. Certification seems to affirm one’s competence as an educational leader in the areas of instruction, material and human resources, and leadership.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The central issue of the current investigation was to investigate whether there is a significant statistical difference in perceived effectiveness between certified and noncertified high school principals in Manitoba. Using the traits and practices of highly effective principals previously reviewed, the researcher sought to obtain a realistic profile of the performance of various school principals. Using these traits, the researcher developed a High School Principal Effectiveness Questionnaire (HSPEQ). Two levels of data collection were conducted using two identical Likert-type questionnaires. The first one (HSPEQI) was administered to teachers who gauged their principals’ effectiveness and generated staff demographics.

The second questionnaire (HSPEQII) was administered to principals, who provided demographic and other pertinent information to address the research questions. More importantly, the questionnaire elicited responses on the principals’ self perceptions of effectiveness. Besides the central question of effectiveness based on certification, the HSPEQ II was also used to develop traits and characteristics that might be used to statistically predict the level of effectiveness of principals based on age, professional credentials and length of service of the principal, and the size, location, age, and type of the school.

Participants

In 2006, there were 952 school principals in Manitoba working in elementary, middle, and high schools (MECY, Schools in Manitoba, 2005). Of these, 189 were high school principals who constituted the study’s population, representing public and funded
private (independent) schools. Excluded from the study were nonfunded independent schools and First Nations’ Band schools. Contact information for these individuals was obtained from the Manitoba Education Citizenship and Youth (MECY, 2005) document. From each school a random sample of teachers was selected to evaluate their principals’ perceived levels of effectiveness. A staff list was drawn up and the sample names drawn out of a hat. Respondents were requested to submit their completed questionnaires to the school’s coordinator, who subsequently forwarded them to the researcher by mail.

Instrumentation

The High School Principal Effectiveness Questionnaire (versions I and II), a 5-point Likert-type of instrument, was constructed by the researcher and used to elicit the required data. The instrument was tested for content validity by a panel of judges. Two practicing educational administrators in different jurisdictions and four university professors in the Educational Leadership and Research department at The University of Southern Mississippi evaluated the measuring instrument for clarity and content validity. The team responded to the instrument’s accuracy and comprehensiveness, its format, clarity, and overall effectiveness in measuring what it purports to measure. The team’s feedback was then be incorporated into the two working versions of the HSPEQ I & II. The collected data was then utilized to estimate the instruments’ reliability using the Cronbach Alpha value. Since the value was within the acceptable limits of greater than .79 (Gliem & Gliem, 2003; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), the HESPQ was administered to the target population. The generic traits and characteristics for the measuring instrument were derived from a number of sources, (see Frase & Hetzel, 2002; Kirk & Jones, 2004; McEwan, 2003; Pashiardis, 1997; Peeke, 2002; Persell & Cookson, 1982;
Reid, Hopkins, & Holly, 1987; Seyfarth, 1996). Samples of the measuring instrument are provided in Appendix 1. The completed questionnaires had a Cronbach Alpha reliability value of .92 (Standardized item alpha = .94), as estimated by the statistical analysis program SPSS v.10.

Data Collection

The researcher obtained mailing addresses of individual schools in the population from the MECY (2005) publication. After securing authorization from the target school boards and principals, the instrument was mailed out to the respondents, through the local coordinator. The school’s secretary served in this capacity. For each principal taking the questionnaire, at least 20% of the staff in the school participated. As completed questionnaires were returned, the researcher entered them in the SPSS database for further analysis.

Each participating school was assigned a randomly selected 3-digit code. Additionally, the principal’s version of the questionnaire was marked with a “-00” code, while the staff versions were sequentially numbered “-01” to “-10”. Such identification facilitated any follow up for schools that needed to be contacted for any reason. Schools that did not return both sets of questionnaires were not excluded from the study because the pooled data was more important than the individual data sets.

Limitations

1. The willingness of principals to participate for fear of being ‘evaluated’ by subordinates.

2. The teacher’s perception of the principal’s effectiveness may unfairly be influenced by collegiality or lack of it.
3. The teacher’s reluctance to evaluate the principal for fear of repercussions in the event of a poor review, despite the assurance of anonymity for the respondents and confidentiality in the treatment of the data.

4. Physical factors that might influence principal effectiveness, such as quality of facilities, or student body composition, were not factored into the study (Reid, Hopkins, and Holly, 1987). The rationale centers on eliminating factors of resource availability from influencing the study. In other words, schools with more material resources should not have an unfair advantage over schools with fewer resources. Inequity in resource availability and distribution was to have no influence in the study and was not part of the questionnaire.

Data Analyses

Once the data were collected, analyses proceeded in four ways. First, certified and non-certified principals’ effectiveness was compared using 1-Way Analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests. This analysis was to clarify whether there is statistically significant difference in perceived effectiveness between the two groups. Second, a stepwise multiple linear regression was conducted to determine “which of the specific [proposed] predictors make meaningful contributions to the overall prediction” (Mertler & Vannatta, 2002, p.170) of perceived effectiveness among the principals. In other words, of the independent variables under study (principal’s years of experience, years in current school, and highest degree attained, certification status, and the school’s, size, age, and location), which ones would be isolated as contributing the most in making principals effective. Third, 1-Way ANOVA tests were conducted to compare the difference in the perception of effectiveness of the principal between the staff and the principal’s self-
perception of effectiveness. Fourth, a simultaneous linear regression was employed to investigate to what extent the staffs’ perceptions of principal effectiveness can be predicted using the staffs’ credentials and experience. Tests for statistical significance were set at an alpha value of $p < .05$. 
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

After the questionnaires were entered into the data base, additional processing of the data was required. This chapter will discuss the means by which the data was prepared for analysis, a statistical description of the samples, and the statistical results of the study.

Data Preparation

As the questionnaires arrived, the researcher entered them in a database. Certified principals and their staff constituted one group while noncertified principals and their teaching staff constituted the other group. These two groups formed the basis of the study from which various combinations would be used to compare their perceived effectiveness using the Composite Effectiveness Value (CEV). Additional comparison groups included certified and noncertified principals, and teachers whose principals were certified and those whose principals were noncertified. The data was analyzed using SPSS v. 10.0.

In order for the study to proceed, there needed to be a benchmark for comparing various statistical analyses. Such a benchmark would form the basis of the dependent variable, which would adjust in value accordingly to reflect the effect of the independent variables, such as certification status, years of experience, location of school, and so on. The CEV became that value. As a construct, the CEV was the sum of all the subscales of the variables: strategic practice; curriculum management; personnel management; fiscal and facility management; student management; school climate; character traits; and, community relations. Data was also checked for accuracy, such that any questionnaires
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with inadequate information or those outside $\pm 3$ standard deviations were eliminated. Altogether, 3 such questionnaires were excluded from the study.

Description of the Sample

The sample for this study was drawn from a population of 189 public and private (independent) funded high schools in Manitoba. Excluded from the study were nonfunded independent and First Nations Band schools. Within the sample of 42 high schools, various school descriptions were discerned. Overlap in numbers was possible. For example, a large school could appear in the urban school count as well as in the public school count. The following categories were observed: large (7), small (35), rural (37), urban (5), private (5) and public (37) schools. The mean age of the schools represented was 41.6 with a mean enrollment of 303.08 students.

For each research question the sample size was subject to change due to incomplete information on some of the questionnaires. For example, a questionnaire reporting an unrealistic school age was eliminated when the age of the school was important for statistical analysis, but was reintroduced into the sample when other required data were available. Such a strategy was adopted to improve the sample size. Whenever questionnaires were excluded for a particular analysis, they were reported as missing from the analysis.

The sample size included 40 principals and 149 teaching staff, the latter of whom were drawn from the participating principals’ schools. Two principals’ questionnaires were eliminated due to inadequate information, making the effective principals’ sample size $n = 38$. The rate of principal participation was about 21%. Among the principals, 28 were male and 10 were female. The mean age and median age for the principals were
46.4 years and 48.0 years, respectively. Of these, 75% of the principals had their highest degree in Education while 8% specialized in Administration. However, only 17 had a Bachelors’ degree or lower (44.7%), 21 had post Baccalaureate to Masters’ degrees (55.3%), and none had doctoral degrees. In addition, 25 (65.8%) were certified and 13 (34.2%) were non-certified. Principals were in their schools for a mean length of 4.4 years and had an average experience of 17.3 years. The certification status of the principals was critical to the study.

The number of teaching staff who participated from each school varied but each time representing at least 20% of the teaching staff in their schools. Such participation levels reflected the differences in the size of the schools. While large schools would have had enrollments of over a thousand students, there were small schools with under fifty students. In the end, the valid staff demographics sample size was n = 147. Within the sample, 83 were female (56.1%) and 65 were male (43.9%). The age ranges, years in current school, years of experience, and highest degree attained are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Staff Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years in current school</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Less than 6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 6 and 10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 11 and 20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 21 and 30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Less than 6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 6 and 10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 11 and 20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 21 and 30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than 30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Bachelor’s or less</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attained</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post Bachelor’s</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dashes indicate uncalculated percentage values for data not used in the analysis.

Research Questions and Statistical Results

*Research Question 1*

Is there a statistically significant difference in perceived effectiveness between certified principals and noncertified high school principals in Manitoba?
Procedures for Answering Question 1

All staff questionnaires were used to address this question. One-way ANOVA tests were run. The CEV was the independent variable that was used to compare the score between certified and noncertified principals. Teaching staff whose principals were certified constituted one group while staff whose principals were noncertified constituted the other group.

Results for Question 1

The results showed that certified principals were rated to have a higher CEV mean (164.24, SD = 35.65) than noncertified principals mean (157.71, SD = 36.70) and in all subscale categories of the descriptives. The results are indicated in Table 3.

Table 3

Descriptives of Variable Subscales of Certified and Noncertified Principals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>min</th>
<th>max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Practice</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>28.43</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>24.87</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Facility Management</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>13.93</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Management</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>min</th>
<th>max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>25.43</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Traits</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Effectiveness Value</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>164.25</td>
<td>35.65</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CEV)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>157.71</td>
<td>36.70</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>210.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way ANOVAs were conducted to investigate whether there was a statistically significant perceived difference in perceived effectiveness between certified and noncertified principals. The independent variable, principal certification, included two levels: certified, and noncertified. The dependent variable was the CEV. Due to the existence of multiple ANOVAs, Bonferroni correction was applied to avoid Type I error. The significance value was set at .05/8; $p = .006$. The ANOVA tests indicated no statistically significant influence of principal certification status on the effectiveness subscales, $F(1, 146) = 1.00, p = .32$. Table 4 shows this data.
Table 4

Summary of Significance Values of the Effect of Certification in Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Practice</td>
<td>(1, 146)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>(1, 146)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>(1, 146)</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Facility Management</td>
<td>(1, 146)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Management</td>
<td>(1, 146)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>(1, 146)</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Traits</td>
<td>(1, 146)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>(1, 146)</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 2

Which, if any, of the following principal’s demographic factors can statistically significantly predict perceived effectiveness among principals in Manitoba: years of experience as a principal, certification status, years of service at current school, and the location, size, and age of the school?

Procedure for Answering Question 2

Thirty six principals were used for this analysis’ sample. The independent variables were checked for internal correlations. A as a principal, certification status, years of service at current school, and the location, size, and age of the school) in predicting the perceived effectiveness of high school principals in Manitoba. Based on casewise diagnostics (3 or more standard deviations outside the mean), 1 case was identified as an outlier and deleted from the data for analysis. Another case reported an
unrealistic school age of 700 years. Other deletions involved missing data on one or more of the variables under investigation. In all, 4 cases were excluded from the analysis.

Results for Question 2

Evaluations of linearity, normality, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity showed that the assumptions were met within acceptable limits. Regression results showed that the single variable, years of experience, significantly predicted perceived principal effectiveness in the overall model, $R^2_{adj} = .17, F(1, 34) = 8.31, p = .007$. Of the six variables, only one (years of experience) significantly contributed to the model, and accounted for 17% of the variance in perceived principal effectiveness. The coefficients for the model variables were $B = .69$, $\beta = .44$, $t = 2.88$, Bivariate $r = .44$, and Partial $r = .44$ at 95% Confidence Interval (.20, 1.18).

Research Question 3

Do principals’ perceptions of their own effectiveness differ statistically from the perception held by their subordinates?

Procedure for Answering Question 3

For this investigation, the principals’ self-perception of effectiveness was compared to that of their subordinates using the CEV. One principal’s questionnaire was eliminated from the analysis due to inadequate data. The mean CEV score among principals was 163.95 ($n = 39$), while that of the teaching staff was 162.44 ($n = 149$). A summary of descriptive is indicated in Table 5.

Results for Question 3

One-way ANOVAs were conducted to evaluate whether there is a difference in the perception of effectiveness between the principals and their subordinates. The
Table 5

Comparison of Mean Scores and Standard Deviation Values by Subscales between Teaching staff (T) and Principals (P).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>min</th>
<th>max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Practice</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>24.59</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Facility Management</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Management</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Traits</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Effectiveness Value</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>162.44</td>
<td>35.83</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CEV)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>163.95</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>188.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
independent variable, role of participant, had 2 levels: principals and teaching staff. The dependent variable was analyzed by the change in the value of the CEV. The ANOVA tests indicated no significant statistical differences in the principals' self-reported perception of effectiveness based on the composite effectiveness value scores, when compared with their subordinates' perceptions; F(1, 186) = .065, p = .80. In other words, the principals' rating of their effectiveness was comparable to that of their staff's evaluation. A summary of statistical values indicated in Table 6.

Table 6

Summary of Significance Values between the Principals’ Self-perceptions of Effectiveness and that of their Subordinates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAIT</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Practice</td>
<td>(1, 186)</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Management</td>
<td>(1, 186)</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>(1, 186)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Facility Management</td>
<td>(1, 186)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Management</td>
<td>(1, 186)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>(1, 186)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Traits</td>
<td>(1, 186)</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>(1, 186)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 4

Can the teaching staff's age, years of experience, years in current school, and highest degree attained by the teaching staff statistically significantly predict how they perceive the effectiveness of their principals?
**Procedure for Answering Question 4**

The teaching staffs' sample (n = 136) was used for this investigation, which included the teaching staff's age, years of experience, years in current school, and highest degree attained by the teaching staff, as the independent variables. The dependent variable was the CEV. A summary of the values is indicated in Table 7.

Table 7

*Summary of Descriptive Statistics.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of Respondents</td>
<td>40.60</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Current School</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEV</td>
<td>162.20</td>
<td>36.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results for Research Question 4**

Correlation among the variables was also established. Years of experience and years in current school, as well as years of experience and age of respondents were highly correlated at .72 and .89, respectively. A simultaneous multiple linear regression analysis was then conducted to assess prediction of perceived principal effectiveness using the teaching staff's demographic factors of years of experience; years in current school; school enrollment; age of school; location of school; highest degree attained; and certification status of the principal. Based on casewise diagnostics (3 or more standard deviations outside the mean), 2 cases were identified as outliers and deleted from the data. Evaluations of linearity, normality, and homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity showed that the assumptions were met within acceptable limits. In the regression results the single variable, years of experience, entered the equation and weakly predicted
principal effectiveness in the overall model, $R^2 = .04$, $R^2_{adj} = .01$, $F(4, 130) = 1.45$, $p = .22$. This model accounted for only 1.3% of the variance in the CEV. Therefore, the linear combination of variables was not significant. Table 8 below presents a summary of the regression coefficients.

Table 8

Regression Coefficients for Model Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Bivariate r</th>
<th>Partial r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of Respondents</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.93</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Current School</td>
<td>-.93</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Attained</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All factors of education (highest degree attained), longevity (years in current school and years of experience), and the age of respondents did not form reliable predictors.

Chapter Summary

As a construct, principal efficacy was measured by a composite effectiveness value (CEV). Tests of perceived effectiveness between certified and noncertified principals, as well as between principals’ self-perceptions of effectiveness and their subordinates’ perceptions, both showed no statistical significant difference. In addition, participants’ demographics and their location parameters did not yield reliable predictors of principal effectiveness.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to investigate whether there is a statistically significant difference in efficacy between certified and noncertified principals in Manitoba. The study also investigated whether there are certain predictors that might significantly contribute to principal efficacy. Additional questions investigated whether there is a significant difference in the perception of effectiveness between the staffs’ perception and the principals’ self-perceptions of effectiveness, and whether the staffs’ perception of effectiveness of the principals could be predicted using the staffs’ credentials and experience.

This chapter will discuss the implications of the results, and will propose some policy recommendations for high schools in Manitoba and make recommendations for future study.

Literature is rather scanty about data on the principals’ credentials in Manitoba. Hickcox (2001) noted that nearly 14% held a Master’s Degree in unspecified fields. Information about which level of certification (Level I or II) was even more scarce. Assuming the principals’ sample is representative, its demographics indicate a marked increase in credentials since Hickcox’s work. The study found that about 55% of the principals had at least a Master’s Degree, predominantly in the areas of education and administration. Smaller percentages were recorded for training in such specialized areas as Math and Science (5.3%) and Theology (2.6%). In addition, the number of certified principals increased to about 66%, from less than 50% six years earlier (Hickcox, 2001).
The first question sought to compare the levels of perceived effectiveness between certified and noncertified principals. Subscribers to the human capital theory equate education and training to higher potential, efficacy, and productivity (Dean, Murk, & Del Prete, 2000; Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1983; Sorensen, 2000). The current study was conclusive about improved effectiveness through principal certification; certification has no effect. This finding was incongruent with the human capital theory, which would have predicted certified principals to excel in all the areas of leadership within the school. However, due to the small sample size, the difference observed could have been by chance.

As stated earlier, the human capital theory would expect certified and noncertified principals to demonstrate different levels of effectiveness. However, the study found no such detectable statistical differences. This finding brings doubt to the effectiveness of the certification process, as well as the training principals undergo to seek certification. What this lack of difference might suggest is the inability of the certification process to turn "cauliflower into cabbage" (Mark Twain, p. 68), to give credence to the human capital theory. From this perspective, resources poured into training for the principalship do not yield expected results and would be better utilized in other ways. Alternatively, principal training institutions may need to re-examine the nature of the courses or training they offer in an effort to make them more productive.

One school division in Manitoba did not differentiate between certified and noncertified principals in its hiring process (see Appendix 5). The division had, in effect, established that training has no effect on principal effectiveness. Aspiring certified principals entering this school division would have no advantage over their noncertified
counterparts. Currently MECY does not insist on certification for prospective principal hires (MECY, 2004) as a guarantee of effective schools. This observation corroborates the assertion that no evidence has been found for leadership contributing to the success of the school. It is as if factors contributing to the principal’s success and efficacy lie outside the principal’s controllable domain of factors (Kannapel et al., 2005), such as school size, urban or rural location, new or established school, public versus private ownership of the school, and whether the school is an elementary or secondary school (Yukl, 1981). Another observer concluded that the vast majority of principals (69%) and superintendents (80%) were of the opinion that principal training programs did not adequately equip school leaders for the challenges that lay ahead (Lashaway, 2003b). However, these claims were not verified by the present study, and would need to be corroborated by further research using much larger samples.

Despite the lack of consensus on the role of education in improving efficacy, MECY continues to organize, provide, and recognize CEUs toward certification for principals. There is a latent recognition that principals in the field will experience challenges brought about by their continually evolving jobs. As a result “disorienting dilemmas” are inevitable. Flexibility that education provides ensures that certified principals become more adaptable and able to cope with any professional eventualities (Mezirow, 1991). Such CEUs are specifically designed to augment what professionally trained principals have covered in their four-strand university curriculum in the areas of Leadership, Instruction, Management, and Personnel. This might explain the increased rate of certification since 2001.
However, the study did not corroborate Mezirow’s concept of disorienting dilemmas. In this context, such dilemmas would explain why principals seek certification after assuming leadership. Since 34% remain uncertified (or are in process), it cannot be assumed that disorienting dilemmas are nonexistent in their situations. If certification provided any professional advantage, the expectation would be for more principals to be certified. One school division did not attach any significant value to principal certification (see Appendix 5), nor does MECY for its hiring recommendations (2001).

But the question that remains unexplored in the current study is why the rate of certification increased. Since there is no economic advantage to certification, it may be plausible that principals do intuitively recognize the role of certification in terms of efficacy and adequate preparation for the principalship. If that were not the case, the rate of certification would have dropped or stabilized since 2001. This area will require further investigation to clarify the reasons why principals seek certification. The current study did not account for principals still in the process of certification. Therefore, it is hard to predict any trends for the future.

The second question sought to identify which principal and school characteristics formed significant predictors of efficacy among high school principals in Manitoba. The burden of establishing highly effective schools rests on school boards as the hiring bodies for school principals. Ultimately, however, the challenge of developing effective schools becomes the principal’s (Jones & Kilburn, 2005). The study indicated that the sole significant factor in predicting principal effectiveness was the principal’s experience, which was highly correlated with the age of the principal. It is clear from the study that the training that principals have does not reflect itself in performance. However,
performance improves after the principal has had time at the job. It is as if the training material requires a "simmering period" in which the principal has time to integrate the training into her current situation, realizing that each school is unique and requires tailor-made solutions. The study also remains inconclusive about whether it is the pre- or post-service training or experience that ultimately makes the difference. It is plausible that a combination of these two variables plays a significant role in developing effective principals. But there is no statistical evidence in the study to suggest any direct link. This is an area for further study.

The study found that no combination of factors that form a regression equation. Therefore, the principal's years of experience, years in current school, the highest degree attained, certification status, and the school's size, age, and location do not significantly contribute to effectiveness as a system of factors. By contrast, however, Simkins and others reported that a cluster of factors was found to be reliable in predicting efficacy. Among these key predictors were the leader's leadership style, strategic planning abilities, ability to manage human and material resources, and aptitude in information management and analysis (Simkins et al., 2003).

Studies have indicated that principals of smaller schools are more likely to be successful than their counterparts in larger schools. In this study, small schools have 600 students or less, while large schools have more than 600 students. Studies have indicated that large schools do not easily integrate their students the way smaller schools do. Consequently, a sense of community elusive and this elusiveness this elusiveness ultimately becomes a detriment to the education of its learners. By contrast, small schools were found to be inclusive and promoted learning through their core curriculum (Collins,
These observations are in contrast with the findings of the present study. School characteristics such as age, size, and location had no bearing on the success of their principals. A veteran principal is more likely to succeed regardless of the location, size, or age of the school than a novice principal. Ability in managing the human resource base (Isherwood & Achoka, 1991; Firestone, 1991; Waters et al., 2004), and expertise in instructional leadership (Edwards, 2002; Lipham, 1981), while valuable, do not significantly contribute to effectiveness. The study strongly corroborates the notion that the experience of the principal is the single variable that significantly contributes to a perception of principal efficacy and success. Through longevity on the job, principals progress through the observing stage, the action stage, to the stability stage of acquired experience. The final stability stage is the equivalent of the experience stage, taking about 5 years to achieve (Kwok et al., 1997). Knowles' (1970) concept of andragogy reflects the role of experience. As principals establish themselves, they tend to become more self-directed and draw upon their experiences as a resource for facing new challenges. New social and professional roles within their contexts demand a readiness to learn, and the need to immediately implement what they learn, supporting the assertion that “transitions in adult life are strongly linked to learning” (Merriam & Simpson, 1995, p. 62). This forms the core of self-directed learning that distinguishes a truly adult learner from a child learner.

In the third question, the study compared the principals' perceptions of their own effectiveness with the perception held by their subordinates. Results indicated that there was no statistical difference in the perception of effectiveness between the two groups. This is a new finding about which the literature seems to be silent. This statistic indicates
that principals are reliable in appraising their performance to the same degree as any third party appraisal. In other words, this suggests that principals are not over-rating or underrating themselves, and that staff are not over-rating or under-rating their principals. The principals’ perceived self-effectiveness is generally shared by their staff, and vice versa.

Studies have shown that the process of evaluating principals often has punitive objectives (Reeves, 2004). A more holistic approach must be adopted, whose intent is to make principals better practitioners, and subsequently improve the school. Involving subordinates in the evaluation process would add invaluable information that external evaluators are not privy to (Marcoux et al., 2003).

The final question intended to isolate whether the factors of experience and educational credentials of staff significantly predict how they perceive the effectiveness of the principal. The data indicated that staff credentials are not reliable predictors of their perception of principal effectiveness.

On the one hand novice staff are essentially idealistic in what they expect of their principals. Consequently, their evaluations yield lower scores in many categories (School climate, Student management, and Strategic Practice). However, as they gain experience, their expectations align themselves with the realities of school environments, and they become more aware of the issues principals have to deal with, even with the principals’ limited resources. In the end, the evaluation of their principals’ effectiveness becomes congruent with that of the principals’ self-evaluation.
Recommendations for Policy and Practice

1. Even though certified principals scored higher averages in the subscales of perceived effectiveness, statistical analyses indicated no statistical significant difference between the two groups. Intuitively, more principals have pursued higher credentials hoping for certification to improve their performances. But as the results indicate, school divisions would have no advantage in hiring certified over noncertified principals. Since experience is highly correlated with perceived effectiveness, it is not clear why principals may seek certification. Certified principals do not increase their earning potential when compared to their noncertified counterparts.

2. Perceived principal effectiveness is highly correlated with experience and not pre- or postservice training. Therefore, principal training needs to be revitalized: emphases ought to be placed on post-training CEUs with general introductory courses to leadership in the pre-training phase. Such an arrangement would be a departure from the traditional method of graduating principals expected to fully implement their store of knowledge gathered in the four or five years of training at the Master’s Degree Level.

3. If training is to be effective, changes will have to be made so that graduates of such institutions will score higher on such tests as the HSPEQ I and II after training. The four areas of Leadership, Instruction, Management, and Personnel, seem to be adequate preparation. However, increased dialogue between certifying bodies like MECY and training institutions like universities and community colleges is highly recommended. Evaluation tools like the HSPEQ I and II are
designed for field performance evaluation. Effective principalship evolves over time. Theory alone covered in university classes would not adequately prepare candidates for the principalship. Rigorous performance appraisals would be critical in the initial years leading up to the stability stage of experience (see Kwok et al., 1997). Therefore, it is recommended that performance evaluations occur periodically, the frequency of which would remain the jurisdiction of the school division. These evaluations should occur more frequently than they do presently.

4. Fair principal evaluation remains an enigma for many school divisions. At best the process is riddled with unfairness and lack of objectivity (Reeves, 2004). Based on the findings of the current study, principals, staff, and other stakeholders, like students, parents, and superintendents, should be an integral part of the protocol in principal evaluation (Lashaway, 2003c; Reeves, 2004). These sources would introduce a measure of objectivity that often lacks in conventional protocol.

5. Reevaluate the content and certification process. Principals should be required to undertake refresher courses governed by a centralized body like MECY to ensure that standards are high and uniform across the province.

Recommendations for Future Research

The current study focused on the principals' performance and how to evaluate them. Future studies could repeat the current study with a much larger sample. In addition, studies could address these questions:
• Do principals of public schools perform better than principals of private schools?

• Are the four strands of school leadership preparation (Leadership, Management, Personnel, and Instruction) adequate in preparing principals for the modern high school?

• Is there a significant difference in the way principals in public schools are evaluated when compared to principals in private and First Nations Band schools?

• What factors influence principals in seeking certification status? What avenues are most popular in pursuing certification?
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Mediates and facilitates effective conflict resolution in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Provides recognition for excellence and achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Respects others by being punctual to meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Arranges for and promotes opportunities for professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Initiates and supports programs and activities that facilitate a caring and positive learning climate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. CHARACTER TRAITS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Demonstrates honesty, integrity, and fair play.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Possesses personable character.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Strives to improve leadership skills through self-initiated professional development activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. COMMUNITY RELATIONS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Demonstrates appropriate and effective techniques for community and parent involvement in school's activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Works cooperatively with the district office and the Department of Education (MECY).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Projects a positive image to the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Seeks support for school programs from the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Is a strong advocate for the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much for your participation. All data collected will be treated as anonymous and confidential. The results will reflect group and not individual profiles.

**High School Principal Effectiveness Questionnaire I**

To be completed by High School Teaching Staff

**Staff Demographic Information**

Gender: 1. (M):   2. (F):   Age:______ years

Years of Teaching Experience:______

Years of Teaching In Current School:______

Highest Degree Attained: 1. (Bachelors or less):______ 2. (Post Bachelors to Masters):______ 3. (Doctorate):______

**School Profile**

Approximate Student Enrolment:______

Age of School:______

School Location: 1. (Rural)______ 2. (Urban)______

Type of School: 1. (Private):______ 2. (Public):______

ID#:_________________
**Principal Effectiveness Profile**

Rate the principal of your school in the criteria outlined by placing a check mark (✓) in the appropriate box. Use the scale provided where 1 indicates least observed and 5 means most observed. N/A means criteria do not apply.

### A. STRATEGIC PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Develops a clearly articulated common mission/vision with staff involvement.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Builds environment conducive to accomplishing vision.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Manages change and fosters continuous school improvement.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Identifies, analyzes, and applies relevant research to facilitate school improvement.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ensures curriculum renewal is continuous.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Provides instructional materials and resources to support staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Systematically and continuously monitors and evaluates instructional process.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Administers and integrates special needs programming in school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Remains current and informed about Department of Education (MECY) curricular changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Places high expectation on self, staff, and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Monitors student achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Ensures high academic student achievement through standardized testing administered by MECY.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Conducts regular and consistent evaluation of staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Confers with subordinates regarding their professional growth plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. FISCAL AND FACILITY MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Clearly defines expectations for staff performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Effectively conducts interviews, selects, and orientation of new staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Makes sound recommendations relative to personnel placement, retention, and dismissal.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Fosters collegiality and a productive working relationship among her team.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Conducts effective staff meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. STUDENT MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Develops budget and maintains fiscal control.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Monitors the use, care, and replacement of capital equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Manages school facilities to ensure clean, orderly, and safe buildings and grounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Is effective in scheduling activities and the use of resources needed to accomplish determined goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. SCHOOL CLIMATE AND IMPROVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Develops and communicates to students, staff, and parents guidelines of student conduct.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Ensures school rules are uniformly observed and consequences applied equitably to all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Conducts required conferences with parents, students, and staff regarding school or student issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Maintains accurate student records.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Rewards and reinforces excellence and high achievement ethic among students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Maintains visibility in the school and quality interaction with staff and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Mediate and facilitate effective conflict resolution in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Provide recognition for excellence and achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Respect others by being punctual to meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Arrange for and promote opportunities for professional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Initiate and support programs and activities that facilitate a caring and positive learning climate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. CHARACTER TRAITS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Demonstrate honesty, integrity, and fair play.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Possess personable character.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Strive to improve leadership skills through self-initiated professional development activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. COMMUNITY RELATIONS</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Demonstrate appropriate and effective techniques for community and parent involvement in school’s activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Work cooperatively with the district office and the Department of Education (MECY).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Project a positive image to the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Seek support for school programs from the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I am a strong advocate for the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much for your participation. All data collected will be treated as anonymous and confidential. The results will reflect group and not individual profiles.
**Principal Effectiveness Profile**

Rate yourself in the criteria outlined by placing a check mark (✓) in the appropriate box. Use the scale provided where 1 indicates least observed and 5 means most observed. N/A means criteria do not apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. STRATEGIC PRACTICE</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop a clearly articulated common mission/vision with staff involvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Build environment conducive to accomplishing vision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manage change and foster continuous school improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify, analyze, and apply relevant research to facilitate school improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Ensure curriculum renewal is continuous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide instructional materials and resources to support staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Systematically and continuously monitor and evaluate instructional process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Administer and integrate special needs programming in school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Conduct regular and consistent evaluation of staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Confer with subordinates regarding their professional growth plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. FISCAL AND FACILITY MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Clearly define expectations for staff performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Effectively conduct interviews, select, and provide orientation of new staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Make sound recommendations relative to personnel placement, retention, and dismissal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Foster collegiality and a productive working relationship among my team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Conduct effective staff meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. STUDENT MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Develop and communicate to students, staff, and parents guidelines of student conduct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Ensure school rules are uniformly observed and consequences applied equitably to all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Conduct required conferences with parents, students, and staff regarding school or student issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Maintain accurate student records.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. SCHOOL CLIMATE AND IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Reward and reinforce excellence and high achievement ethic among students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Maintain visibility in the school and quality interaction with staff and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow US federal regulations. Risks have been scrupulously minimized in the study design. Only statistical summaries of responses will be reported. In no case will the identity of respondents or their schools be revealed. All respondent information will be kept anonymous and confidential. Any codes on the forms are intended to track questionnaires by school and not by individual. Only the researcher and data entry personnel will have access to the raw data. Hardcopies and a data CD will be secured in a locked cabinet. Any questions or concerns about research subject’s rights should be directed to the Chair, Institute Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

Upon completion of the survey, please return it to the school secretary at your earliest convenience but no later than November 30, 2006. If you want information about the survey or an executive summary of results, contact me at the coordinates above.

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Akapelwa Mweemba
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APPENDIX F
REQUEST FOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL PARTICIPATION

October 11, 2006

Akapelwa Mweemba
690 10th Street N.W.
Portage la Prairie, MB R1N 3P2
(204) 239-0389
akapsmweemba@hotmail.com

Re: Request for High School Principal Participation in a Study

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am requesting you and your staff to participate in a research study on principal effectiveness. I am a high school teacher in Manitoba conducting this research as part of my doctoral studies in Adult Education through the University of Southern Mississippi, USA. The study investigates whether a principal’s training and certification have a significant influence on effectiveness. Additionally, it addresses whether the principal’s age and gender, or the size, location, and age of the school are significant predictors of efficacy.

Please take about 15 minutes to complete the High School Principal Effectiveness Questionnaire developed for this study. You will be one of several participants in your school, and 400-1200 high school staff across Manitoba. I also request that you permit the school’s secretary to coordinate the distribution and return of the questionnaires to me.

Your participation is strictly voluntary and you have the right to withdraw at any time. You will not directly and individually be rewarded for participating. However, you can request that your name be entered in a prize draw, dinner for two at the Keg. You can also request a summary of the study findings. Respondents wishing to enter the draw can email me at the address above.

This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow US federal regulations. Risks have been scrupulously minimized in the study design. Only statistical summaries of responses will be reported. In no case will the identity of respondents or their schools be revealed. All respondent information will be kept anonymous and confidential. Any codes on the forms are intended to track questionnaires by school and not by individual. Only the researcher and data entry personnel will have access to the raw data. Hardcopies and a data CD will be secured in a locked cabinet. Any questions or concerns about research subject’s rights should be directed to the Chair, Institute Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

Upon completion of the survey, please return it in the school secretary at your earliest convenience but no later than November 30, 2006. If you want information about the survey or an executive summary of results, contact me at the coordinates above.

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Akapelwa Mweemba
APPENDIX G
REQUEST FOR SECRETARY PARTICIPATION

For the Secretary

October 11, 2006

Akapelwa Mweemba
690 10th Street N.W.
Portage la Prairie, MB R1N 3P2
(204) 239-0389
akapsmweemba@hotmail.com

Akapelwa Mweemba
Westpark High
Box 91
Portage la Prairie, MB R1N 3B2
(204) 857-3726

Re: Secretary’s Coordination of Study

Dear Secretary:

I am a high school teacher in Manitoba conducting this research as part of my doctoral studies in Adult Education through the University of Southern Mississippi, USA.

In an effort to preserve total anonymity of respondents, the Principal has honored my request to permit you to coordinate this study in my behalf. In this capacity you will:

- Distribute the questionnaires to the principal and a random sample of ten teaching staff;
- Distribute accompanying letters of request to the participating staff;
- Collect the completed questionnaires before November 30th, and forward them to me in the return envelope.

Your assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated, as it will help me complete my studies. You may contact me at the above addresses with any queries.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Akapelwa Mweemba
APPENDIX H
LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT

Mr. A. Mweemba
690 - 10th Street N.W.
Portage la Prairie, MB R1N 3P2

Oct. 5, 2006

Dear Mr. Mweemba:

I wish to indicate support for your dissertation study and assure educators in Manitoba that you have complied with standard protections for studies that involve human participation.

The Research and Planning Branch, as part of its mandate, supports the development, implementation and dissemination of educational research activity in Manitoba and by Manitobans. We are pleased to know that you are pursuing doctoral studies at the University of Southern Mississippi (USM). We are particularly interested in the fact that your dissertation study will investigate aspects of effective school practice in Manitoba. We anticipate that our Department and educators in Manitoba generally will benefit from the results that you generate.

I also want to assure potential participants that we have reviewed your research proposal and methodology. You have provided us with evidence that your proposal meets current USM ethical standards for "protection of human subjects" and our own review confirms that opinion. Your proposal includes adequate protection for the privacy of the educators who participate and of the information that they provide to you.

As indication of our support, we have enabled you to disseminate your request for participation through our Department's bulk mailing system. This allows you to contact all high schools in the province in an efficient, effective manner.

I wish you success in completion of your research and doctoral program. If I can be of any further assistance, please contact me.

Sincerely,

John VanWalleghem
Director
T: (204) 945-7831
Email: jovanwalle@gov.mb.ca
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March 6, 2007

Mr. Akapelwa Mweemba  
The University of Southern Mississippi (USM)  
690 10th St. NW  
Portage la Prairie, MB R1N 3P2

Dear Mr. Mweemba:

Re: Research Request “Efficacy and Pre and Post Service Training Among High School Principals in Manitoba”

This letter is to inform you that the proper officers of The Winnipeg School Division have reviewed and denied your request to conduct the above mentioned research project. There is not a differentiation between “certified” and “non-certified” principals.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this decision.

Yours truly,

Signed.
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