Dissertations   Theses and Dissertations

1996

Impact of Superordinate/Administrator Evaluations upon Selected Michigan Public School, K-6 Principals' Performance as Perceived by Superintendents and Elementary Principals

Christopher J. Peal
Loyola University Chicago

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

IMPACT OF SUPERORDINATE/ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATIONS UPON

SELECTED MICHIGAN PUBLIC SCHOOL, K-6 PRINCIPALS' PERFORMANCE

AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

BY

CHRISTOPHER J. PEAL

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MAY 1996

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Appreciation is accorded to my advisor and director of this dissertation, L. Arthur Safer, Ph.D., as well as to my dissertation committee members, Max Bailey, J.D.; Ed.D. and Phillip Carlin, Ed.D., each of whom serves as a member of the faculty of the School of Education, Loyola University-Chicago.

Special thanks also go to my family members and friends. They have encouraged, supported, and stood with me through each of my endeavors. To them, I am ever grateful.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Gerald and Annette Peal.

Thank you Mom and Dad for being there the entire way!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary

LIST OF TABLES

making, and associated implications concerning the roles of principals and supervisors in regard to change processes (Frerking, 1992), the issue of administrative evaluations remains a primary focus of attention. Many, including Andrews (1990), believe that "a well-crafted principal evaluation system is important . . . for the progress and welfare of [a] school's students and staff."

Despite over 25 years of focus, however, few studies have sought to empirically gauge what effect and impact superordinate/subordinate performance appraisals have had upon a principal's performance. Manatt (1989) concludes that performance evaluations for principals remain sketchy, poorly thought out, and ineffective. He notes, "Today's evaluations of school administrators are largely meaningless bureaucratic exercises."

"The vast majority of literature on principal evaluation is not research-oriented," write Berry and Ginsberg (1990), "clearly depict[ing] the process of principal evaluation as being minimally studied and minimally changed over the years."

In this "uncertain, complex, problematical, changing, accountable, legalistic, and systematized" environment in which administrators' apply their trade (Bolton, 1980), this research undertakes a study of a portion of one of the key elements of the institution of education that has, according to Redfern (1980), "baffled" school personnel for many years.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the impact, as perceived by superordinates (e.g. superintendents, assistant superintendents, associate superintendents)

and elementary-level principals, of the superordinate/administrator evaluation process upon the performance of kindergarten through sixth grade, State of Michigan, public school principals.

Following an exhaustive review of the related literature, a researcher-developed questionnaire was developed and used to gather these perceptions in order to answer six research questions. Five of the questions were directly related to key performance areas of an elementary principal, and the sixth focused on the effect of certain demographic variables on perceptions.

A randomly selected, representative sample of currently practicing, public school superintendents and elementary-level principals was surveyed utilizing two similar forms. The superintendent questionnaire focused on the evaluating-superordinate's perceptions of the impact of his/her evaluations upon the elementary principals within the school district. The principal questionnaire was directed toward his/her perceptions of the influence of the process of being evaluated by a district superordinate.

In addition to requests to complete demographic statements, both questionnaire instruments contained subscales of five questions each that related to the key principal performance areas. The areas which the subscales addressed included the influence of the evaluation process on a principal's supervision of teachers, on the perception of his/her role as a building principal, on the supervision of students, on the development of curriculum, and on the building administrator's relations with parents and other community constituents.

Definition of Terms

1. <u>Superordinate</u> - Superordinate refers to a superintendent and/or his/her designee who has the direct responsibility of conducting performance evaluations upon building-level principals within the school district. The term "superordinate" primarily encompasses the positions of superintendent, assistant superintendent, and associate superintendent.

2. <u>Superintendent</u> - A person employed by a local board of education to directly oversee the operation of the school district.

3. <u>Elementary Principal</u> - A pre-kindergarten/kindergarten through fifth/sixth grade building-level administrator whose primary responsibility is administering instructional programs. Throughout this text, the term "principal" refers specifically to elementary-level principals.

4. <u>Evaluation</u> -An event or process conducted by a school district to determine the performance ability and level of an employee. More ideally, Bolton (1980) defines "evaluation" as the process of making judgements regarding the value or goodness of certain events, behaviors, or results of behaviors in light of certain agreed upon or well-understood and predetermined objectives.

5. <u>Administrator</u> - The term administrator refers to one's immediate supervisor. For principals, this term refers to a superordinate. For teachers, this person would, in most cases, be a building principal or assistant principal.

6. <u>Teacher</u> - For the purposes of this study, the term "teacher" refers specifically to certified elementary teachers. Throughout the text, the term "teaching" encompasses

all of the activities and duties of a teacher including, but not limited to, classroom instruction.

7. School district - In the State of Michigan, five types of school districts exist: a) a primary school district; b) a school district of the fourth class; c) a school district of the third class; d) a school district of the second class; and e) a school district of the first class (Michigan, 1994). There are 555 public school districts in the State of Michigan (Michigan Education Directory, 1995).

Research Questions

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the impact that superordinate/administrator evaluations have upon kindergarten through sixth grade, State of Michigan, public school principals' performance, as perceived by superintendents and elementary-level principals. A researcher-developed questionnaire was used to gather these perceptions.

Specific research questions for examination were:

1. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's supervision of teachers?

2. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's perception of his/her role as a building administrator?

3. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's supervision of students?

4. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's role/function in curriculum development?

5. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon how a building principal works with parent and community constituency?

6. Do certain respondent demographic factors affect perceptions regarding the influence of the administrator (superordinate) evaluation process?

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations existed in this study:

1. Survey respondents were employed by districts with student populations of less than 20,000 pupils. Excluded districts consisted of the Detroit Public Schools (Wayne County), the Flint Community Schools (Genesee County), the Grand Rapids Public Schools (Kent County), and the Shelby Township-Utica Community Schools (Macomb County) (Michigan Education Directory, 1995).

2. Survey respondents were randomly chosen solely from the State of Michigan.

3. Survey respondents from the principal population were randomly chosen from those currently employed in elementary-level buildings.

4. Survey respondents from the superintendent population were randomly chosen from unit districts serving kindergarten through twelfth grade student populations.

5. Survey respondents were randomly chosen from public school systems. Members of private, denominational, public school academies (charter schools), or parochial school systems were excluded.

Organization of the Study

This study was organized into five chapters.

The first chapter provides an overview of the research. Initially, a discussion of the background and purpose of the study was undertaken. A definition of terms, list of research questions, and notation of limitations followed.

Chapter Two presents a review of the related research literature which is representative of the available literature. Sources within the field of educational writings and research were primarily consulted, but readings representing the public and private business sector, as well as those pertaining to psychology-based backgrounds were also included and studied.

The third chapter provides an overview and description of the methodology pertinent to this research. Included is a discussion of the design of the study, the population and sample, survey instrumentation and administration, as well as the treatment of the data.

Chapter Four provides a presentation and analysis of the data collected through the survey instrument. Mean response rates, univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAS), correlation matrices, and an inter-correlation matrix are provided.

The fifth chapter includes a discussion and summarization of the data, conclusions, related discussion elements, as well as recommendations for further research in this topic area.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Wherever there are human beings, there will be evaluation.
<div align="right">Robert B. Howsam, 1983</div>

Introduction

As a middle-level manager in the educational hierarchy, the elementary school principal functions as a link between a public school district's central office and the diverse multitude of audience members that he/she contacts and serves (Harrison and Peterson, 1986; Harrison and Peterson, 1987; Peterson, 1984). "Bombarded on all sides by the demand to satisfy expectations," the building-level administrator's environment is "uncertain, complex, problematical, changing, accountable, legalistic, and systemized" (Bolton, 1980).

Seen as a primary unit of change, attention surrounding the role of the principal has increased dramatically throughout many circles. Monitored by virtually everyone around them, principals are theoretically both supervised and evaluated (Anderson, 1989; Duke and Stiggins, 1985; Featherstone and Romano, 1977; Frerking, 1992; Peterson, 1984; Weiss, 1988). This monitored attention comes from direct and indirect constituents which include school board members and trustees, teachers, parents, students, citizens and

taxpayers, peers, along with members from all levels of the state and federal government (Bolton, 1980; Sapone, 1983; Zappulla, 1983).

With increased public expenditures and with growing pressures from these various constituents for school reform, demands for accountability and assessment have risen, due, in part, to the realization that principals are key players in influencing the performance and attitudes of students and faculty (Berry and Ginsberg, 1990; Robinson, 1985; Sapone, 1983). Accordingly, formal evaluation procedures of educational personnel, particularly school principals, are being advocated, researched, legislated, and implemented by internal and external constituents (Anderson, 1989; Harrison and Peterson, 1986; Look and Manatt, 1984; McCleary, 1983).

According to Howsam (1983), "Never in the history of education in the country has there been so much external demand for evaluation." Deal (1983) believes that a general decline of faith in public schools has created the attention being paid to the evaluation of school administrators because people doubt educational leaders' "virtues" and want them to "prove they make a difference." McCleary (1983) cites two conditions that underlie an increased pressure to have performance appraisals in place: the first is the complexity of the school unit; the second can be accounted to the gains made in knowledge about the relationship of human needs and organizational effectiveness. Howsam (1983) believes rising costs, troubles within schools, loud voices of criticism, the specific attention of the federal government, and the widespread emphasis on accountability are all factors that have contributed to the heightened interest in evaluations of administrators.

Given these charges for accountability and improvement, the periodic appraisal of a building administrator's performance becomes an integral component of the overall enhancement of an effective educational management system (Frerking, 1992; Mueller, 1987; Weiss, 1988). Organizations can ensure their goals are achieved through a variety of mechanisms including rewards, sanctions, supervision, and evaluation (Duke and Stiggins, 1984).

Specifically, evaluation may be seen as a meaningful process for integrating individual and organizational interests (McCleary, 1983). It has the potential to substantially affect productivity, performance, employee commitment, and evaluation stability, as well as to contribute to organizational morale (Harrison and Peterson, 1986; Oberg, 1972). Evaluative mechanisms sense deviation from a set of explicit or implicit standards and activate corrective actions to return subordinates to acceptable levels of performance or to correct beliefs (Harrison and Peterson, 1987). An effective and comprehensive means of performance evaluation, although a complex element of school system practice, is needed to offer the assurance that practicing principals are implementing the skills needed to lead tomorrow's schools and to grow and to develop effective leadership skills throughout their professional careers (Andrews, 1990; Bolton, 1980; Frerking, 1992; Piele, 1989).

Simply put, educators are realizing that successful administration does not come about by accident, and that the evaluative process can be one tool to use in helping them to attain system, as well as personal, goals and objectives (Redfern, 1980).

State of Evaluative Programs

Principal evaluation has been formally practiced for nearly a century. Berry and

Ginsberg (1990) provide a brief overview of the early history of this process dating back

to documentation produced between 1910 and 1920 when numerous "schemes" for

carrying out principal ratings such as "clocking," and "standardizing work" to assure that

the principal was not being overpaid were prepared. Prior to the last quarter of the

century, though, this history may be of slight significance, since "the rural agrarian

environment where personal independence was a major value has been replaced by a

densely populated, industrial environment where interdependence is a necessity of survival

and well-being" (Bolton, 1980). And, at least until recently, little systematic research

actually examined principal evaluation (Berry and Ginsberg, 1990).

Business and industry have long lead the field of education in the development of

comprehensive management appraisal systems with a majority of companies having

performance appraisal programs (Oberg, 1972). According to Weiss (1988), "Education

has very little experience with assessing administrative performance and has usually done

this assessment in isolation and focused on nebulous administrative qualities."

In the last 25 years, methods and systems for improving principal performance

have been advocated both inside and outside of the profession. School systems have

responded, accordingly. One indicator of this response is the increased emphasis on

assessing principals' performance in a growing number of states which are mandating their

evaluation (Anderson, 1989). Through a 1985 survey, the Educational Research Service

(ERS) found that 27 states mandated evaluations of school administrators compared to nine states in an 1974 ERS survey (Carnes, 1985).

The State of Michigan is not one of the states that mandate administrative personnel appraisals. In Michigan, the School Code of 1976 loosely stipulates superintendents to supervise and to direct the work of employees of the local school board, including building-level principals, but does not require formal, specific action (Michigan, 1994). Professional organizations within the State, such as the Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association (MEMSPA), suggest administrators request the inclusion in their individual contracts a provision to be evaluated in regard to their professional service within a given school district (MEMSPA, 1995).

Another response indicator is the growing number of school systems employing appraisal review programs. Since 1962, the number of public school districts in the United States which employ formal evaluation instruments for administrators has increased over 56 percent. A 1985 ERS survey found that 85.9 percent of responding school districts utilized a formal instrument. This compares to 54.5 percent in a 1971 ERS survey, 39.5 percent in a 1968 survey, and 29 percent in a 1962 study (Carnes, 1985). A survey of the research conducted by Berry and Ginsberg (1990) indicate similar patterns of increase in current practice.

Most systems of appraisal review have been in place for a number of years. Carnes (1985) found that 66.3 percent of the responding districts had used formal procedures for more than five years with 31.8 percent having revised them during the last year. Over half (53.4 percent) anticipated revising their appraisal systems within the following two years.

Duke and Stiggins (1985) found a different response, however, with only 16 percent of their survey respondents indicating that their districts are actually undertaking projects to improve principal evaluation.

In general, the purposes of performance appraisal systems can be divided into two broad categories consisting of formative evaluations and summative evaluations (Anderson, 1989; Berry and Ginsberg, 1990; Carnes, 1985; Daresh and Playko, 1995; Mueller, 1987). Formative evaluations are designed to help modify and to improve administrative skill and effectiveness by using data as the appraisal process unfolds. They are designed to give feedback, to bring out strengths and weaknesses, and to improve performance (Knoop, 1985). Summative evaluation occurs at the conclusion of a cumulative effort and serves as an end, an account, or judgment of an administrator's performance in order to base promotion, demotion, or other personnel actions (Carnes, 1985; Oberg, 1972).

Specific purposes for performance appraisals take on many facets. They include identifying areas in which improvement is needed, aiding the evaluatee in working toward the achievement of goals or objectives, assisting in professional development, stimulating self development, and assessing the evaluatee's performance in accordance with prescribed standards (Bolton, 1980; Carnes, 1985; Deal, Dornbusch, and Crawford, 1977; Noland and Moylan, 1967; Redfern, 1980).

"At the very least," write Look and Manatt (1984), "principal performance appraisal fulfills a legal obligation; at best, it is a process to improve the administrator's performance."

Carnes (1985) provides an extensive listing of these purposes, citing 30 examples collected from her review of related literature from the preceding decade. Ultimately, the goal of appraisal efforts, according to Oberg (1972), "should not obscure the fact that pupil learning and behavior are the purpose of the school and, therefore, must be the ultimate objects of evaluation."

In conducting performance appraisals, a variety of methods of collecting information are cited. These include peer observation, student opinion, teacher and staff review, as well as observation by the superintendent or another designated superordinate, (Carnes, 1985; Duke and Stiggins, 1985). Stemncock (1973) provides a representative collection of forms illustrating various evaluation practices performed by these populations.

The frequency with which formal evaluations of administrative personnel are made is most often one time per year. The superintendent is listed as the most frequent evaluator depending upon the size of the school district (Carnes, 1985; Berry and Ginsberg, 1990). According to Carnes' (1985) analysis of a 1985 ERS survey, school districts with student populations of 25,000 or more showed 51.5 percent of the principals reporting that the assistant superintendent conducted the performance appraisal. In districts with 10,000 to 24,999 pupils, 49.1 percent of the building principals responded that the assistant superintendent performed their evaluation; in districts with 2,500 to 9,999 students, 72.8 percent of the principals were evaluated by the superintendent; and in school districts with student populations of less than 2,500 pupils, 93.5 percent of the principals had their performance appraisals conducted by the superintendent.

In surveys conducted by ERS, responding principals assessing the effectiveness of their administrative evaluation programs predominantly found them to be "good" or "excellent" with minor, if any, need for change (Carnes, 1985).

Duke and Stiggins (1985) conducted similar research with findings comparable to those of the ERS surveys. Their principal questionnaire elicited a 73 percent satisfaction rate, but these researchers stated that the high degree "may be less a comment on the effectiveness of principal evaluation than an indication of priorities" or that the process was "relatively non-threatening and innocuous."

Additional related research echoes this latter hypothesis, finding that building principals express little confidence in the ability of the principal evaluation system to support them in impacting teaching, learning, and student achievement (Deal, Dornbusch, and Crawford, 1977; Frerking, 1992). Through a questionnaire they distributed to principals, Harrison and Peterson (1987) established that there was a 56 percent satisfaction rate with the evaluation process, while 30 percent were unsatisfied, and 14 percent voiced uncertain opinions.

Excellent Schools and the Role of the Principal

Quality schooling leads to quality learning (Sergiovanni, 1991). Research consistently shows that a principal's leadership has a significant qualitative impact on the people and on the environment of the school, on the school's direction toward the improvement of instructional levels, as well as on its overall effectiveness (Mueller, 1987; Weiss, 1988).

Principals play an influential role in the performance and attitudes of students, faculty, and support staff members (Carnes, 1985). Additionally, they must keep a multi-varied level of resources, personnel, and students working efficiently toward organizational goals and objectives (Peterson, 1984).

Principals of effective schools most often function as instructional leaders within their buildings. They have a vision and a sense of purpose, are proactive, let others participate in management decisions, know the elements that constitute sound instruction, monitor progress, and are resourceful. Principals set the tone, create the ethos, establish the climate, and reinforce desired attitudes (Deal, 1983; Frerking, 1992; Manasse, 1984; Manatt, 1989; Sergiovanni, 1991).

Accordingly, the improvement of a school is directly related to an improved level of principal performance (Mueller, 1987). Evaluation, then, becomes an effective tool when its overriding purpose is to enhance and to improve the performance and leadership of administrative personnel and to ensure professional competence and growth (Anderson, 1989; Weiss, 1988).

Clearly, a principal's leadership is among the most critical elements necessary for building excellent schools since educational managers are central to effective school administration (Anderson, 1989; Harrison and Peterson, 1987; Zappulla, 1983). The degree to which the quality of education can be ensured for all children within a district will be significantly impacted by the degree to which the performance of principals can be effectively evaluated (Frerking, 1992).

Excellent Schools and the Role of the Superintendent

Few studies raise the question of the superintendent's role in school improvement and the research is largely absent on the function of the superintendent and its link to school effectiveness (Griffin, 1994; Hallinger, Murphy, and Peterson, 1985).

Available research shows that in relation to assessing principal performance, superintendents and other superordinates of effective school districts provide well-established procedures and clearly defined criteria. They have high expectations, exhibit a strong instructional focus, and expect the principal to operate the school in a manner that accelerates student performance. They show administrative interest in school and classroom activities, they are highly visible and interact with teachers and administrators throughout the school year, and they have an interest and knowledge in curriculum and instruction (Griffin, 1994; Hallinger, Murphy, and Peterson, 1985).

Harrison and Peterson (1987) indicate that a principal's satisfaction with the appraisal process is associated with superintendents who communicate clear expectations regarding the criteria for successful principal performance, who relay both satisfaction and dissatisfaction with principal performance, who display a concern for instructional leadership, and who engage in evaluation as a continuous process.

Performance Appraisal Components and Standard Categories

Performance standards are expressed in a variety of ways and forms, including general behaviors, knowledge or content items, and personality dimensions (Duke and Stiggins, 1985).

In reviewing the literature, a wide range of components were cited either directly in appraisal samples or indirectly through lists and tables. Performance review items include, but are not limited to, relations with teachers, curriculum and program development, school climate, communication skills, student management, instructional leadership, emotional stability, observance of district responsibilities, facilitation of change, fiscal management, administration of attendance, maintenance of order and routine, promotion of school objectives, regard for others, staffing, decision-making techniques, availability to staff members, allocation of supplies and equipment, facilitation of parent meetings, management of food service programs, participation in professional development activities, relations with the parent-teacher organization, and evaluation of student progress (Carnes, 1985; Deal, Dornbusch, and Crawford, 1977; Duke and Stiggins, 1985; Gaynor, 1975; Harrison and Peterson, 1986; Knoop, 1985; Look and Manatt, 1984; McIntyre and Grant, 1980; Redfern, 1980; Sanacore, 1976; Sergiovanni, 1991; Weiss, 1988).

Gaynor (1975) records an historical compilation of written performance standards dating to 1925 that describes the model tasks of a school administrator and the general consistency of these tasks over time. He writes, "Although the specific phrases differ, it seems that despite 50 years difference in time and despite some shift in focus from administration at the district level to administration at the building level, the prescriptions . . . are remarkably consistent."

Very little research is available to suggest which administrator behaviors have a real impact on schools (Bolton, 1980). However, five elements were consistently cited

across the literature and were accordingly implemented for use with this study's survey

instrument. They are: supervision of teachers; perception of role as building principal;

supervision of students; curriculum implementation and development; and relations with

parent and community constituency.

Shortcomings of the Administrative Appraisal System

Following a thorough review of the related literature of the past three decades,

Berry and Ginsberg (1990) found a consistent theme relating to the shortcomings of the

research base and a depiction of the appraisal process as being minimally studied and

minimally changed over the years. "A folklore of principal evaluation exists," they write,

"although no sound evidence supports any specific set of methods or techniques."

Berry and Ginsberg (1990) break their review of the related literature into five

categories. The first, "Home Recipes," consists of "the vast majority of published material

on principal evaluation" which reports on local practices, presents individuals' opinions or

suggestions as to how to improve the evaluation of principals, or describes the methods

and instruments in use in some school district or state. According to Berry and Ginsberg,

these writings lack validity or reliability verification, with the field of education gaining

little from their "exhortations beyond the 'here's what I think' syndrome."

The second category, "Literature Reviews of Principal Evaluations," finds that "the

most consistent theme derived from all of the reviews is the lack of analysis and research

on the topic of principal evaluation." The third review category, "Guidelines and

Textbooks on Principal Evaluation," notes little space in educational personnel

administration textbooks that devotes itself to principal evaluation; those which contain information offer no research-based evidence to substantiate any approach over another. Berry and Ginsberg's fourth area, "Surveys of Practices," notes a predominance of "flawed methodology," and frequent non-accounting for nonrespondents. The final review category, "Research and Evaluation Studies," overviews a small number of studies that validate specific instruments, research practices in effective districts, and compare evaluation-related practices (Berry and Ginsberg, 1990).

Berry and Ginsberg's (1990) summation extends across the literature search conducted for this study. Rieder (1973) uses words such as "disappointment," "disillusionment," "confusion," and "a loss of confidence in a tool of management" to describe the appraisal process. Manatt (1989) describes evaluations of school administrators as "largely meaningless bureaucratic exercises." Hallinger, Murphy, and Peterson (1985) conclude that principal evaluation "is today more primitive than teacher evaluation was before the advent of teacher effectiveness research. In many districts [the process is] either nonexistent or perfunctory, episodic, and nonsubstantive."

States Olds (1977), "Most of the trouble in which educational organizations find themselves today can be traced to inadequate performance information [which is] inadequately communicated and used by those in the organization." Bolton (1980) purports that most evaluation models are "couched in terms of the value system which previously prevailed rather than in terms of what is likely to be of value and produce good results in the future."

Other apparent flaws in the systems of evaluation of principals include the perception of the vehicle as a reward/punishment process where individuals assume the roles of "supervisor versus subordinate," low levels of confidence in the appraisal program, an overemphasis on personality and appearance rather than on performance, a lack of uniform data collection practices, unsatisfactory and disappointing results, minimal training of superordinates in evaluative methods, an expansive base of evaluation standards, the use of single evaluation instruments for all school executives, as well as a mechanical and procedural character (Bolton, 1980; Deal, 1983; Deal, Dornbusch, and Crawford, 1977; Duke and Stiggins, 1985; Frerking, 1992; Manatt, 1989; McCleary, 1983; Meyer, Kay, and French, 1965; Oberg, 1972; Olds, 1977; Piele, 1989; Redfern, 1980; Rieder, 1973; Sapone, 1983).

Collected information is often disseminated through checklists and rating scales, "both of which lack reliability, [have] rater bias, and are ineffective forms of feedback" (Thurston, McGreal, and Kiser, forthcoming).

Some cite evidence that evaluations overly rely on hearsay, snap judgments, or deliberate vagueness manifested in systems designed to find people incompetent (Anderson, 1989; Manatt, 1989). While others, like Olds (1977), cite a superordinate motivation to ignore success data and to concentrate on the discovery of negative pieces of information that are brought out in "traditional report card judgment" fashion at the close of an evaluation period. Featherstone and Romano (1977) believe that appraisals are "largely based on the emotional response of the evaluator to some perceived behavior of the administrator" that results in an "haphazard" approach to evaluation. In a related

study, Harrison and Peterson (1986) found that only 51 percent of principals claim to
know precisely how superordinates gather information used in their evaluations.

Discontent with and dislike of the process itself appears to be prevalent (Berry and
Ginsberg, 1990; Daresh and Playko, 1995). "Few indeed can cite example of constructive
action taken - or significant improvement achieved - which stem from suggestions
received in a performance appraisal interview with their boss," write Meyer, Kay, and
French (1965). Harrison and Peterson (1987) note that when an individual who is
evaluated is dissatisfied with the system, the system may become distabilized.

An additional element of discontent may be related to an inadequacy of
communication in the managerial hierarchy (Redfern, 1980). Studies show that principals
are supervised on an infrequent basis and that there is a lack of ongoing, productive
contact with central office personnel (Anderson, 1989; Bolton, 1980). Deal, Dornbusch,
and Crawford (1977) report that only 28 percent of the principals in their survey were
evaluated frequently or very frequently.

Agreement between superordinates and evaluatees as to this frequency of
observation or visitation varies greatly. Frerking (1992) notes that 25.7 percent of
elementary principals report weekly visits; whereas, 54 percent of the elementary
evaluators report such visits.

Varied accounts of the purpose of principal evaluation have also been documented.
Frerking (1992) found that 58.7 percent of elementary principals responding to her survey
reported the key purpose of performance appraisals in their district was accountability,
while 52 percent of the evaluators reported the key purpose as being growth. Harrison

and Peterson (1986) report that while superintendents believe they are communicating their expectations to principals, 42 percent of the principals in their study were uncertain or did not understand what their superintendents expected of them. Because of such a lack of communication, employees may often not know how they are rated, resulting in limited performance measurement validity (Oberg, 1972; Zappulla, 1983).

Literature Recommendations for Appraisal System Success

Despite its lengthy attention to the shortcomings of the evaluative process, the literature related to this study is replete with recommendations for successful appraisal system development and implementation. Given the postulate that a principal's leadership is among the most critical elements necessary for building successful schools, districts must devote considerable time and resources, including the development of a well-designed and comprehensive evaluation system, to help principals continue their professional growth.

Supervision and evaluation have many purposes. The major objective of any organization should be to coordinate the activities of its personnel toward greater educational efficiency, effectiveness, and performance (Berry and Ginsberg, 1990; Manatt, 1989; Redfern, 1980; Sapone, 1983; Thurston, McGreal, and Kiser, forthcoming). One hallmark of a good supervisory system is that it reflects quality control, professional development, and motivation (Sergiovanni, 1991).

Another hallmark of a stable administrative evaluation process should be that appraisal is an ongoing and frequent occurrence that allows for a mutual communication

effort centered around information collected (Anderson, 1989; Deal, Dornbusch, and Crawford, 1977; Meyer, Kay, and French, 1965; Mueller, 1987; Redfern, 1980; Rieder, 1973; Thurston, McGreal, and Kiser, forthcoming). A solid performance evaluation program should have no visible ending and should allow either the evaluatee or the evaluator to request a progress conference whenever one is desired (Olds, 1977).

Daresh and Playko (1995) suggest that performance appraisals should focus on professional growth and improvement rather than on judgment. They recommend a six-component appraisal method that consists of a principal resume, a platform statement, goal statements, assessment and reflection statements, artifacts and evidence, and other related material.

Gaynor (1975), Look and Manatt (1984), Redfern (1980), and Rieder (1973) concur with such a recommended focus. States Rieder, "Reinforcement of strong performance breeds more strong performance."

Bolton (1980) suggests a careful planning and implementation of three phases in the development of a systematic and successful evaluation program that meets the functions of both accountability and professional improvement. "Planning for Evaluation" is the first stage in which analysis of situation, establishment of purpose, setting of goals and objectives, and determination of means for process and outcome measurement occur. "Collecting Information" is the second stage wherein monitoring and measuring activities take place. The third stage, "Using Information," includes the communication of collected information as well as the decision of future action to be taken.

In any appraisal program, specific evaluation criteria, which should reflect a balance between performance and outcome measures, and collection strategies should be cooperatively developed and made known before evaluations are conducted (Anderson, 1989; Andrews, 1990; Bolton, 1980; Deal, Dornbusch, and Crawford, 1977; Duke and Stiggins, 1985; Gaynor, 1975; Harrison and Peterson, 1986; Harrison and Peterson, 1987; Redfern, 1980; Weiss, 1988). Ideally, principals should be included in all stages of this development as well as in all of the implementation procedures (Anderson, 1989; French, Kay, and Meyer, 1966; Meyer, Kay, and French, 1965; Weiss, 1988). Allowing principals to individually set job targets takes this component a step further, thus providing for principals to be judged on criteria most relevant to their school. Subsequent self-evaluation by the principal increases the likelihood of creativity and motivation (Berry and Ginsberg, 1990; Bolton, 1980; Olds, 1977; Rieder, 1973).

Performance appraisal reviews must also incorporate an ability to deal with need satisfaction since it relates to productivity, turnover, and absenteeism. Accordingly, administrator evaluation systems should allow and encourage the establishment of individual personal goals as well as organizational goals in an atmosphere that is professionally enhancing as well as emotionally and psychologically satisfactory (McCleary, 1983; Noland, 1967; Thurston, McGreal, and Kiser, forthcoming). Additionally, systems should be designed in such a way that the risk of losing self-respect is reduced (Anderson, 1989; Meyer, Kay, and French, 1965).

Skolnick (1971) relates a similar belief, especially in relation to those with lower levels of self-esteem. He found that persons with strong positive self-concepts are not

overly concerned with negative or positive evaluations simply because they are convinced of their worth; these persons do, however, prefer positive evaluators but to a lesser degree than do those with lower self-concepts.

Need satisfaction directly correlates to a principal's perception of the appraisal process. Perceptions take on a variety of forms and influence the effectiveness of the process. Human behavior is controlled by what is believed as much as performance controls belief (Breines, 1981; Harrison and Peterson, 1987).

Sergiovanni (1991) notes that it is how principals think about performance evaluations that makes the major difference. Studies, such as conducted by McGinnies (1949), that date back nearly a half of a century, affirm this belief, indicating that individuals both perceive and react in manners consistent with their emotional responses. An evaluatee's view of his/her manager's competence, knowledge in a given performance area, as well as that manager's respect for personnel are critical factors that affect the outcome of an appraisal review (Kellogg, 1975).

Satisfaction with or acceptance of the overall process may be related to the impact that an evaluation has on principal performance. Harrison and Peterson (1987) found that of those principals satisfied with the process, 53 percent agree that the appraisal system has a positive effect on principal performance. On the other hand, slightly more than four percent of those dissatisfied with the process believe it has a positive effect, while 62 percent report that it does not have a positive effect. Harrison and Peterson's evidence shows that those satisfied with the appraisal process feel that evaluation has a positive

effect on their own performance; whereas those dissatisfied have a significantly different opinion.

Harrison and Peterson (1987) go on to exhibit data that reveals that a majority of satisfied principals hold different views than do those who are not satisfied. The majority of satisfied principals believe that: the appraisal instrument makes criteria for performance clear; the superintendent allows the principal to influence the operation of the appraisal process; the superintendent conducts an appraisal review as a continuous process rather than as a one or two day event; the superintendent communicates satisfaction with principal performance on a frequent basis; and the superintendent is more concerned with the instructional leadership aspects of the principal's job than with the management tasks. Those principals not satisfied with the appraisal process more often show disagreement with all of these statements except as to whether the instrument makes criteria for performance clear.

Feedback is another factor that plays a large role in the success of an appraisal program. To capture the complex nature of a principal's role, multiple sources of feedback should be included in the overall evaluative process. These could include feedback from teachers or subordinate staff members, parents and other clients, artifacts collected throughout the appraisal period, journal entries, and supervisor performance observation (Anderson, 1989; Thurston, McGreal, and Kiser, forthcoming).

The way in which feedback is delivered and the manner in which evaluation occurs greatly affects the morale of the individuals within the organization. The frequency with which the superordinate requests the subordinate's opinions and input during an appraisal

interview is significantly correlated with satisfaction (Bolton, 1980; Greller, 1975).

French, Kay, and Meyer (1966) confirm this belief, finding that increased participation in

the interview process leads to increased job satisfaction and improved personal relations.

Overall, proper methods of feedback affect changes in principal behavior and can have a

facilitative effect on the evaluatee (Bolton, 1980; Daw and Gage, 1967).

Noland (1967) espouses three principles relative to giving feedback and to

conducting appraisal meetings. They are: an understanding developed primarily through

an employee's own efforts is superior to an understanding which comes from information

given to him/her by a superior; self-initiated understanding is more likely to lead to

emotional acceptance of a discovered relationship, solution, or objective than is

understanding which is initiated and directed by the supervisor; and an evaluator should be

his/her self and should know his/her self when communicating information to the

evaluatee.

Frerking (1992) writes, "The degree which the . . . players in the district value

productive two-way communication and vertical collaborative planning and monitoring

will determine the degree which principal evaluation is effective in contributing to school

improvement."

Findings of three additional researchers are worthy of mention. In an early study,

Indik, Georgopoulos, and Seashore (1961) found that high levels of performance tend to

be positively associated with open communication between superiors and subordinates,

subordinate satisfaction with supervisor supportiveness, high degrees of mutual

understandings of others' viewpoints, and high degrees of local influence and autonomy on work-related matters.

Based on information gathered from the practices of three Oregon school districts that have established a systematic and comprehensive approach to evaluating their principals, Anderson (1989) identifies nine strategies that characterize a successful appraisal program for principals. The components direct a program to: identify the purposes of evaluation; develop clear performance expectations; involve principals in planning; encourage goal setting and reflection; observe principals in action and often; involve peers and teachers in providing feedback; collect artifacts; adopt a cyclical approach to evaluation; and reward outstanding performance.

Redfern (1980) conceives a six-component program that engenders cooperation, fosters good communication, places a premium on identifying and achieving improvement, promotes professional growth, stresses evaluators becoming skilled at evaluating, and commits to a bottom line of greater effectiveness in the teaching/learning/supervising process.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Design of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of the superordinate/ administrator evaluation process upon the performance of kindergarten through sixth grade, State of Michigan, public school principals, as perceived by superordinates (e.g. superintendents, assistant superintendents, associate superintendents) and elementary-level principals.

Specific research questions for examination were:

1. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's supervision of teachers?

2. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's perception of his/her role as a building administrator?

3. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's supervision of students?

4. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's role/function in curriculum development?

5. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's relations with parent/community constituency?

6. Do certain respondent demographic factors affect perceptions regarding the influence of the administrator (superordinate) appraisal process?

Population and Sample

The population for this study consisted of currently practicing, public school superordinates and elementary, building-level principals from the State of Michigan. Districts with student populations over 20,000 students were eliminated prior to a random selection of the study's participants. Four districts comprised this exclusion, consisting of the Detroit Public Schools (Wayne County) with an enrollment of 167,750 students, the Flint Community Schools (Genesee County) with a student population of 25,963 students, the Grand Rapids Public Schools (Kent County) with a pupil population of 31,000, and the Shelby Township-Utica Community Schools (Macomb County) with an enrollment of 23,091 students (Michigan Education Directory, 1995).

Demographic data was requested of questionnaire participants from both groups in order to draw intra-group and inter-group response comparisons and to further analyze the data. Demographic information for the superordinates included the number of years in his/her current position, the number of years in a like professional capacity, his/her district's elementary principal population, the district student population, the district elementary pupil population, and the superordinate's gender.

Requested respondent demographic data for the principals included the number of years in his/her current position, the number of overall years in a building-level principalship, his/her current building's student population, the current building's teacher

population, his/her school district's student population, and the principal's gender.

Questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of 120 principals and 120 superintendents. There was no intent to identify individuals, specific school districts, or geographic regions of the respondents. Participating principals and superordinates from the same school district existed solely on a random selection basis hence allowing only for comparisons of superordinates and principals as groups rather than comparing the responses of individual principals to those of their own immediate administrator.

Of those who received questionnaires, 72 percent (N=86) of the principals and 59 percent (N=71) of the superordinates returned the questionnaires completed and in usable condition. Of these, four percent (N=4) of the principals reported that no appraisal system was in place within their district, and two percent (N=2) of the superordinates reported that there was no evaluation process; demographic data provided by these respondents was used for overall demographic distribution reporting only.

Frequency distributions for the demographic data of the responding superordinates consisted of the following. Twenty percent (N=14) of the respondents held their current position for zero to two years; 69 percent (N=49) were in their current position for three to 10 years; and 11 percent (N=8) had held their current position for 11 or more years. Of the respondents, 13 percent (N=9) had been in a superordinate position for zero to two years; 59 percent (N=42) had held a superordinate position for three to 10 years; and 28 percent (N=20) had been in a superordinate position for 11 or more years. Fifty-nine percent (N=42) of the superordinates had one or two elementary principals in their district; 30 percent (N=21) had an elementary principal population of three to 11; and 11

percent (N=8) of the superordinates had 12 or more elementary principals in their district.

Twenty percent (N=14) of the responding superordinates had one to 1239 students in their

district; 31 percent (N=22) had a student population of 1240 to 2500; 34 percent (N=24)

of the superordinates had pupil populations of 2501 to 7250; and 15 percent (N=11) of

the responding superordinates had 7251 or more students in their district. Fifteen percent

(N=11) of the responding superordinates had elementary student populations of one to

535; 31 percent (N=22) had elementary populations of 536 to 1199; 37 percent (N=26) of

the superordinates' districts had between 1200 and 3900 elementary students; and 17

percent (N=12) had 3901 or more elementary students within their school district. Eighty-

nine percent (N=63) of the responding superordinates were male and 11 percent (N=8)

were female.

Frequency distributions for the demographic data of the responding elementary

principals consisted of the following. Twenty-eight percent (N=24) of the responding

principals had held their current position for zero to two years; 59 percent (N=51) had

been in their current position for three to 10 years; and 13 percent (N=11) had held their

current position 11 or more years. Fifteen percent (N=13) of the principals had held a

building-level principalship for zero to two years; 50 percent (N=43) of the responding

principals had held a principalship for three to 10 years; and 35 percent (N=30) had held a

building-level principal's position for 11 or more years. Twelve percent (N=10) of the

principals had building student populations of one to 299; 45 percent (N=39) had building

populations of 300 to 444; 33 percent (N=28) had between 445 and 590 students in their

building; and 10 percent (N=9) had building student populations 591 or greater. Two

percent (N=2) of the responding elementary principals had one to 10 teachers in their building; 48 percent (N=41) had teacher populations between 11 and 20; 36 percent (N=31) of the principals had between 21 and 30 teachers on staff; and 14 percent (N=12) had building faculty populations of 31 or more teachers. Ten percent (N=9) of the responding elementary principals were in school districts with populations of one to 1264 students; 37 percent (N=32) worked in districts with student populations of 1265 to 3299; 26 percent (N=22) of the principals were in school districts that had 3300 to 7100 students; and 27 percent (N=23) of the principals worked in districts that had student populations of 7101 or greater. Forty-four percent (N=38) of the responding elementary principals were male and 56 percent (N=48) were female.

Instrumentation

Following a comprehensive review of the related literature, five key elements of principal performance were found to be consistently cited and were accordingly utilized for use with this study's survey instrument. These areas were comprised of supervision of teaching, perception of role as a building principal, supervision of students, curriculum development, and relations with parent/community constituency.

Two similar survey instruments were developed by the researcher (Appendix C and Appendix D). One instrument focused on a superintendent's/superordinate's perceptions of the impact of performance evaluations on elementary, building-level administrators, while the second questionnaire was directed toward an elementary principal's perception of the influence of the process of being evaluated. Both instruments

utilized a Likert-type scale to map beliefs about and perceptions of the evaluation process in regard to the key areas.

The five identified performance areas served as subscales consisting of five questions each. Question one of each subscale related to the perception of the evaluatee's understanding of his/her strengths in relation to an area. Question two dealt with perceptions involving the evaluatee's understanding of his/her performance area weaknesses. Question three addressed whether the evaluation better equipped the evaluatee to meet the needs and to handle the issues relative to the performance area. The fourth question on each subscale focused on whether the evaluatee would, as a direct result of the evaluation process, increase his/her overall level of area performance. The final question of each subscale dealt with superordinate and elementary principal perceptions of the evaluator's clarity of understanding relative to the evaluatee's performance in a given area.

Participants were asked to react to each subscale question based upon the most recent evaluation relative to the study, circling the number that best described their response. Each response point on the scale was assigned a score of one to five. "Highly Disagree" received a value of one; "Disagree" received a value of two; "Neither Agree nor Disagree" received a value of three; "Agree" received a value of four; and "Highly Agree" received a value of five. Therefore, a value of one or two represented perceptual disagreement with a statement, while a score of four or five represented perceptual agreement with a questionnaire item. Although Likert-scaled responses limit the degree to which actual administrative behaviors can be fully described, they nonetheless provide a

mapping of beliefs about and perceptions of the evaluation process (Harrison and Peterson, 1986).

Administration of the Survey Instrument

Questionnaires were placed in the U.S. Mail to a random sample of 120 principals and 120 superintendents. Identification numbers were logged and placed on each of the return envelopes in order to note a respondent's completion of the questionnaire. Follow-up letters (Appendix E and Appendix F) and questionnaires (Appendix C and Appendix D) were mailed after a three week period to those superintendents and principals not responding to the initial request of completion of the instrument.

Of the initial questionnaires sent, 47 percent (N=65) of the principals and 54 percent (N=65) of the superordinates returned them in usable condition. Follow-up letters and questionnaires mailed to all non-respondents elicited an overall response of 72 percent (N=86) of the principals and 59 percent (N=71) of the superordinates.

Treatment of the Data

Data analysis was completed utilizing a variety of methods and techniques that followed directly from the exploratory nature of the study.

Frequency distributions for the demographic data and survey items (e.g. entire survey, individual subscales) for both the responding superordinate and elementary principal groups were completed. A mean response for the subscales was done by the following demographic variables for the superordinates: the number of years in his/her

current position, the number of overall years in a like professional capacity, his/her elementary principal population, district student population, and district elementary student population, as well as his/her gender; likewise, a mean response for the subscales was done by the following demographic data for the elementary principals: the number of years in his/her current position, the number of overall years as a principal, his/her current building's student population, teacher population, and district student population, as well as his/her gender.

Univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAS) were run for each subscale by the demographic information. A total of 60 ANOVAS were performed, 30 for the superordinate data and 30 for the principal data. Three were found to be statistically significant. A Tukey LSD was run for each of these significant ANOVAS.

Lastly, a correlation matrix between the survey subscales for the principals, a correlation matrix between the survey subscales for superordinates, and an inter-correlation matrix between the survey subscales for the superordinates and the principals were computed to determine interrelationships between survey subscales.

Summary

Chapter Three described the procedures utilized to conduct this study's examination of the impact, as perceived by superordinates and elementary-level principals, of the superordinate/administrator evaluation process upon the performance of State of Michigan, public school, kindergarten through sixth grade principals.

A questionnaire for each group was researcher developed and was comprised of five subscales. Each subscale focused on a key area of a principal's performance and requested respondents to rank their perception of the impact that the evaluation process had upon that given area. There were five questions per subscale, each utilizing a Likert-type response scale. Respondents were also asked to complete six demographic statements.

One hundred and twenty public-sector superintendents and 120 public elementary school principals were randomly selected to receive questionnaires. Seventy-two percent (N=86) of the principals and 59 percent (N=71) of the superordinates responded. Those participating had a varied experiential background and represented a cross section of building and district populations.

Treatment of the data was completed utilizing a variety of methods and techniques that followed directly from the nature of the study.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of the superordinate/ administrator evaluation process upon the performance of public school, kindergarten through sixth grade, principals from the State of Michigan, as perceived by superordinates (e.g. superintendents, assistant superintendents, associate superintendents) and elementary principals. A researcher-developed questionnaire was used to gather these perceptions.

Specific research questions for examination were:

1. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's supervision of teachers?

2. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's perception of his/her role as a building administrator?

3. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's supervision of students?

4. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's role/function in curriculum development?

5. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's relations with parent/community constituency?

6. Do certain respondent demographic factors affect perceptions regarding the influence

of the administrator (superordinate) evaluation process?

One hundred and twenty randomly selected, public school superintendents and 120

randomly selected elementary-level principals were mailed similar survey instruments

(Appendix C and Appendix D). The superintendent questionnaire focused on a

superordinate's perceptions of the impact of his/her evaluations of the elementary

principals within the school district, while the principal questionnaire was directed toward

his/her perceptions of the influence of the process of being evaluated by a district

superordinate. Both instruments had five subscales reflecting key principal performance

areas and requested completion of demographic statements by the respondents. The five

subscales consisted of influence on supervision of teachers, influence on perception of role

as building principal, influence on supervision of students, influence on curriculum

development, and influence on relations with parents/community.

Participants were asked to react to each subscale based upon their most recent

evaluation relative to the study. Using a Likert-type scale, each response point was

assigned a score of one to five. "Highly Disagree" received a value of one; "Disagree"

received a value of two; "Neither Agree nor Disagree" received a value of three; "Agree"

received a value of four; and "Highly Agree" received a value of five. Therefore, a value

of one or two represented perceptual disagreement with a questionnaire item, while a

score of four or five represented perceptual agreement with a statement.

Seventy-two percent (N=86) of the principals and 59 percent (N=71) of the

superordinates completed a questionnaire and returned it in usable condition.

Data gathered from the questionnaires are discussed and presented in this chapter on the basis of the solicited demographic information. First, a mean response rate for grand scales and each subscale as a function of a demographic variable for the elementary principals and for the superordinates will be given. Second, results from univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAS) between the total survey, as well as each of the subscales, and the demographic variables from the principal data, and between the total survey, as well as each of the subscales, and the demographic variables from the superordinate data will be presented. A Tukey LSD was run and will be noted for each of the ANOVAS that were statistically significant. Lastly, a presentation of a correlation matrix between the survey subscales for the superordinates, a correlation matrix between the survey subscales for the principals, and an inter-correlation matrix between the survey subscales for the superordinates and the principals will be provided.

Mean Response Rates

Each superordinate recipient of a questionnaire was requested to provide the following demographic information: number of years in current position; number of years in a like professional capacity; current district's elementary principal population; current district's total student population; current district's elementary student population; and his/her gender. Each principal receiving a questionnaire was also asked to complete six demographic statements that included: number of years in current position; total number of years as a building principal; current building's student population; current building's teacher population; current district's total student population; and his/her gender.

Mean response rates were completed by grand scale and by each subscale as a function of the individual demographic factors.

Table 1 represents the mean response rate for the grand scale and for each subscale as a function of the superordinates' and the principals' total number of years in their current position.

For all subscales, principals with fewer than three years in their current position neither agreed nor disagreed that the evaluation process had an influence upon their performance in the five key areas. Principals with three to 10 years in their present capacity generally disagreed that the evaluations performed by their superordinates influenced their performance. Principals in their current position for 11 or more years also generally disagreed that the evaluation process influenced key area performances.

Specifically per subscale, principals disagreed in all categories of current job experience that superordinate performance reviews influenced their supervision of teachers. In subscale two, influence on perception of role as building principal, principals with less than three years in their present capacity neither agreed nor disagreed about the influence of the process in regard to effect; all principals with three or more years on the job expressed perceptions of disagreement in this area. In regard to the influence of performance reviews on their supervision of students (subscale three), principals in all categories disagreed that there was an overall effect. Subscale four, influence on curriculum development, yielded a response of neither agree nor disagree from those with less than three years in their present position, and a response of disagree from all respondents with three or more years. Finally, in the area of influence on relations

TABLE 1

MEAN RESPONSE RATE FOR EACH SCALE AS A FUNCTION
OF TOTAL YEARS EXPERIENCE FOR CURRENT POSITION

	Subject Type			
	Principals		Superordinates	
	Means	N	Means	N

Scale Type

Grand Scale

> 3	76.00	21	89.25	12
3 to 10	68.72	47	95.76	49
< 10	60.73	11	94.86	7

Subscale 1 - Influence on Supervision of Teachers

> 3	14.68	22	17.33	12
3 to 10	12.78	49	19.41	49
< 10	11.82	11	19.00	8

Subscale 2 - Influence on Perception of Role as Building Principal

> 3	16.24	21	18.92	12
3 to 10	14.08	49	19.47	49
< 10	13.09	11	19.25	8

Subscale 3 - Influence on Supervision of Students

> 3	14.64	22	16.33	12
3 to 10	12.98	49	19.02	49
< 10	11.27	11	18.43	7

Subscale 4 - Influence on Curriculum Development

> 3	15.32	22	18.58	12
3 to 10	13.54	48	18.98	49
< 10	12.09	11	18.00	7

Subscale 5 - Influence on Relations with Parents/Community

> 3	14.95	22	18.08	12
3 to 10	15.21	48	18.88	49
< 10	12.45	11	20.00	7

with parents and community (subscale five), principals with less than three years in their

present position disagreed that the process influenced their behavior, principals with three

to 10 years neither agreed nor disagreed that their most recent evaluation influenced their

behavior, and those principals with 11 or more years in their present position disagreed

that the process influenced their relations.

For superordinates, the mean response rate for the grand scale and each of the

subscales as a function of total years experience for current job yielded similar intra-group

responses across nearly all scales. For the grand scale, superordinates with less than three

years in their current capacity neither agreed nor disagreed that their evaluations had an

influence upon their elementary principals in the key performance areas. Superordinates

with three to 10 years also expressed a response of neither agree nor disagree as did those

superordinates with 11 or more years of serving in their current capacity. In each of the

subscales, the superordinates neither agreed nor disagreed about the effect of the

evaluation process on all the key performance areas except for the influence of the process

on relations with parents and community constituency (subscale five). In this area,

superordinates with 11 or more years of experience expressed agreement that the process

influenced their principals' performance.

Table 2 represents the mean response rate for each scale for the superordinates and

the principals as a function of the total number of years experience in a like professional

capacity.

On a grand scale, building level principals with less than three years of experience

neither agreed nor disagreed that the evaluation process influenced their performance in

the key areas. Principals with three to 10 years in a principalship generally disagreed across the subscales as to the effect of their most recent evaluation. Principals with 11 or more years experience expressed similar responses of disagreement.

In the individual subscales, principals with fewer than three years of building principal experience neither agreed nor disagreed whether the process influenced their behavior in the categories of supervision of teachers (subscale one), perception of role as principal (subscale two), curriculum development (subscale four), and relations with parents and community (subscale five). These principals expressed perceptions of disagreement that the evaluation process influenced their behavior in the area of influence on supervision of students (subscale three). For principals with three to 10 years of experience, as well as those with 11 or more years of service as a principal, respondents expressed disagreement as to whether the evaluation process influenced their actions across all of the five performance areas.

For superordinates, the mean response rate for each scale as a function of total years in a like professional capacity yielded the same general response patterns across breakdowns of year-level experience. In the grand scale, superordinates neither agreed nor disagreed as to whether their evaluation process influenced elementary building principal behavior. As total years of experience increased, superordinates tended to affirm to a greater degree the level of influence that the process played upon the principals. In each of the subscales similar patterns held consistent to those of the grand scale except in the areas of influence on curriculum development (subscale four) and influence on relations with parents and community (subscale five). In both of these areas,

TABLE 2

MEAN RESPONSE RATE FOR EACH SCALE AS A FUNCTION OF
TOTAL YEARS EXPERIENCE IN A LIKE PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY

	Subject Type			
	Principals		Superordinates	
	Means	N	Means	N

Scale Type

Grand Scale

> 3	80.70	10	90.14	7
3 to 10	69.90	40	94.73	41
< 10	65.21	29	95.60	20

Subscale 1 - Influence on Supervision of Teachers

> 3	15.91	11	17.43	7
3 to 10	13.05	41	19.17	42
< 10	12.30	30	19.20	20

Subscale 2 - Influence on Perception of Role as Building Principal

> 3	18.30	10	19.29	7
3 to 10	13.85	41	19.21	42
< 10	14.13	30	19.65	20

Subscale 3 - Influence on Supervision of Students

> 3	14.64	11	16.14	7
3 to 10	13.39	41	18.61	41
< 10	12.40	30	19.05	20

Subscale 4 - Influence on Curriculum Development

> 3	15.91	11	18.57	7
3 to 10	14.02	41	18.88	41
< 10	12.76	29	18.75	20

Subscale 5 - Influence on Relations with Parents/Community

> 3	15.36	11	18.71	7
3 to 10	14.88	40	18.83	41
< 10	14.40	30	18.95	20

superordinates responded nearly identically across the three categories of years of experience.

Table 3 represents the mean response rate for the grand scale and each of the subscales for the principals as a function of the student population of their current elementary school building. On a grand scale, principals from buildings with less than 300 students, with 300 to 444 students, with 445 to 590 students, and with more than 590 students expressed perceptions of disagreement as to whether the evaluation process influenced their behavior across the five key performance areas. Principals with building student populations of 445 to 590 displayed a greater degree of disagreement than did the other three population groupings.

In the individual subscales, all principals perceptually disagreed in regard to the influence that the evaluation process played upon any of the key performance areas. In subscale one, influence on supervision of teachers, principals with elementary populations of 445 to 590 showed the highest levels of perceptual disagreement between the population groupings. In subscale two, influence on perception of role as building principal, those administrators with the highest two categories of populations expressed slightly higher levels of disagreement than those in the two categories of smaller student populations. Both subscale three, influence on supervision of students, and subscale four, influence on curriculum development, yielded the most disagreement from the principals from buildings with 445 to 590 students. In regard to influence on relations with parents and community, building principals with one to 590 students projected similar responses, while those with over 590 students expressed greater disagreement as to the influence of

TABLE 3

MEAN RESPONSE RATE FOR EACH SCALE AS A FUNCTION
OF STUDENT POPULATION FOR PRINCIPAL'S CURRENT BUILDING

	Subject Type			
	Principals		Superordinates	
	Means	N	Means	N

Scale Type

Grand Scale

> 300	70.44	9	-	
300 to 444	70.78	37	-	
445 to 590	67.27	26	-	
< 590	70.29	7	-	

Subscale 1 - Influence on Supervision of Teachers

> 300	13.67	9	-	
300 to 444	13.46	37	-	
445 to 590	12.44	27	-	
< 590	13.57	7	-	

Subscale 2 - Influence on Perception of Role as Building Principal

> 300	14.67	9	-	
300 to 444	14.64	39	-	
445 to 590	14.27	26	-	
< 590	14.43	7	-	

Subscale 3 - Influence on Supervision of Students

> 300	13.56	9	-	
300 to 444	13.41	38	-	
445 to 590	12.74	27	-	
< 590	13.29	7	-	

Subscale 4 - Influence on Curriculum Development

> 300	13.78	9	-	
300 to 444	14.03	38	-	
445 to 590	13.37	27	-	
< 590	14.57	7	-	

Subscale 5 - Influence on Relations with Parents/Community

> 300	14.78	9	-	
300 to 444	14.97	38	-	
445 to 590	14.56	27	-	
< 590	14.43	7	-	

the performance review process upon their subsequent behavior.

Table 4 represents the mean response rate for each scale for the elementary principals as a function of teacher population in their current building.

On a grand scale, principals with less than 11 teachers in their building neither agreed nor disagreed that the evaluation process affected their performance. Principals with 11 to 20 faculty members, 21 to 30 teachers, and over 30 professional staff all expressed perceptual disagreement with the overall effect that the evaluation process played as an influencing agent on the key performance areas.

In the individual subscales, principals with fewer than 11 teachers neither agreed nor disagreed in regard to the evaluation procedure's influence on supervision of teachers (subscale one), influence on supervision of students (subscale three), influence on curriculum development (subscale four), and influence on relations with parents and community (subscale five). They showed disagreement about the process in relation to its influence on their perception of their role as building principal. Principals with teacher populations of 11 to 20 expressed perceptual disagreement relative to the influence on supervision of teachers (subscale one), on perception of role (subscale two), on supervision of students (subscale three), and on curriculum development (subscale four). Subscale five, influence on relations with parent and community constituency, was the only area where these principals neither agreed nor disagreed. Elementary principals with 21 to 30 teachers, as well as those with over 30 faculty members, expressed disagreement across all of the subscales in regard to their perception of how their most recent evaluations influenced their behavior.

TABLE 4

MEAN RESPONSE RATE FOR EACH SCALE AS A FUNCTION
OF TEACHER POPULATION FOR PRINCIPAL'S CURRENT BUILDING

	Subject Type			
	Principals		Superordinates	
	Means	N	Means	N
Scale Type				
Grand Scale				
> 11	75.00	2	-	
11 to 20	71.46	39	-	
21 to 30	66.82	28	-	
< 30	68.60	10	-	
Subscale 1 - Influence on Teachers				
> 11	15.50	2	-	
11 to 20	13.60	40	-	
21 to 30	12.27	30	-	
< 30	13.60	10	-	
Subscale 2 - Influence on Perception of Role as Building Principal				
> 11	14.50	2	-	
11 to 20	14.90	40	-	
21 to 30	14.00	29	-	
< 30	14.40	10	-	
Subscale 3 - Influence on Supervision of Students				
> 11	15.00	2	-	
11 to 20	13.32	40	-	
21 to 30	13.00	30	-	
< 30	12.90	10	-	
Subscale 4 - Influence on Curriculum Development				
> 11	15.00	2	-	
11 to 20	13.80	40	-	
21 to 30	13.86	29	-	
< 30	13.60	10	-	
Subscale 5 - Influence on Relations with Parents/Community				
> 11	15.00	2	-	
11 to 20	15.08	39	-	
21 to 30	14.57	30	-	
< 30	14.10	10	-	

Table 5 represents the mean response rate for the grand scale and each of the subscales as a function of the elementary principals' current school district's population. Populations were divided into four categories: one to 1264 students; 1265 to 3299 pupils; 3300 to 7100 students; and over 7100 children. Principals in all four categories generally expressed responses of disagreement when answering statements regarding the five subscales. Principals in districts with 1264 or less students noted the greatest levels of disagreement while those in the two middle categories expressed responses of less disagreement.

In each of the subscales and for all of the categories, the elementary principals responding to the questionnaire expressed answers representing "Disagree" on the Likert-type scale. One exception occurred in questions regarding influence on relations with parents and community (subscale five). In this subscale, principals with district populations of 3300 to 7100 students neither agreed nor disagreed that their evaluations affected performance in this area.

Table 6 represents the mean response rate for the grand scale and for each of the subscales as a function of the superordinates' current district student population. Four categories were established and consisted of those districts with 1239 or fewer students, districts with pupil populations of 1240 to 2500 students, student populations of 2501 to 7250, and districts with 7251 or more students.

The grand scale, representing all of the subscales, exhibits a neither agree nor disagree response pattern on behalf of those completing questionnaires as to the influence that their most recent evaluation had upon the elementary principals within their school

TABLE 5

MEAN RESPONSE RATE FOR EACH SCALE AS A FUNCTION OF
SCHOOL DISTRICT'S STUDENT POPULATION

	Subject Type			
	Principals		Superordinates	
	Means	N	Means	N

Scale Type

Grand Scale

> 1265	66.50	8	-	
1265 to 3299	70.21	28	-	
3300 to 7100	71.29	21	-	
< 7100	68.14	22	-	

Subscale 1 - Influence on Teachers

> 1265	12.25	8	-	
1265 to 3299	13.03	30	-	
3300 to 7100	13.45	22	-	
< 7100	13.35	22	-	

Subscale 2 - Influence on Perception of Role as Building Principal

> 1265	13.88	8	-	
1265 to 3299	14.72	29	-	
3300 to 7100	14.36	22	-	
< 7100	14.59	22	-	

Subscale 3 - Influence on Supervision of Students

> 1265	13.50	8	-	
1265 to 3299	13.02	30	-	
3300 to 7100	13.55	22	-	
< 7100	12.95	22	-	

Subscale 4 - Influence on Curriculum Development

> 1265	13.13	8	-	
1265 to 3299	13.92	30	-	
3300 to 7100	14.43	21	-	
< 7100	13.36	22	-	

Subscale 5 - Influence on Relations with Parents/Community

> 1265	13.75	8	-	
1265 to 3299	14.52	30	-	
3300 to 7100	16.36	21	-	
< 7100	13.86	22	-	

TABLE 6

MEAN RESPONSE RATE FOR EACH SCALE AS A FUNCTION
OF STUDENT POPULATION FOR CURRENT DISTRICT

	Subject Type			
	Principals		Superordinates	
	Means	N	Means	N
Scale Type				
Grand Scale				
< 1240	-		96.71	14
1240 to 2500	-		92.18	22
2501 to 7250	-		95.52	23
> 7250	-		94.22	9
Subscale 1 - Influence on Teachers				
< 1240	-		19.50	14
1240 to 2500	-		18.27	22
2501 to 7250	-		19.33	24
> 7250	-		19.11	9
Subscale 2 - Influence on Perception of Role as Building Principal				
< 1240	-		19.29	14
1240 to 2500	-		18.82	22
2501 to 7250	-		19.88	24
> 7250	-		19.33	9
Subscale 3 - Influence on Supervision of Students				
< 1240	-		19.14	14
1240 to 2500	-		17.95	22
2501 to 7250	-		18.48	23
> 7250	-		18.78	9
Subscale 4 - Influence on Curriculum Development				
< 1240	-		20.07	14
1240 to 2500	-		18.68	22
2501 to 7250	-		18.48	23
> 7250	-		18.00	9
Subscale 5 - Influence on Relations with Parents/Community				
< 1240	-		18.71	14
1240 to 2500	-		18.45	22
2501 to 7250	-		19.26	23
> 7250	-		19.00	9

district. Expressing the higher levels of agreement with the survey questions were those superordinates who had 1239 or fewer students in the district, followed by superordinates with 2501 to 7250 students, those with 7251 or more pupil populations, and those with 1240 to 2500 student counts, respectively.

In subscale one, influence on supervision of teachers, superordinates neither agreed nor disagreed that the evaluation process affected the performance of their elementary principals in this area. In subscale two, influence on perception of role as building principal, superordinates again neither agreed nor disagreed that the evaluation process had an influence on their principals. Subscale three, influence on supervision of students, likened responses similar to those reported in subscales one and two. In subscale four, influence on curriculum development, superordinates from districts with 1239 or fewer pupils expressed agreement when asked if their evaluations of principals affected this area. Superordinates from the other three categories neither agreed nor disagreed. In the fifth subscale, influence on relations with parents and community members, superordinates in all categories neither agreed nor disagreed that the process played a role in influencing the behavior of their principals.

Table 7 represents the mean response rate of the responding superordinates on a grand scale as well as on an individual subscale basis as a function of their current school districts' student populations. Populations of under 535 students, of 535 to 1199 pupils, of 1200 to 3900 children, and of those over 3900 students comprised the four groups in this demographic category.

TABLE 7

MEAN RESPONSE RATE FOR EACH SCALE AS A FUNCTION
OF CURRENT SCHOOL DISTRICT'S ELEMENTARY STUDENT POPULATION

| | Subject Type | | | |
| | Principals | | Superordinates | |
	Means	N	Means	N
Scale Type				
Grand Scale				
< 535	-		92.09	11
535 to 1199	-		93.95	22
1200 to 3900	-		96.00	25
> 3900	-		94.22	9
Subscale 1 - Influence on Teachers				
< 535	-		18.64	11
535 to 1199	-		18.77	22
1200 to 3900	-		19.19	26
> 3900	-		19.22	9
Subscale 2 - Influence on Perception of Role as Building Principal				
< 535	-		18.36	11
535 to 1199	-		19.05	22
1200 to 3900	-		19.92	26
> 3900	-		19.56	9
Subscale 3 - Influence on Supervision of Students				
< 535	-		17.64	11
535 to 1199	-		18.59	22
1200 to 3900	-		18.64	25
> 3900	-		18.44	9
Subscale 4 - Influence on Curriculum Development				
< 535	-		19.64	11
535 to 1199	-		19.00	22
1200 to 3900	-		18.64	25
> 3900	-		18.11	9
Subscale 5 - Influence on Relations with Parents/Community				
< 535	-		17.82	11
535 to 1199	-		18.55	22
1200 to 3900	-		19.52	25
> 3900	-		18.89	9

The grand scale shows all superordinates neither agreeing nor disagreeing that their district's elementary principal evaluation process influenced principal behavior in any of the five key performance areas. Superordinates with less than 535 students expressed the greatest neutrality; whereas, superordinates representing districts with 1200 to 3900 elementary student populations responded more favorably in relation to their belief that the process influenced principal behavior.

In the individual subscales, superordinates neither agreed nor disagreed across the subscales as to whether their most recent evaluation of elementary principals played an influential role on the five key performance areas. Superordinates representing all districts with 1200 or more students nearly agreed that the evaluation process influenced their principals' perception of their role as a building principal (subscale two), as did superordinates with 534 or fewer students in subscale four, influence on curriculum development, and superordinates with 1200 to 3900 pupils in subscale five, influence on relations with parent and community constituency. The most neutral responses came from superordinates from districts with less than 535 students in subscale three, influence on supervision of students, and in subscale five, influence on parent and community members.

Table 8 represents the mean response rate for superordinates on a grand scale and for each subscale as a function of their current school districts' elementary principal populations. Demographic groupings consisted of those with fewer than three principals, those with three to 11 elementary principals, and those in districts with 12 or more elementary-level building principals.

TABLE 8

MEAN RESPONSE RATE FOR EACH SCALE AS A FUNCTION
OF CURRENT SCHOOL DISTRICT'S ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL POPULATION

	Subject Type			
	Principals		Superordinates	
	Means	N	Means	N

Scale Type

Grand Scale

< 3	-		94.10	41
3 to 11	-		95.48	21
> 11	-		94.00	6

Subscale 1 - Influence on Teachers

< 3	-		18.71	42
3 to 11	-		19.52	21
> 11	-		19.17	6

Subscale 2 - Influence on Perception of Role as Building Principal

< 3	-		19.05	42
3 to 11	-		19.95	21
> 11	-		19.33	6

Subscale 3 - Influence on Supervision of Students

< 3	-		18.34	41
3 to 11	-		18.76	21
> 11	-		18.50	6

Subscale 4 - Influence on Curriculum Development

< 3	-		19.34	41
3 to 11	-		18.19	21
> 11	-		17.33	6

Subscale 5 - Influence on Relations with Parents/Community

< 3	-		18.63	41
3 to 11	-		19.05	21
> 11	-		19.67	6

The grand scale shows a neither agree nor disagree response from the superordinates relative to their perception that the elementary principal evaluation process plays an influential role upon their building principals' behaviors in the five key performance areas. Superordinates in districts with three to 11 principals showed higher levels of agreement than did the nearly identical responses of those superordinates in the other two categories.

In each of the subscales, near agreement was expressed by superordinates with three to 11 principals in subscale one, influence on supervision of teachers, and in subscale two, influence on perception of role as a building principal. Additionally, superordinates with 12 or more elementary principals in the district expressed the same near agreement in subscale five, influence on relations with parents and community members; these same superordinates, however, noted the lowest neutral levels of mean response in subscale four, influence on curriculum development, in regard to the effect that the appraisal process played on impacting principal performance.

Table 9 represents the mean response rate for principals and superordinates on a grand scale as well as on each of the individual subscales as a function of the respondents' gender.

On the grand scale, representing all of the subscales, responding male and female principals expressed nearly identical perceptions of disagreement in regard to whether their most recent administrative evaluation played an influential role upon their performance in any of the five key performance areas. Superordinates, on the other hand, expressed neither agreement nor disagreement about the process and the influence that it

TABLE 9

MEAN RESPONSE RATE FOR EACH SCALE
AS A FUNCTION OF GENDER

| | Subject Type | | | |
| | Principals | | Superordinates | |
	Means	N	Means	N
Scale Type				
Grand Scale				
males	69.42	38	95.18	61
females	69.66	41	88.71	7
Subscale 1 - Influence on Teachers				
males	13.00	38	19.15	62
females	13.30	44	17.71	7
Subscale 2 - Influence on Perception of Role as Building Principal				
males	14.71	38	19.37	62
females	14.33	44	19.14	7
Subscale 3 - Influence on Supervision of Students				
males	13.00	38	18.70	61
females	13.36	44	16.57	7
Subscale 4 - Influence on Curriculum Development				
males	13.50	38	18.95	61
females	14.12	43	17.57	7
Subscale 5 - Influence on Relations with Parents/Community				
males	15.21	38	18.98	61
females	14.37	43	17.71	7

played. Male superordinates expressed higher levels of belief that the process played an influential role than did their female counterparts.

In subscale one, influence on supervision of teachers, in subscale three, influence on supervision of students, and in subscale four, influence on curriculum development, similar response patterns as were exhibited in the grand scale occurred for male and female principals and superordinates. In subscale two, influence on perception of role as building principal, both male and female principals expressed general perceptual disagreement with the female principals noting a slightly higher degree of disagreement; superordinates responded in a somewhat similar manner across gender lines in subscale two. In subscale five, influence on parents and community constituency, female elementary principals showed disagreement about the influence of the evaluation process, whereas male principals expressed neither agreement nor disagreement. Male and female superordinates responded with neutral perceptions of influence with the male superordinates expressing a slightly higher agreement belief that the evaluation process affected this area of principal performance.

Univariate Analyses of Variance (ANOVAS)

Univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAS) were run for each subscale by the requested demographic information. A total of 60 ANOVAS were performed, 30 for the superordinate data and 30 for the principal data. The results are displayed in Table 10, Table 11, Table 12, Table 13, Table 14, Table 15, Table 16, Table 17, Table 18, Table 19, Table 20, and Table 21.

Of the 60 ANOVAS run, three were found to be statistically significant. They are as follows: Subscale 2A, influence on perception of role as building principal, as a function of the principals' total number of years in a like professional capacity, F=4.55, and p.<.014, as represented in Table 12; Subscale one, influence on supervision of teachers, as a function of the superordinates' number of years in his/her current position, F=5.30, and p.<.007, as represented in Table 17; and Subscale three, influence on supervision of students, as a function of the superordinates' number of years in his/her current position, F=4.78, and p.<.012, as represented in Table 19.

Post hoc procedures, Tukey LSDs, were performed on each of the statistically significant ANOVAS. In Subscale 2A, influence on perception of role as building principal, as a function of total number of years in a building principalship, principals with fewer than three years of experience in a like professional capacity responded significantly different than did those elementary principals with three to 10 years of overall like professional experience as well as did those who had 11 or more years of experience in a building-level principal's capacity.

In Subscale one, influence on supervision of teachers, as a function of the superordinates' number of years in his/her current position, the Tukey LSD showed that those superordinates with fewer than three years were found to have responded statistically significantly different from both those superordinates who had served in their current position from three to 10 years as well as from those superordinates with 11 or more years in their present position.

TABLE 10

RESULTS FROM UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE (ANOVAS)
BETWEEN THE TOTAL SURVEY AND THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FROM
THE PRINCIPAL DATA

Variable	F	p-value
Current position experience (in years)	2.17	.121
Years in occupation	2.22	.116
Building's student population	0.22	.804
Building's teacher population	0.33	.806
District's student population	0.15	.929
Gender	0.01	.959

Note: * indicates a statistical significance

TABLE 11

RESULTS FROM UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE (ANOVAS)
BETWEEN SUBSCALE 1A (INFLUENCE ON SUPERVISION OF TEACHERS) AND
THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FROM THE PRINCIPAL DATA

Variable	F	p-value
Current position experience (in years)	1.82	.169
Years in occupation	2.50	.088
Building's student population	0.42	.659
Building's teacher population	0.67	.573
District's student population	0.14	.932
Gender	0.08	.778

Note: * indicates a statistical significance

TABLE 12

RESULTS FROM UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE (ANOVAS)
BETWEEN SUBSCALE 2A (INFLUENCE ON PERCEPTION OF ROLE AS
BUILDING PRINCIPAL) AND THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FROM THE
PRINCIPAL DATA

Variable	F	p-value
Current position experience (in years)	2.45	.093
Years in occupation	4.55	.014*
Building's student population	0.55	.946
Building's teacher population	0.22	.879
District's student population	0.08	.969
Gender	0.15	.700

Note: * indicates a statistical significance

TABLE 13

RESULTS FROM UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE (ANOVAS)
BETWEEN SUBSCALE 3A (INFLUENCE ON SUPERVISION OF STUDENTS) AND
THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FROM THE PRINCIPAL DATA

Variable	F	p-value
Current position experience (in years)	2.16	.122
Years in occupation	1.03	.362
Building's student population	0.19	.825
Building's teacher population	0.14	.935
District's student population	0.08	.969
Gender	0.13	.723

Note: * indicates a statistical significance

TABLE 14

RESULTS FROM UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE (ANOVAS)
BETWEEN SUBSCALE 4A (INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT)
AND THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FROM THE PRINCIPAL DATA

Variable	F	p-value
Current position experience (in years)	1.89	.158
Years in occupation	1.81	.171
Building's student population	1.33	.875
Building's teacher population	0.05	.987
District's student population	0.23	.874
Gender	0.33	.569

Note: * indicates a statistical significance

TABLE 15

RESULTS FROM UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE (ANOVAS)
BETWEEN SUBSCALE 5A (INFLUENCE ON RELATIONS WITH
PARENTS/COMMUNITY) AND THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FROM THE
PRINCIPAL DATA

Variable	F	p-value
Current position experience (in years)	1.71	.187
Years in occupation	0.02	.818
Building's student population	0.06	.941
Building's teacher population	0.15	.930
District's student population	1.39	.253
Gender	0.69	.409

Note: * indicates a statistical significance

TABLE 16

RESULTS FROM UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE (ANOVAS)
BETWEEN THE TOTAL SURVEY AND THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FROM
THE SUPERORDINATE DATA

Variable	F	p-value
Current position experience (in years)	1.99	.144
Years in occupation	0.75	.477
Building's student population	0.13	.878
Building's teacher population	0.66	.581
District's student population	0.39	.764
Gender	2.55	.115

Note: * indicates a statistical significance

TABLE 17

RESULTS FROM UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE (ANOVAS)
BETWEEN SUBSCALE 1 (INFLUENCE ON SUPERVISION OF TEACHERS) AND
THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FROM THE SUPERORDINATE DATA

Variable	F	p-value
Current position experience (in years)	5.30	.007*
Years in occupation	2.26	.112
Building's student population	1.06	.351
Building's teacher population	1.38	.258
District's student population	0.29	.834
Gender	3.00	.088

Note: * indicates a statistical significance

TABLE 18

RESULTS FROM UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE (ANOVAS)
BETWEEN SUBSCALE 2 (INFLUENCE ON PERCEPTION OF ROLE AS
BUILDING PRINCIPAL) AND THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FROM THE
SUPERORDINATE DATA

Variable	F	p-value
Current position experience (in years)	0.33	.721
Years in occupation	0.28	.756
Building's student population	1.28	.286
Building's teacher population	0.95	.423
District's student population	1.62	.194
Gender	0.07	.790

Note: * indicates statistical significance

TABLE 19

RESULTS FROM UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE (ANOVAS)
BETWEEN SUBSCALE 3 (INFLUENCE ON SUPERVISION OF STUDENTS) AND
THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FROM THE SUPERORDINATE DATA

Variable	F	p-value
Current position experience (in years)	4.78	.012*
Years in occupation	2.96	.058
Building's student population	0.15	.863
Building's teacher population	0.52	.667
District's student population	0.35	.792
Gender	3.67	.060

Note: * indicates statistical significance

TABLE 20

RESULTS FROM UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE (ANOVAS)
BETWEEN SUBSCALE 4 (INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT) AND
THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FROM THE SUPERORDINATE DATA

Variable	F	p-value
Current position experience (in years)	0.41	.666
Years in occupation	0.04	.960
Building's student population	2.13	.127
Building's teacher population	1.32	.275
District's student population	0.55	.652
Gender	1.52	.223

Note: * indicates a statistical significance

TABLE 21

RESULTS FROM UNIVARIATE ANALYSES OF VARIANCE (ANOVAS)
BETWEEN SUBSCALE 5 (INFLUENCE ON RELATIONS WITH PARENTS/
COMMUNITY) AND THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FROM THE
SUPERORDINATE DATA

Variable	F	p-value
Current position experience (in years)	1.04	.360
Years in occupation	0.02	.979
Building's student population	0.42	.659
Building's teacher population	0.32	.812
District's student population	1.04	.379
Gender	1.29	.261

Note: * indicates a statistical significance

The third of the statistically significant ANOVAS was found in Subscale three, influence on supervision of students, as a function of the superordinates' number of years in his/her present capacity. Those superordinates with fewer than three years were found to respond statistically significantly different from both those superordinates who had been in their current position from three to 10 years and from those with 11 or more years in their same position.

Correlation Matrices and Inter-Correlation Matrix

Two correlation matrices were performed. The first was performed between the survey subscales for the superordinates to show the interrelationships between the scales. The second was performed between the survey subscales for the elementary principals. Of the 20 correlations performed, 20 were found to be statistically significant from zero.

The correlation matrix between the survey subscales for the principals is shown in Table 22. The correlation matrix between the survey subscales for the superordinates is shown in Table 23.

An inter-correlation matrix was performed to show the interrelationships between the survey subscales of the building principals and the survey subscales of the superordinates. Of the 25 inter-correlations performed, one was found to be statistically significant from zero. Thirteen of the 25 inter-correlations were found to have an inverse relationship, showing the principals' response data to correlate low and negatively with the superordinates' response data in these areas.

TABLE 22

CORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN THE SURVEY SUBSCALES FOR THE
PRINCIPALS

	1A	2A	3A	4A	5A
1A	-				
2A	.71*	-			
3A	.79*	.76*	-		
4A	.81*	.75*	.86*	-	
5A	.67*	.72*	.73*	.66*	-

Note * indicates a statistically significant correlation

TABLE 23

CORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN THE SURVEY SUBSCALES FOR THE
SUPERORDINATES

	1	2	3	4	5
1	-				
2	.55*	-			
3	.73*	.55*	-		
4	.45*	.58*	.59*	-	
5	.55*	.64*	.59*	.42*	-

Note * indicates a statistically significant correlation

TABLE 24

CORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN THE SURVEY SUBSCALES FOR THE
PRINCIPALS AND THE SUPERORDINATES

	1A	2A	3A	4A	5A
1	-.09	-.05	-.11	-.11	-.08
2	.08	.07	.00	.00	.10
3	-.11	-.05	-.13	-.18	-.03
4	.24*	.19	.18	.13	.15
5	.05	.05	-.02	-.06	-.08

Note * indicates a statistically significant correlation

The inter-correlations between the survey subscales for the superordinates and the principals is provided in Table 24.

Summary

Chapter IV provides a presentation and analysis of the data gathered through a researcher-developed survey that was administered to State of Michigan, public school superintendents and elementary-level building principals.

Data from the randomly distributed questionnaires was presented on the basis of demographic information that was solicited from both groups. A mean response rate on a grand scale and for each of five subscales as a function of each demographic variable was given for the responding superordinates and principals.

Results from univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAS) between the total survey, as well as each of the subscales, and the demographic variables from the principal data, and between the total survey, as well as each of the subscales, and the demographic variables from the superordinate data was then presented. A Tukey LSD was run for the three ANOVAS that were statistically significant.

Lastly, two correlation matrices were provided. The first was performed between the survey subscales for the elementary principals to show the interrelationships between the scales. The second was performed between the survey subscales for the superordinates to show these interrelationships.

An inter-correlation matrix was also provided and showed the interrelationships between the survey subscales of the building principals and the survey subscales of the superordinates.

Chapter V will provide a discussion of the data presentation along with a summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

As a middle-level manager in the hierarchy of public educational systems, an elementary school principal functions as a link between a school district's central office and a diverse customer base that he/she serves (Harrison and Peterson, 1987; Peterson, 1984). This base includes school board members, local citizenry, teachers and other staff members, parents, students, peers, and lawmakers. As a result, a principal is "bombarded on all sides by the demand to satisfy expectations" (Bolton, 1980).

Since the 1970s, attention has increasingly focused on the role of the principal and the influence it plays on student performance, instructional improvement, and effective programming. Due, in part, to the realization that principals are key players in the overall educational process, public demands for accountability and assessment have risen. Accordingly, formal evaluation procedures of school administrative personnel have been advocated, researched, legislated, and implemented.

Despite nearly three decades of focus, however, few studies have sought to empirically gauge what effect and impact superordinate/subordinate evaluations have had upon a principal's performance. Berry and Ginsberg (1990) postulate, "The majority of

the literature on principal evaluation is not research oriented, but rather presents opinions or local methods and techniques for others to consider."

Given this setting, the purpose of this study was to examine the impact of the superordinate/administrator evaluation process upon the performance of public school, kindergarten through sixth grade, elementary building-level principals from the State of Michigan, as perceived by superordinates (e.g. superintendents, assistant superintendents, associate superintendents) and elementary principals. A researcher-developed questionnaire was used to gather these perceptions relative to five key areas of principal performance that were identified through a comprehensive review of the related literature.

Specific research questions for examination were:

1. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's supervision of teachers?

2. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's perception of his/her role as a building administrator?

3. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's supervision of students?

4. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's role/function in curriculum development?

5. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's relations with parent/community constituency?

6. Do certain respondent demographic factors affect perceptions regarding the influence of the administrator (superordinate) evaluation process?

Two similar survey instruments were developed, each containing five subscales consisting of five questions each (Appendix C and Appendix D). The subscales were aligned with the first five research questions. Additionally, demographic information was requested to examine the sixth research question. One survey instrument focused on the superordinates'/superintendents' perceptions of the impact of evaluations of elementary building administrators, while the second instrument was directed toward the elementary principals' perceptions of the influence of the process of being evaluated. Both instruments utilized a Likert-type scale to map perceptions.

The population for this study consisted of currently practicing, public school superordinates and elementary-level principals from the State of Michigan. Four school districts, each with student populations over 20,000, were excluded from the study sample prior to a random selection of the study's participants. Questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of 120 principals and 120 superintendents. There was no intent to identify individuals, specific districts, or geographic regions of the respondents.

Of those who received questionnaires, 72 percent (N=86) of the principals and 59 percent (N=71) of the superordinates returned the questionnaires in usable condition. Of these, four percent (N=4) of the principals reported that no system of appraisal was in place in their district, and two percent (N=2) of the superordinates reported that there was no evaluative process; demographic data provided by these respondents was used for overall demographic distribution reporting only. All survey responses were tabulated and a data analysis was completed utilizing a variety of methods and techniques that followed directly from the exploratory nature of the study.

Discussion of the Findings

The purpose of the survey was to assess the impact of the superordinate/ administrator evaluation process upon the performance of public school, elementary-level principals as perceived by superordinates and elementary principals. The findings are based on the most recent evaluation conducted and are summarized according to the six research questions posed.

1. <u>What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's supervision of teachers?</u>

In regard to whether the evaluation process helped principals better understand their strengths and weaknesses in relation to their supervision of teachers, 29 percent of the principals agreed that their most recent evaluation helped them to better understand their strengths and 18 percent perceived weakness identification. Asked similar questions, 84 percent of the superordinates felt they identified and clarified principal strengths, and 72 percent believed that their evaluation of elementary principals identified and helped their principals to better understand weaknesses in the area of supervision of teachers. As to whether principals are better equipped to meet the needs of their teachers as a result of their most recent evaluation, 18 percent of the principals felt they were; whereas, 70 percent of the superordinates believed that the process put their principals in a better position to meet teacher needs.

Thirty-three percent of the principals responded that they will attempt to increase their overall level of impact on their teachers and their teachers' performance as a result of the evaluation process. Again, the superordinates expressed a higher agreement rate (83

percent) as to whether there would be a catalytic effect as a result of the appraisal. Lastly, in regard to whether the superordinate had a clear picture of a principal's performance in the area of teacher supervision, 37 percent of the principals believed that the superordinates could appropriately judge this area. Conversely, 73 percent of the superordinates felt they held a clear picture of principal performance in relation to teacher supervision.

There appears to be a sharp differentiation between superordinates and principals relative to their perceptions of the effect that appraisal reviews have upon a principal 's supervision of teachers. In one of the most primary areas of principal duty, superordinates overwhelmingly believe that their evaluations of building administrators elevate levels of understanding of strengths and weaknesses and provide direction in order to promote enhanced leadership. Principals, on the other hand, perceive their superordinate appraisals as exercises with minimal resulting effect relative to their supervision of the teaching staff. This could be attributed to a lack of principal communication as to overall influence, a superordinate assumption that completed appraisals equate with effective appraisals, and/or a generally deficient means of measuring this area of performance.

2. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's perception of his/her role as a building administrator?

Thirty-five percent of the principals reported that they better understood their strengths in relation to the perception they have of their role as a building principal as a result of their most recent appraisal. For the superordinates, 81 percent expressed a belief that their principals better understood these strengths. In regard to whether the principals

better understood their weaknesses in relation to the perception they held of their role as a building principal, 31 percent of the responding principals noted levels of agreement, while 81 percent of the superordinates conveyed that their principals had a better grasp on weaknesses.

As to whether the appraisal process enhanced principals' perceptions of their role as building principal, 33 percent of the principals believed their most recent evaluation enhanced their view of their role. For the superordinates, 77 percent believed there was a positive effect on principal perception of role. As to whether the most recent evaluation better equipped principals to fulfill their perceived role as a building principal, 24 percent of the principals felt better equipped. Sixty-seven percent of the superordinates reported that their appraisal process positively served their elementary principals in helping them to better understand their role. Finally, as to whether the superordinate had a clear picture of how building principals perceive their role, 43 percent of the principals felt their superordinates knew how they perceived their role; whereas, a large 81 percent of the superordinates thought they understood their principals' perceptions of roles.

Again, a large discrepancy is apparent between superordinate perceptions of appraisal process impact compared to principal perception of impact. This supports Frerking's (1992) findings that principals express little confidence in the ability of the principal evaluation system to support their overall impact. She found, however, that superintendents also expressed little confidence in the system. This study shows relatively overwhelming confidence exhibited by the superordinates in regard to their perceptions of process impact.

One additional finding worthy of note is the average percentage of response to this performance area's questions as being "Neither Agree nor Disagree." Both principals' (34 percent) and superordinates' (24 percent) average responses comprised approximately one quarter or more of the result showing neither agreement nor disagreement that the process had any influential effect. This possibly exhibits the prevalence of a laissez-faire attitude toward appraisals on the part of these percentages of both populations.

3. <u>What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's supervision of students?</u>

In regard to whether principals better understood their strengths in relation to their supervision of students as a result of their most recent appraisal, 23 percent of the principals expressed that their superordinate helped them to better understand these strengths. This compares to 70 percent of the superordinates who responded that they helped principals to understand areas of strength. As to whether principals better understood their weaknesses in relation to student supervision, only 12 percent of the principals reported that their superordinates relayed usable information in this area. Conversely, 64 percent of the superordinates felt they helped principals to better understand student supervision weaknesses.

A small 16 percent of the principals felt their evaluation better suited them for meeting student needs; superordinates expressed a 57 percent agreement rate that the evaluation process served as a tool to better equip their principals. Twenty-nine percent of the principals indicated they would attempt to increase their overall level of impact on students and their performance as a result of their appraisal; interestingly, 82 percent of

the superordinates believed there would be an increased impact effort. Lastly, 32 percent

of the elementary principals thought their superordinate had a clear picture of performance

in this area; whereas, 71 percent of the evaluators felt they held a clear picture of student

supervision performance.

These results may be primarily due to a superordinate's relatively extensive

removal from the day-to-day contact that a principal has with students. Although a

superordinate's measure of a principal may be based on standardized test scores, frequency

of parent contacts involving students, or glimpses of performance relative to student

influence, these factors provide a vague snapshot of a principal's overall influence and

performance.

4. <u>What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon</u>
<u>a principal's role/function in curriculum development?</u>

Thirty-two percent of the responding principals report that they better understand

their strengths and 22 percent better understand their weaknesses in relation to their

role/function in curriculum development based on their most recent appraisal. For the

superordinates, 72 percent report their principals better understand their strengths and 66

percent believe principals better understand their weaknesses.

Twenty percent of the principals feel better equipped in regard to fulfilling their

curriculum role; whereas, 71 percent of the superordinates felt they better equipped

principals as a result of evaluating them. As to increasing their level of area performance,

28 percent of principals said they would; this compares to 79 percent of the evaluators

believing performance would increase. Finally, 35 percent of the principals felt their

appraiser had a clear picture of curriculum performance; 78 percent of the superordinates were confident they had a clear picture of principal performance.

These findings echo those of Duke and Stiggins (1985) as well as of Harrison and Peterson (1986). Both found principals to be less positive than the superintendent as to levels of communication, concern with instructional matters, and agreement on scope and purpose. One possible reason for response differences could include the often "top-down" flow of curriculum issues and development from either the state level or from intermediate or district curriculum committees. Additionally, differences in opinion as to what works at an individual building level, and/or ongoing implementation of district curriculum practices irrelevant to the appraisal process could affect particular perceptions toward this performance area.

5. What level of influence do administrator (superordinate) evaluations have upon a principal's relations with parent/community constituency?

Thirty-eight percent of the responding principals believed their latest performance appraisal helped them to understand their strengths relative to relations with parent and community constituency. Only 23 percent felt that weaknesses were better understood. The superordinates, on the other hand, expressed an 81 percent perceptual belief that principal strengths were clarified and more greatly understood, and a 68 percent response rate that weaknesses were explored. Less than 25 percent of the principals felt better equipped to meet parent and community needs as a result. Fifty-nine percent of the superordinates thought their principals were better able to meet these needs following their appraisal.

Thirty-seven percent of the principals expressed that they would attempt to increase their level of influence on parents and community as a result of the evaluation process; whereas, 71 percent of the superordinates thought principals would make such an attempt. As to whether the evaluators held a clear picture of principal performance in regard to relations with parents and community, 43 percent of the principals felt they did, and 75 percent of the superordinates had confidence in their knowledge of their principals' performance in this area.

Although there is less of a perceptual difference in this area between superordinate and principal responses than in any of the other performance areas, sizable variation still exists. This could again be a factor of limited contact on behalf of the superordinate. Principals have a daily direct contact with their constituents. Superordinates, on the other hand, are often at a site other than the elementary building and become involved with a principal's constituents on a limited issue basis, possibly providing a "hit-and-miss" view of actual overall principal contact.

6. Do certain demographic factors affect perceptions regarding the influence of the administrator (superordinate) evaluation process?

As detailed at length in Chapter Four, there is little evidence that the number of years in one's current position, total number of years in a related position, building teacher population, building student population, district student population, elementary principal population, or gender have any significant effect on either a superordinate's or a principal's perceptions of the impact of the evaluation process.

In two cases, superordinates' number of years were found to be statistically significant, and in only one case did principals' number of years in current position exhibit statistical significance.

Conclusions

Each area of this study's findings indicate an obvious discrepancy between the perceptions of superordinates and their subordinates in regard to the impact of the appraisal process. This supports and builds upon related research conducted by Berry and Ginsberg (1990), Duke and Stiggins (1985), Frerking (1992), and Harrison and Peterson (1986), all of whom found similar superordinate/principal response patterns in various surveys of these populations relative to the administrative evaluation process.

In summary, the following conclusions are established:

1. Superordinates hold a higher level of positive perception about the evaluation process, its impact, and its results than do elementary building principals.

2. Perception discrepancies between superordinates and principals occur across all of the identified performance areas. Widest perception gaps appear in the area of evaluation influence on the supervision of teachers. Lowest perception differences are found in the area of appraisal influence on principal relations with parents and community.

3. Demographic factors including number of years experience, building and district student populations, and gender have no significant effect upon a superordinate's or a principal's perceptions of how the appraisal process impacts performance.

4. A notable average percentage in all subscales of superordinates (21 percent) and of principals (28 percent) portrays a neutral perceptual response as to whether the appraisal process has any influence upon a principal's performance.

5. Superordinates express a greater confidence in their level of realization of principal performance than do the principals whom they evaluate. On the average, 75 percent of the superordinates perceive they hold a clear knowledge of principal performance; whereas, only 38 percent of the principals express confidence that their superordinate has a clear picture of how they perform their duties.

Recommendations

Based on the research and interpretation of the data from this study's survey of the perceptions of superintendents and elementary-level principals in regard to the impact of the superordinate/administrator appraisal process upon kindergarten through sixth grade, State of Michigan, public school principals, the following recommendations for further study and consideration are submitted:

1. It is suggested that a study be undertaken in other states. It might be worthwhile to compare findings from those states which mandate administrator evaluations to findings from those states which do not mandate the practice.

2. In order to compare findings to those found at the elementary level, a similar study should be undertaken at the middle school level and at the high school level.

3. A study comparing impact perceptions of evaluation systems in which principals have exhibited a high degree of input during the stages of development and

implementation to those in which they have had a low degree of input could possibly establish what relationship this commonly recommended appraisal process element has to levels of perceived impact.

4. A qualitative follow-up study may be beneficial to determine the reasoning behind principal and superordinate responses to the various questions within the performance areas of the survey instrument.

5. To establish whether findings in private, denominational, or parochial schools compare to those within the public school system, a similar study should be undertaken in these settings.

6. A follow-up study in five to 10 years could provide evidence concerning whether impact perceptions have increased, have remained neutral, or have declined.

APPENDIX A

SUPERINTENDENT REQUEST LETTER

APPENDIX A

SUPERINTENDENT REQUEST LETTER

Dear Superintendent:

I am conducting a survey of Michigan, public school, superintendents and elementary principals to determine the perceived level of impact that superordinate/ administrator evaluations have upon principals' performance. As participant selection is random, your district's elementary principal(s) may or may not be chosen to participate in the study. This research is being undertaken as part of my dissertation process at Loyola University of Chicago.

Your participation is essential. I would greatly appreciate your taking of approximately ten minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire. Please reply candidly and base your answers upon your most recent evaluation of your elementary principal(s). Within two weeks, please complete and return the survey in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Your responses will remain completely confidential. All data will be reported in general categories. Absolutely no reference will be made to individuals, their buildings, or their districts.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. Peal

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL REQUEST LETTER

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL REQUEST LETTER

Dear Principal:

I am conducting a survey of Michigan, public school, elementary principals and superintendents to determine the perceived level of impact that superordinate/ administrator evaluations have upon principals' performance. As participant selection is random, your district's superintendent may or may not be chosen to participate in the study. This research is being undertaken as part of my dissertation process at Loyola University of Chicago.

Your participation is essential. I would greatly appreciate your taking of approximately ten minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire. Please reply candidly and base your answers upon your most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation as conducted by your superintendent or his/her designee. Within two weeks, please complete and return the survey in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Your responses will remain completely confidential. All data will be reported in general categories. Absolutely no reference will be made to individuals, their buildings, or their districts.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. Peal

APPENDIX C

SUPERINTENDENT SURVEY INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX C

SUPERINTENDENT SURVEY INSTRUMENT

I. Influence on Supervision of Teaching

Please respond to the following statements based on your most recent evaluation of your district's elementary principal(s). Circle the number that best describes your response.

I. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they better understand their strengths in relation to how they supervise their teachers.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

II. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they better understand their weaknesses in relation to how they supervise their teachers.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

III. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they are better equipped to meet the needs of their teachers.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

IV. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they will attempt to increase their overall level of impact on their teachers and their teachers' performance.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

V. Based on my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I am confident that I have a clear picture of their performance in the area of teacher supervision.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

II. Influence on Perception of Role as Building Principal

Please respond to the following statements based on your most recent evaluation of your district's elementary principal(s). Circle the number that best describes your response.

I. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they better understand their strengths in relation to the perception they have of their role as a building principal.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

II. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they better understand their weaknesses in relation to the perception they have of their role as a building principal.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

III. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they have an enhanced perception of their role as a building principal.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

IV. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they are better equipped to fulfill the role, as they perceive it, of a building principal.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

V. Based on my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I am confident that I have a clear picture of how they perceive their role as a building principal.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

III. Influence on Supervision of Students

Please respond to the following statements based on your most recent evaluation of your district's elementary principal(s). Circle the number that best describes your response.

I. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they better understand their strengths in relation to how they supervise their students.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

II. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they better understand their weaknesses in relation to how they supervise their students.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

III. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they are better equipped to meet the needs of their students.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

IV. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they will attempt to increase their overall level of impact on their students and their students' performance.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

V. Based on my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I am confident that I have a clear picture of their performance in the area of student supervision.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

IV. Influence on Curriculum Development

Please respond to the following statements based on your most recent evaluation of your district's elementary principal(s). Circle the number that best describes your response.

I. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they better understand their strengths in relation to their role/function in curriculum development.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

II. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they better understand their weaknesses in relation to their role/function in curriculum development.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

III. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they are better equipped to fulfill their role/function in regard to curriculum development.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

IV. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they will attempt to increase their level of performance in regard to curriculum development.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

V. Based on my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I am confident that I have a clear picture of their performance in the area of curriculum development.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

V. Influence on Relations with Parents/Community

Please respond to the following statements based on your most recent evaluation of your district's elementary principal(s). Circle the number that best describes your response.

I. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they better understand their strengths in relation to how they work with their parent/community constituency.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

II. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they better understand their weaknesses in relation to how they work with their parent/community constituency.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

III. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they are better equipped to meet the needs of their parent/community constituency.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

IV. As a direct result of my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I believe that they will attempt to increase their level of influence on their parent/community constituency.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

V. Based on my most recent evaluation of my elementary principals, I am confident that I have a clear picture of their performance in the area of working with their parent/community constituency.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

Respondent Demographic Information

Please complete the following statements.

I. I have held my current position as a superintendent for _____ years.

II. I have held a superintendent-level position for _____ years.

III. My current district's elementary principal population is _____ elementary principals.

IV. My current district's student population is _____ students.

V. My current school district's elementary student population is _____ students.

VI. My gender is _____ male

_____ female.

Thank you for your participation in this survey. Please place your completed survey in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope and place it in the U. S. Mail.

APPENDIX D

PRINCIPAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX D

PRINCIPAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT

I. Influence on Supervision of Teaching

Please respond to the following statements based on your most recent evaluation by the superintendent or his/her designee. Circle the number that best describes your response.

I. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I better understand my strengths in relation to how I supervise my teachers.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

II. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I better understand my weaknesses in relation to how I supervise my teachers.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

III. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I believe that I am better equipped to meet the needs of my teachers.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

IV. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I will attempt to increase my overall level of impact on my teachers and their performance.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

V. Based on my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I am confident that my evaluator has a clear picture of my performance in the area of teacher supervision.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

II. Influence on Perception of Role as Building Principal

Please respond to the following statements based on your most recent evaluation by the superintendent or his/her designee. Circle the number that best describes your response.

I. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I better understand my strengths in relation to the perception I have of my role as a building principal.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

II. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I better understand my weaknesses in relation to the perception I have of my role as a building principal.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

III. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I have an enhanced perception of my role as a building principal.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

IV. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I believe that I am better equipped to fulfill the role, as I perceive it, of a building principal.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

V. Based on my most recent administrative evaluation, I am confident that my evaluator has a clear picture of how I perceive my role as a building principal.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

III. Influence on Supervision of Students

Please respond to the following statements based on your most recent evaluation by the superintendent or his/her designee. Circle the number that best describes your response.

I. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I better understand my strengths in relation to how I supervise my students.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

II. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I better understand my weaknesses in relation to how I supervise my students.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

III. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I believe that I am better equipped to meet the needs of my students.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

IV. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I will attempt to increase my level of impact on my students.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

V. Based on my most recent administrative evaluation, I am confident that my evaluator has a clear picture of my performance in the area of student supervision.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

IV. Influence on Curriculum Development

Please respond to the following statements based on your most recent evaluation by the superintendent or his/her designee. Circle the number that best describes your response.

I. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I better understand my strengths in relation to my role/function in curriculum development.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

II. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I better understand my weaknesses in relation to my role/function in curriculum development.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

III. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I believe that I am better equipped to fulfill my role/function in regard to curriculum development.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

IV. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I will attempt to increase my level of performance in regard to curriculum development.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

V. Based on my most recent administrative evaluation, I am confident that my evaluator has a clear picture of my performance in the area of curriculum development.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

V. Influence on Relations with Parents/Community

Please respond to the following statements based on your most recent evaluation by the superintendent or his/her designee. Circle the number that best describes your response.

I. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I better understand my strengths in relation to how I work with my parent/community constituency.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

II. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I better understand my weaknesses in relation to how I work with my parent/community constituency.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

III. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I believe that I am better equipped to meet the needs of my parent/community constituency.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

IV. As a direct result of my most recent superordinate/administrator evaluation, I will attempt to increase my level of influence on my parent/community constituency.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

V. Based on my most recent administrative evaluation, I am confident that my evaluator has a clear picture of my performance in the area of working with my parent/community constituency.

1	2	3	4	5
Highly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Highly Agree

Respondent Demographic Information

Please complete the following statements.

I. I have held my current position as an elementary principal for _____ years.

II. I have held a building-level-principal position for _____ years.

III. My current building's student population is _____ students.

IV. My current building's teacher population is _____ teachers.

V. My current school district's student population is _____ students.

VI. My gender is   _____ male

                         _____ female.

Thank you for your participation in this survey. Please place your completed survey in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope and place it in the U. S. Mail.

APPENDIX E

SUPERINTENDENT FOLLOW-UP LETTER

APPENDIX E

SUPERINTENDENT FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Dear Superintendent:

Approximately three weeks ago, I mailed you a questionnaire concerning your perceptions of the impact of your district's elementary principal evaluation process.

Unfortunately, I have not received your reply. I would very much appreciate your assistance and cooperation by completing the survey and forwarding it to me.

I have enclosed another questionnaire with this mailing for your response. As noted in the original mailing, individual responses will remain completely confidential, and all data will be reported in general categories. Absolutely no reference will be made to individuals, their buildings, or their districts.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. Peal

APPENDIX F

PRINCIPAL FOLLOW-UP LETTER

APPENDIX F

PRINCIPAL FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Dear Fellow Principal:

Approximately three weeks ago, I mailed you a questionnaire concerning your perceptions of the impact of your district's elementary principal evaluation process.

Unfortunately, I have not received your reply. I would very much appreciate your assistance and cooperation by completing the survey and forwarding it to me.

I have enclosed another questionnaire with this mailing for your response. As noted in the original mailing, individual responses will remain completely confidential, and all data will be reported in general categories. Absolutely no reference will be made to individuals, their buildings, or their districts.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. Peal

REFERENCES

Anderson, Mark E. "Evaluating Principals: Strategies to Assess and Enhance Their Performance." Oregon School Study Council Bulletin 32, no. 8 (April 1989).

Andrews, Carl. "Evaluating Principals." Research Roundup 6, no. 2 (Feb. 1990).

Berry, Branett and Rick Ginsberg. "The Folklore of Principal Evaluation." Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education 3, no. 3 (March 1990): 205-230.

Bolton, Dale L. Evaluating Administrative Personnel in School Systems. New York: Teachers College Press, 1980.

Breines, Estelle. Perception: Its Development and Recapitulation. Lebanon, N.J.: Geri-Rehab, Inc., 1981.

Carnes, Margaret L. Evaluating Administrative Performance. Arlington, Va: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1985.

Daresh, John C. and Marsha A. Playko. "Portfolios for Principals: Planning for Professional Development." National Association of Elementary School Principals Here's How 14, no. 1 (Sept. 1995): 1-4.

Daw, Robert W. and N. L. Gage. "Effect of Feedback from Teachers to Principals." Journal of Educational Psychology 58, no. 3 (1967): 181-188.

Deal, Terrence E. Foreward to Evaluating Administrative Performance: Current Trends and Techniques, by Elio Zappulla. Belmont, Calif.: Star Publishing Company, 1983.

Deal, Terrence E., Sanford M. Dornbusch, and Robert A. Crawford. "Villains and Victims: Evaluating Principals." Phi Delta Kappan, no. 59 (Dec. 1977): 273-274.

Duke, Daniel L. and Richard J. Stiggins. "Evaluating the Performance of Principals: A Descriptive Study." Educational Administration Quarterly 21, no. 4 (Fall 1985): 71-98.

Featherston, Richard L. and Louis Romano. "Evaluation of Administrative Performance." The Clearinghouse 50 (May 1977): 412-415.

French, John R. P., Emanuel Kay, and Herbert H. Meyer. "Participation and the Appraisal System." Human Relations 19 (Feb. 1966): 3-20.

Frerking, Ruth A. "Principal Performance Evaluation: A Nationwide Status Report on the Type and Effectiveness of Evaluation as Perceived by Principals and Supervisors." Ph.D. diss., Iowa State University, 1992.

Gaynor, Alan K. "The Role of the School Administrator." In The Evaluation of Administrative Performance, ed. William J. Gephart, Robert B. Engle, and W. James Potter. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1975.

Greller, Martin M. "Subordinate Participation and Reactions to the Appraisal Interview." Journal of Applied Psychology 60, no. 5 (1975): 544-549.

Griffin, Gloria. "The Superintendent's Impact on School Effectiveness: Profiles of Six School Districts." ERS Spectrum (Fall 1994): 20-27.

Hallinger, P., J. Murphy, and K. Peterson. "Supervising and Evaluating Principals: Lessons from Effective Districts." Educational Leadership 42 (Oct. 1985): 78-82.

Harrison, William C. and Kent D. Peterson. Complexities in the Evaluation of Principals: The Relationship between Satisfaction with Evaluation Processes, Criteria, and Sources of Information. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., 20-24 April 1987, ERIC, ED 286-276.

_____. "Pitfalls in the Evaluation of Principals," The Urban Review 18, no. 4 (1986): 221-35.

Howsam, Robert B. "Current Issues in Evaluation." In Evaluating Administrative Performance: Current Trends and Techniques, ed. Elio Zappulla, 183-191. Belmont, Calif.: Star Publishing Company, 1983.

Indik, Bernard P., Basil S. Georgopoulos, and Stanley E. Seashore. "Superior-Subordinate Relationships and Performance." Personnel Psychology 14 (1961): 357-374.

Kellogg, Marion S. What To Do About Performance Appraisal. 2d ed. New York: AMACOM, 1975.

Knoop, Robert and Ronald W. Common. A Performance Appraisal System for School
    Principals. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Study of Education,
    Montreal, Quebec, Canada, 28-31 May 1985, ERIC, Ed 269-849.

Look, Ellen and Richard Manatt. "Evaluating Principal Performance with Improved
    Criteria." NASSP Bulletin 68, no. 476 (Dec. 1984): 76-81.

Manasse, A. Lorri. "Principals as Leaders of High-Performing Systems." Educational
    Leadership 41, no. 5 (Feb. 1984): 42-46.

Manatt, Richard P. "Principal Evaluation is Largely Wrongheaded and Ineffective." The
    Executive Educator, no. 11 (Nov. 1989): 22-23.

McGinnies, Elliott. "Emotionality and Perceptual Defense." Psychology Review 56
    (1949): 244-251.

McIntyre, Kenneth E. and Ed A. Grant. "How Principals, Teachers and Superintendents
    View the Principalship." NASSP Bulletin 64, no. 433 (Feb. 1980): 44-49.

McCleary, Lloyd E. "Administrator Evaluation: Concerns for the Practitioner." In
    Evaluating Administrative Performance: Current Trends and Techniques, ed. Elio
    Zappulla, 174-181. Belmont, Calif.: Star Publishing Company, 1983.

_____. "Evaluation of Principals." In Evaluating Administrative Performance:
    Current Trends and Techniques, ed. Elio Zappulla, 249-257. Belmont, Calif.: Star
    Publishing Company, 1983.

Meyer, Herbert H., Emanuael Kay, and John R. P. French, Jr. "Split Roles in Performance
    Appraisal." Harvard Business Review 43 (Jan. 1965): 123-129.

Michigan Education Directory 1995. Lansing, Mich.: Lansing Printing Co. [1994].

"Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association Recommended
    Individual Contract." Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals
    Association Letter 21, no. 5 (May/June 1995): 8-9.

Michigan. The School Code of 1976. 1994.

Mueller, Donald W. "Development of Performance Improvement Commitments for
    Secondary School Principals." Ph.D. diss., Iowa State University, 1987.

Noland, Robert L. and Joseph J. Moylan. How to Conduct Better Performance Appraisal
    Interviews. Springdale, Conn.: Motivation, Inc., 1967.

Oberg, Winston. "Make Performance Appraisal Relevant." Harvard Business Review 50 (Jan./Feb. 1972): 61-67.

Olds, H. Robert. How To Evaluate Administrative and Supervisory Personnel. Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators, 1977.

Peterson, Kent D. "Mechanisms of Administrative Control over Managers in Educational Organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly 29 (1984): 573-597.

Piele, Philip K. Preface to "Evaluating Principals: Strategies to Assess and Enhance Their Performance." Oregon School Study Council Bulletin 32, no. 8 (April 1989).

Redfern, George B. Evaluating Teachers and Administrators: A Performance Objectives Approach. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1980.

Rieder, George A. "Performance Review - A Mixed Bag?" Harvard Business Review 51 (July/Aug. 1973): 61-67.

Robinson, Glen. Foreward to Evaluating Admnistrative Performance, by Margaret L. Carnes. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1985

Sanacore, Joseph. "How Teachers Can Evaluate Their Principal." NASSP Bulletin 60, no. 402 (Oct. 1976): 98-101.

Sapone, Carmelo V. "An Appraisal and Evaluation System for Teachers and Administrators." In Evaluating Administrative Performance: Current Trends and Techniques, ed. Elio Zappulla, 174-181. Belmont, Calif.: Star Publishing Company, 1983.

Skolnick, Paul. "Reactions to Personal Evaluations: A Failure to Replicate." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 18, no. 1 (1971): 62-67.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. The Principalship: A Reflective Practice Perspective. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1991.

Stemnock, Suzanne K. "Evaluating the Evaluator." Educational Research Service Circular, no. 4 (July 1973): 1-48.

Thurston, Paul, Tom McGreal, and M. Kiser. Human Resource Management in Education: A Dynamic Policy Perspective. New York: Longman Publishers, forthcoming.

Weiss, Kathy G. "Evaluation of Elementary and Secondary School Principals' Performance." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1988.

Zappulla, Elio. ed. <u>Evaluating Administrative Performance: Current Trends and Techniques</u>. Belmont, Calif.: Star Publishing Company, 1983.

VITA

Christopher J. Peal currently serves as the principal of North Elementary School in Watervliet, Michigan. He formerly held positions as a dean of students at Canton Middle School in Streamwood, Illinois, as an assistant principal at Muskegon Catholic Central Junior/Senior High School in Muskegon, Michigan, and as an English, speech, and journalism teacher at Plymouth-Canton High School in Canton, Michigan.

In August 1989, Mr. Peal earned a Master of Arts degree in Educational Foundations, Policy, and Administration from the School of Education at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, Michigan. In May 1986, he earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in English Education from Olivet Nazarene University in Kankakee, Illinois.

Mr. Peal was born in Moline, Illinois, and graduated from Rock Island Alleman High School.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Christopher J. Peal has been read and approved by the following committee:

L. Arthur Safer, Ph.D., Director
Professor, School of Education
Loyola University Chicago

Max Bailey, J.D.:Ed.D.
Associate Professor, School of Education
Loyola University Chicago

Phillip Carlin, Ed.D.
Associate Professor, School of Education
Loyola University Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

March 12, 1996
_____
Date

_____
Director's Signature