Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

1-1-1987

A Comparison of Principal and Teacher Perceptions of Principal Leadership Skills

Alan Mark Carlton

Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Carlton, Alan Mark, "A Comparison of Principal and Teacher Perceptions of Principal Leadership Skills" (1987). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 460.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.460>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

A COMPARISON OF PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER
PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP SKILLS

by

ALAN MARK CARLTON

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

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

Portland State University

1987

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH:

The members of the Committee approve the dissertation of Alan Mark Carlton presented May 19, 1987.

[REDACTED]

John D. Link, Chairperson - PSU

[REDACTED]

Tom E. Thomas - UO

[REDACTED]

Michael E. Carl - PSU

[REDACTED]

Sheldon S. Maron - PSU

[REDACTED]

Jerry W. Lansdowne - PSU

APPROVED:

[REDACTED]

Mary Kinnick, Bi-University Program Coordinator (Portland State University)

[REDACTED]

Richard A. Schmuck, Bi-University Program Coordinator (University of Oregon)

[REDACTED]

Robert B. Everhart, Dean of the School of Education (Portland State University)

[REDACTED]

Bernard Ross, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research (Portland State University)

AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF Alan Mark Carlton for the
Doctor of Education in Education Administration presented May
19, 1987.

Title: A Comparison of Principal and Teacher Perceptions of
Principal Leadership Skills.

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE:

John D. Lind, Chairman

Tom E. Thomas

Michael E. Carl

Sheldon S. Maron

Jerry W. Lansdowne

Charles A. Tracy

This study examined principals' and teachers'
perceptions regarding both the importance of certain

leadership skills and the ratings of principals' actual skills. There are strong theoretical bases for the use of principals' and teachers' perceptions in this study. The analysis of perceptions of leadership skills can lead to: (1) an increased awareness of principals' strengths and weaknesses; (2) greater communication between principals and teachers; and, (3) hopefully, increased productivity on the part of principals and teachers.

The population for this study was a group of twenty-eight principals who participated in the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators Assessment Center, and 189 teachers in those principals' schools. These principals represented the total number of Assessment Center participants who were promoted to their positions subsequent to their participation in the Center. Assessment Center prediction ratings of these principals' skills were compared to teachers' ratings of the same principals' skills.

Research questions sought information in the following areas: (1) principals' perceptions of their own skills; (2) principals' perceptions of the importance of given skills; (3) principals' predictions of teachers' ratings of the importance of skills; (4) principals' predictions of teachers' ratings of principals' actual skills; (5) teachers' perceptions of principals' skills; (6) teachers' perceptions of the importance of given skills; and, (7) Assessment Center prediction ratings of principals' skills.

Data were obtained through questionnaires and from Assessment Center ratings for each principal. All responses were kept strictly confidential and information was reported by category of respondent rather than by name or place. Assessment Center information was based on codes provided by the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators.

The methodology for this study combined survey research with information provided by the COSA Assessment Center. Mailed surveys were used to collect data regarding principals' and teachers' perceptions of leadership skills. Assessment Center information was compared to data collected from the survey research to determine the validity of the Assessment Center predictions.

The results of this study suggested that there is a general agreement between principals and teachers regarding principals' leadership skills. Additionally, the predictions made regarding individuals' skills by the Assessment Center accurately reflected teachers' perceptions of the same individuals' skills in the actual role of principals. The area of greatest difference in this study was in principals' perceptions of teachers' ratings of importance, compared to the teachers' actual ratings. Principals generally predicted that teachers would rate the importance of skills lower than teacher actually rated them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, it is important for me to acknowledge the leading and guidance of God, our father. He has given me strength, endurance and a desire to accomplish this goal for His glory.

For his calm patience and continual support, I would like to thank Dr. John Lind, my doctoral advisor. My sincere appreciation goes to my other doctoral committee members: Dr. Mike Carl, Dr. Jerry Landsdowne, Dr. Sheldon Maron, Dr. Charles Tracy, and Dr. Tom Thomas, for their assistance, encouragement, and their valuable time.

Special gratitude goes to Dr. Steve Carlson who guided me through the statistical analysis of this study. Thank you to Dr. Steve Lynch, my director, and to the other administrators of the Beaverton School District for their support. I am grateful to the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators and to Dr. Wayne Robbins, Director of the COSA Assessment Center, for encouraging me in this study and for providing information.

Finally, thank you to my dear family. To my children, Adam, Kendra and Justin, thank you for your understanding and for your prayers. To my wife Sue, thank you for your love and your support, and for always being there.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....iii

LIST OF TABLES.....vii

CHAPTER

I INTRODUCTION.....1

Statement of the Problem4

Significance of the Problem.....8

Assumptions.....9

Hypotheses.....10

Parameters of the Study.....11

Definition of Terms.....11

Organization of the Document.....13

II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....15

Introduction.....15

Defining Skills Evaluation.....15

History of Evaluation of Skills.....16

Purposes for Evalulation.....23

The Process of Skills Evaluation.....30

Data Gathering in Evaluation Processes.....38

Skills-Based Evaluation Processes.....43

Counseling-Type Evaluation Processes.....46

Self-Evaluation Processes.....48

Content of Skills Evaluation.....49

	The Principal as an Instructional Leader.....	55
	School Effectiveness and Principals' Skills.....	58
	Teachers' Evaluations of Principals' Skills.....	68
	The NASSP Assessment Center Model.....	74
	Conclusions and Implications.....	79
III	METHODOLOGY	82
	Introduction.....	82
	Method of Research.....	82
	Research Design.....	83
	Research Questions.....	85
	Population.....	86
	Development of the Instrument.....	87
	Validation of the Instrument.....	90
	Data Collection.....	91
	Data Analysis.....	92
IV	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	94
	Descriptions of Respondents.....	94
	Skills Importance: Teachers' Ratings and Principals' Predictions of Teachers' Ratings.....	95
	Skills Importance: Teachers' Ratings and Principals' Ratings	98
	Skills Ratings: Teachers' Ratings of Principals' Skills and Principals' Predictions of Teachers' Ratings.....	101
	Skills Ratings: Principals' Self-Ratings and Teachers' Ratings.....	104

Skills Ratings: Assessment Center Ratings and Teachers' Ratings.....	107
Comparisons of Ratings by Skill Area.....	111
Summary of Results.....	113
V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	115
Summary and Conclusions.....	115
Limitations of the Study.....	121
Recommendations for Further Study.....	122
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	124
APPENDIX A	133
APPENDIX B.....	145

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I Participating Districts.....	87
II Number, Gender, and Response Percentage of Subjects Surveyed.....	95
III Skills Importance: Comparison of Teachers' Ratings and Principals' Predictions of Teachers' Ratings.....	97
IV Skills Importance: A Comparison of Teachers' Ratings and Principals' Ratings.....	99
V Skills Ratings: A Comparison of Teachers' Ratings of Principals' Skills and Principals' Predictions of Teachers' Ratings.....	103
VI Skills Ratings: A Comparison of Teachers' Ratings and Principals' Self-Ratings.....	105
VII Skills Ratings: A Comparison Between Teachers' Ratings and COSA ASSESSMENT Center Ratings of Principals.....	108
VIII Comparison of Importance Ratings by Skills.....	111
IX Comparison of Skills Ratings.....	112

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A number of studies on schooling have pointed to the increased focus on assessment and accountability of school personnel (Sciara 1972). School principals have become the focal personalities for school improvement and their actions are judged as pivotal to the success or failure of most school programs (Brookover & Lezotte 1979; Edmonds 1982). The purpose of this study was to measure principals' and teachers' perceptions which relate to the skills of the principalship.

The evaluation of principals' skills was important to this study and the following questions surfaced when considering principals' skills: What skills are to be evaluated? Who measures the effectiveness of the principal? How is the effectiveness measured? What part does the principal play in the evaluation? What standards are used in the evaluation of principal's skills? How often is measurement taken and what is the purpose of evaluating the principal's skills? What is the relationship between principals' perceptions of their leadership skills and teachers' perceptions of the same skills?

The answers to the above questions vary with the evaluators and the processes of evaluation. However, according to the literature, principals generally believed that their appraisal must be more than a fulfillment of a legal requirement or a simple recognition of accomplishment (Guthrie & Willower 1972). Public scrutiny of education requires accurate accountability (Look 1984). It is important that the educational system prove--through systematic, realistic and reliable evaluation systems--that principals are accountable. If this cannot be done, the natural result will be a loss of public trust, a loss of financial support, and a loss of internal credibility (Schaefer 1982).

The ideal evaluation of a principal's skills includes as much measurable information and as many people as possible. However, research indicated that in most cases, principals are evaluated by only one person who is usually their supervisor (Duke 1987). It is not an uncommon practice to have a single conference between the principal and supervisor at the end of a school year for the purpose of signing a state-mandated evaluation instrument (Guthrie & Willower 1972). In theory, the evaluation is designed to assess a principal's performance goals, describe the principal's growth and make recommendations for further development. McCurdy (1983) noted that principals are concerned because their leadership skills often are not

observed and, hence, the evaluations have limited effectiveness. In a 1983 national survey, thirty-eight percent of the principals polled felt that their evaluations were not effective and did not correspond to stated job outcomes (McCurdy 1983). On-site visitations by supervisors are uncommon, yet desired by principals (Hooper 1984). In practice, the final evaluation often becomes what Gutherie and Willower (1972) called nothing more than a "Ceremonial Congratulations."

The evaluation of a principal's skills may take many forms. It does not necessarily have to be tied to a yearly performance rating. Gaslin (1974) defined a formative evaluation as an evaluation designed to "... simply provide data to decision makers to aid in improving programs or performance" (p. 73). Principals can use the information from a formative evaluation with little threat to their tenure. Teachers responding to this survey evaluated their principals in a formative fashion.

This study does not assume that teachers' perceptions are singularly relevant to principals' evaluations. Rather, teachers' evaluations of principals' skills can be a part of the total evaluation process, giving the principal additional information.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Evaluation and accountability are required for efficient operation within any organization (Redfern 1980). A great deal has been written about the importance of teacher evaluation; however, little is written about principal evaluation and even less is written about teacher evaluation of principals' skills. Principals feel that their evaluations are lacking both in content and process (Gephart 1975). Given the correct climate, teachers can assist in the professional growth of principals.

There is a strong theoretical basis for the use of teachers' and principals' perceptions in this study. Perceptions can be the basis for valuable feedback. Lemon (1972) suggested that it is necessary to devise ways of measuring respondents' perceptions with regard to their attitudes because a person's viewpoint can be translated into meaningful responses to certain stimuli. Lemon concluded that the knowledge of a respondent's perception has a direct bearing on that individuals's reaction to his environment (Lemon 1972).

Schmuck, et. al., (1972) described the checking of perceptions as a "basic skill" in increasing and maintaining communication between a staff and a principal. According to Schmuck, it is important to identify subordinates' opinions

and feelings without expressing approval, disapproval, imputing motives, or making accusations. Regular perception-checking tends to convey principals' desires to understand their subordinates. These desires may quite possibly improve interpersonal relations in addition to clarifying communications. Another positive outcome, according to Schmuck, et. al., (1972), is the possible avoidance of actions which a principal might regret due to false assumptions of what a staff could be feeling.

Brighton and Rose (1974) stated that the results of subordinates' perceptions can be very revealing. These authors concluded that public opinions and reactions can play an important part in evaluating programs and personnel (Brighton and Rose 1974).

Lane and Beaucamp (1959) stated that perceptions of a group are important factors to the achievement of group goals such as development of healthy relationships, making sound decisions, and solving complex problems.

Researchers on efficient and successful school programs have identified numerous administrative skills which successful principals consistently demonstrate. The National Association of Secondary School Principals developed an educational assessment center in 1975 for the purpose of creating a method of identifying individuals who demonstrated

skills which related to successful leadership in both elementary and secondary schools.

Skills which were deemed significant were determined through interviews with various school people. A model for the skills analysis was developed in conjunction with the American Psychological Association. A content validity study on the skills was completed at Michigan State University in 1982. The study concluded that skills assessed at the centers accurately reflected skills needed to perform administrative tasks satisfactorily (Schmitt 1982).

Participants in the Assessment Center are individuals who have completed or nearly completed certification programs in educational administration. The Oregon Assessment Center is sponsored by the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA). Participants in the Center are sent by school districts or by universities. Assessors are trained by COSA and represent participating districts; however, participants are not assessed by individuals from their home district. In some cases, school districts may send candidates in an effort to secure a broad base of information relating to the candidates' potential leadership abilities. The candidates in the centers participate in activities designed to simulate types of activities which are typically found in the school principal's day.

Twelve general skill areas are measured in the Assessment Centers. These areas are:

1. Problem Analysis
2. Judgment
3. Organizational Ability
4. Decisiveness
5. Leadership
6. Sensitivity
7. Stress Tolerance
8. Oral Communication
9. Written Communication
10. Range of Interest
11. Personal Motivation
12. Educational Values

According to the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators Assessment Center, as of October, 1986, twenty-eight Oregon Assessment Center participants were promoted to full-time principal positions after completion of the Assessment Center program. This study measured those principals' perceptions and teachers' perceptions which related to the principals' skills suggested by NASSP and the literature on effective schools.

This dissertation study attempted to describe the following information:

1. Principals perceptions of their own skills.
2. Principals' perceptions of teachers' opinions of the principals' skills.

3. Teachers' perceptions of principals' skills.
4. Principals' perceptions of which skills are most important to complete their jobs successfully.
5. Principals' perceptions of which skills teachers think are most important to complete principals' tasks.
6. Teachers' perceptions of which skills are most important for principals to successfully complete their tasks.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

The principal is often characterized as the most important single individual in the school (Edmonds 1979, Brookover and Lezotte 1979). The principal sets the tone. If principals play such a major role in the general educational picture, it follows that the evaluation of principals' skills is extremely important. If the evaluation can be seen as a process whereby the principals can continually refine their skills and use information to improve specific areas of responsibility, the evaluation process is useful. Otherwise, it serves no meaningful purpose.

A need for teacher involvement exists. McGeown (1979) recognized the importance of gaining teacher perceptions and found large discrepancies between principals' reported role

behavior and teachers' expectations. Miller (1984) concluded that

teachers' perceptions are appropriate descriptions of satisfactory principal leadership because they have daily, first-hand experiences assessing the needs of the individuals and the organization. (p.47)

Even if principals' and teachers' perceptions differ, there exists a possibility for the principals to review their skills and develop a set of expectations which reflects the teachers' concerns in addition to the principals' concerns. This study should be helpful to principals, principal supervisors, trainers of administrators, researchers, and teachers as they seek to define areas of expectation, role definitions and accountability of principals.

Finally, the study should prove helpful to the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators Assessment Center. The study surveyed all Oregon Assessment Center participants who now hold positions as principals in Oregon. The data from the surveys provided a comparison between the original Assessment Center perceptions of these individuals' skills and the current perceptions of the principals in the field and the teachers who work with the principals.

ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions were made in this study:

1. Evaluation of the principal is a necessary and a desirable characteristic of any school program.
2. The principal demonstrates various observable skills which are associated with effective leadership.
3. Teachers and principals will give accurate perceptions.
4. Principals and teachers have differing perceptions regarding the principals' skills (Schmitt 1982).
5. Effective principals' skills are directly related to effective schools.

HYPOTHESES

The null hypotheses to be tested in this study, are:

1. There are no significant differences between the principals' individual perceptions of their skills and the teachers' perceptions of the principals' skills.
2. There are no significant differences between principals' perceptions of teachers' understanding of principals' skills and teachers' actual perceptions of the principals' skills.
3. There are no significant differences between

the principals' perceptions of which skills are most important to complete their jobs successfully and the teachers' perceptions of which principal skills are most important to complete the principals' jobs.

4. There are no significant differences between teachers' ratings of skills importance and principals' predictions of teachers' ratings of skills importance.
5. There are no significant differences between COSA Assessment Center ratings of participant skills and the ratings assigned by teachers in the participant principals' schools.

PARAMETERS OF THE STUDY

This study is limited only to those full-time principals who participated in the Confederation of Oregon Schools Administrators Assessment Center and teachers in those principals' schools. The study does not necessarily reflect the perceptions of all principals or all teachers in Oregon.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

In an effort to clarify the meaning of certain terms discussed in this study, it was necessary to define the

following terms which otherwise might be confusing to the reader.

Assessment. Assessment is the process by which as many data as possible are gathered and used to evaluate a person (Good 1973).

Attitude. An attitude is the tendency to react specifically towards a situation or a value. It is usually accompanied by feelings or emotions (Good 1973).

Evaluation Instrument. The evaluation instrument is the means by which one obtains information on the progress and effectiveness of an individual. The instrument is used as a tool which enables the evaluator(s) to make judgment about the employees. The instrument may include both quantitative and qualitative data.

Formative Evaluation. This is a system of evaluation which is used to perform a developmental function. It is designed to help performance or potential for performance by aiding employees in identifying areas for improvement and growth (Ezeadi 1984).

Knowledge. Knowledge is the state of being aware and of understanding certain accumulated facts, truths, principles and information.

Objective. An objective is a specific accomplishment which can be verified within a given time and under specific conditions which if attained, advances the system toward corresponding goals (Banks 1981).

Perceptions. Perceptions are the ways in which a person is viewed by him or herself or others. One's perceptions also include his or her conceptions (what happens in the mind). Perceptions are the way we see the world as result of all our sensory influences.

Principal. In this study, the principal is the full-time manager and educational leader of a primary or a secondary school.

Skills. Skills include the actions or activities of a person which demonstrate his or her knowledge, understanding and judgment in a given area. These actions include overt, physical actions, internal psychological and emotional processes, and implicit mental activities (Good 1973).

Summative Evaluation. The summative evaluation is used to perform a judgmental function. The results of this evaluation are used for making administrative decisions about employees (Ezeadi 1984).

ORGANIZATION OF THE DOCUMENT

This study was divided into five chapters. Chapter I provided an overview and introduction to the dissertation. Chapter II included a review of literature which relates to principals' skills and evaluation of those skills. Chapter III provided an examination of the procedures and methods used to investigate the research problem. Chapter IV reported the results of the comparative analysis applied to

the questions generated from this study. Chapter V included a summary of the results of the study, conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter was to review the literature that relates to principals' skills and evaluation of those skills. The review of the literature and the related research is followed by a summary and conclusions. The following sections are included in the review of pertinent literature: (1) Definition of Skills Evaluation; (2) History of Evaluation; (3) Purposes for Evaluation; (4) Processes of Evaluation; (5) Content of Evaluation; (6) Teachers' Evaluations of Principals' Skills; and, (7) The National Association of Secondary School Principals Assessment Center Model.

DEFINING SKILLS EVALUATION

Bolton (1980) described evaluation as a process to prevent or to correct an error. He believed that an evaluation must involve the making of judgments regarding the value of certain skills or behaviors. Central to one's evaluation is the necessity to prepare for change, according to Bolton.

Redfern (1980) believed that the evaluation of one's skills is a method that enables the person being evaluated to be more effective. According to Redfern, evaluation is the only way to hold a person accountable.

The Dictionary of Education provides a broad definition which includes both program and personnel evaluation:

Evaluation is the process of ascertaining or judging value of something by use of a standard of appraisal...[it is]...the consideration of evidence ...in terms of the particular situation and the goals which the group or individual is striving to attain. (Good 1973 p.220)

No single definition of evaluation will support all needs and values in the education community.

Evaluation often means what ever the evaluator wants it to mean. Because the educational establishment is in a constant state of change and schools are different regionally and ideologically, pressures are placed upon school administrators which preclude using any definitions exclusively. For purposes of this study, evaluation was defined as a continual process which includes measurement, judgment and feedback of one's productivity and skills through use of various means and people.

HISTORY OF EVALUATION OF SKILLS

Accountability is not new from an historical perspective. Throughout history, educational leaders

have generally been accountable to some person or constituted authority and their skills have been formally and informally evaluated (Tyler 1969). Even Socrates was accountable unto his death for his teaching. The first universities were accountable to their students and to the community (Tyler 1969). Today, the school principal is legally accountable to the local school board.

Evaluation of skills has usually been based on some type of end product or performance (Roberson 1971). Before the time of formal educational institutions, families were accountable for the instruction of their children in the form of skills learned. The actual evaluation of the teaching really came in the real world of the children's success or failure to survive. As clans and tribes developed, the functions of education became more formalized, and the fortunes of the clans and tribes served as an assessment of the success or failure of the tribe (Morris 1971).

As early as 2200 B.C., the Emperor of China was said to have used an evaluation system in a rudimentary form of proficiency-testing in an effort to examine his officials every third year (Tyler 1969). These methods of evaluation were further identified under the Chan dynasty in approximately 115 B.C. where job-sample tests requiring proficiency in music, archery, horsemanship, writing, and arithmetic were used (Tyler 1969).

One of the first formal evaluation systems used in education was that of the Reverend George Fisher who produced what he called a "Scale Book" in 1864. This could possibly be the starting point of formal evaluation measurement in the education process (Tyler 1969).

From the early years of this century through the 1930's, numerous studies were done on the evaluation of principals (Banks 1981). However, during the period between World War II and the middle 1950's, little was published in regard to principal evaluation. Most of the early studies centered around two areas (Banks 1981). First, the principal's evaluation was seen as an important part of the educational process and therefore it was defended. Second, certain behaviors and traits were described for principals who were successful. McClure (1938) listed the following areas as appropriate traits for effective principals in the 1930's (p. 344):

1. Care in grading and classifying pupils.
2. Respect secured from teachers as a leader.
3. Permanency of the building corps, based on confidence of the teachers.
4. Influence with pupils and parents.
5. Efforts in professional improvement.
6. Professional leadership, professional alertness, and improvement shown in teachers.
7. Careful discrimination in the rating of teachers.
8. Care of school plant, and efficiency in handling building routines.

A common historical practice as part of assessing principals' skills included the listing of various

personality traits. Another 1938 study described traits perceived by superintendents in rank order of their importance. They are as follows (Lide 1938, p. 143):

1. Cooperativeness	14. Promptness
2. Considerateness	15. Resourcefulness
3. Breadth of interest	16. Enthusiasm
4. Good Judgment	17. Industry
5. Broadmindedness	18. Morality
6. Dependability	19. Refinement
7. Poise	20. Sociability
8. Sincerity	21. Purposefulness
9. Leadership	22. Optimism
10. Adaptability	23. Definiteness
11. Health	24. Punctuality
12. Thoroughness	25. Magnetism
13. Intelligence	26. Forcefulness

Certain inferences can be made of the two listings described above. There appears little direct effect on instruction in the descriptions. The traits lack definition and standardization. There is an apparent lack of any statistical validity and the evaluations gathered opinions only (Lide 1938).

In 1955, a study was published analyzing existing practices in regard to principal evaluations in districts over 100,000 pupil population (Strickler 1957). From a sample of eighty-one districts, it was concluded that most systems evaluated the principals at regular intervals. The study also showed a cooperative approach to the evaluations which was generally practiced on an informal basis. Objective data were not usually gathered and subjective judgment was used in the place of objective data. Assessments were based on principals' executive

ability, professional growth, and personal qualities (Strickler 1957).

Much of the impetus for principal evaluation since the late 1950's has come from state principals' associations (Banks 1981). One early study was done by the California Elementary School Administrators Association. The Association found that the evaluation helped clarify the responsibilities of principals. Formal evaluation also provided specific criteria which could be used to measure an administrator's effectiveness (California Elementary School Association Reviews Evaluation Procedures for Elementary School Administrators, 1958).

In 1962 and 1964, the Educational Research Service of the National Education Association gathered data on the practice of evaluating the performance of school principals. Returns were sparse and not enough information was gathered to form any meaningful conclusions. The research did indicate, however, that in 1964 approximately seventy-five percent of the districts surveyed, formally evaluated principals (ERS. Evaluation of School Administrative and Supervisory Personnel, Circular No. 5, 1964).

The criteria of the assessment procedures for evaluating principals were studied by Howsam and Franco (1965). These authors discovered that in 1965 there was little information about the administrator's performance. Such issues as who evaluates principals and how often one is evaluated were not

addressed. The authors concluded that there was not sufficient research to indicate trait characteristics of effective principals which could be measured.

Through what has become to be known as the "Accountability Movement" of the 1960's, businesses and corporations created goals and objectives to measure their management personnel (McCurdy 1983). Following the private sector, many school districts adopted forms of management by objectives which set specific goals, developed operational objectives, used performance data in the feedback, and had performance reviews (Anzaldua 1984). The major assumption behind the management by objectives model is that behavior-anchored rating scales are more reliable than non-behavior rated scales (Wells 1982).

Because of public perceptions and demands, a legal backing was required to insure that principals were held accountable. In some states, political and other pressures spawned the creation of mandatory evaluation systems of teachers and administrators (Ezeadi 1984). State-mandated administrative evaluations appeared to lay the ground work for many districts' principal evaluation programs. The state of Oregon mandates a performance evaluation as part of its "Fair Dismissal Law" enacted in 1971 (ORS 342.850, 1985). The statute requires an annual evaluation of instructional personnel in all school districts having an average daily membership of 500 or more students. Under Oregon statutes,

the term "teachers" is defined in a broad sense to include administrators.

The Oregon law requires that the local school districts include five areas on the evaluation. These areas are as follows (ORS 342.850,1985):

- (1) Whether the teacher has met or failed to meet or exceed performance goals.
- (2) Development of growth in the profession.
- (3) Additional development needed by the teacher or administrator.
- (4) Additional comments.
- (5) Recommendations by a supervisor.

Current evaluation systems of principals include many methods such as outside consultants, district committees, colleagues, students, teachers, central office personnel and self-evaluations. In most cases, the format has some sort of rating. The subjectivity of the evaluations varies, and according to one source, evaluations by definition will always include some subjective data (McCleary 1979).

Some generalizations might be drawn from this cursory examinations of school principals' skills assessment in the last century. Systematic evaluations are a result of state mandates, formal state organization pressure and the need for formal evaluation in a complex and sometimes complicated system of education. The evaluations of the early twentieth century focused on personality traits and non-objective behavior patterns. As a result of these subjective

evaluations, a greater emphasis was placed on reform and accountability. Part of the reform in principal evaluation centered around defining the purposes for evaluation. Purposes for principals' evaluation will be discussed in the following section.

PURPOSES FOR EVALUATION

Evaluation can serve many purposes and it is important to clearly define the purposes for the evaluation and the processes that will be involved. There is some disagreement as to whether evaluation focuses on the individual principal as a person, or the results of that individual's efforts. Redfern (1980) concluded that the two areas are inseparable. The important point for Redfern was that both the evaluator and the evaluatee have made it clear that the evaluation is, in fact, a rating of job performance and an assessment of the individual person's skills.

The School Executive's Guide (1964) defined evaluation as both administrative and supervisory in purpose. The administrative purpose centers around the recruitment, employment, and placement of the principal. Once the principal has been hired, the evaluation data can serve as a basis for promotion, reassignment, dismissal and/or retirement.

The supervisory function of evaluation is one means for helping the administrator to improve. The primary purpose of the supervisory aspect of evaluation is to help the administrator see how well he or she is doing (The School Executive's Guide, 1964).

Schaefer (1982) emphasized the supervisory role of evaluation, stating that evaluation serves two primary purposes. First, it assesses an individual's current performance and provides feedback on performance. Second, it urges employees toward better performance.

Pharis (1973) stated that "Evaluation should be a matching of intent to results: a comparison of what was expected to happen with what did happen" (p. 37). Pharis felt that principal evaluation should encourage administrative improvement and not focus only on past performance.

Gaslin (1974) believed that the purpose for evaluation differs depending on the type of evaluation used. He distinguished between formative evaluations and summative evaluations--both of which are necessary to the principal. A formative evaluation is designed to provide data to the decision maker, and is not used for administrative purposes. Summative evaluation refers to using data to judge the success or failure of a person or program, and its primary use is administration, according to Gaslin (1974). Formative evaluations might be used only by the person being evaluated, whereas the summative evaluations are most commonly

designed for a larger audience (e.g., supervisor, superintendent, school board). Formative evaluations are more valuable than summative assessments because they are less threatening, according to Gaslin (1974). He also felt that the best formative evaluations will come from the teaching staff, reasoning that the most effective evaluation is based on the premise that an evaluation of an individual should be done by those who are most affected by the individual's decisions or leadership.

Nygaard (1974) saw evaluation as either an end or a means, and made similar conclusions to Gaslin's. As an end, evaluation is used to make judgments about a principal's performance. Data from this type of evaluation are used for personnel decisions such as salary determination and promotion. The focus is on the individual and his or her performance. When evaluation is used as a means, the function is on-going, with communication, feedback, adjustment and assistance as part of the process. Nygaard argued that the purpose selected (i.e. means or end) will determine the process of evaluation and in the end will be reflected in only individual judgment (end) or a system of improvement (means).

Oberg (1972) stated that there are certain purposes for evaluation. In order for the evaluation to be relevant it must: (1) create a system for communications and cooperation; (2) measure the effectiveness of the evaluatees; (3)

establish objectives for improvement; (4) establish a procedure for the creation of long and short range goals; and, (5) motivate individuals for self-improvement.

Stoops, et. al., (1975) described the chief purpose for evaluation as the diagnosis of strengths and weaknesses in an effort to bring about professional improvement. The purpose, according to these authors, should be to consider the retention of personnel; but principals also should be assessed in terms of doing their jobs satisfactorily or unsatisfactorily. Evaluation procedures should keep principals accountable for the outcomes of the school program. Even though the evaluation's primary purpose is retention, it is felt that a "constructive use for evaluation should be the improvement of individuals in their chosen field" (Stoops, et. al., 1975, p. 388).

According to Morris (1971), it is common for educators to be to be retained, dismissed or promoted on the basis of some evaluation. Morris stated that in some cases, teachers were promoted or dismissed on the basis of students' test scores. Duke (1987) contended, however, that few examples can be found of school leaders who have been dismissed or disciplined due to low student achievement or inadequate instruction.

Redfern (1980) was emphatic in his bias towards evaluation use as a tool for improvement rather than a tool for retention. He stated (Redfern 1980, p.4),

When the purpose of evaluation becomes the improvement of performance instead of the rating of it, results are more productive. Most people want to work more effectively.

Redfern also felt that evaluation should not be used to accomplish a number of different ends at one time. Examples of numerous ends would be the promotion of professional growth, helping make decisions with regard to retention of staff, transfer or termination, and the determination of salaries. Redfern felt that these ends might be best accomplished over a longer period of time.

Ostrander (1973) felt that evaluation is important because it is the best process for obtaining feedback concerning accomplishments and not needs. According to Ostrander, feedback should be derived from data which are carefully collected and which are designed to answer specific, goal-oriented questions. He was critical of subjective evaluations (e.g., use of perceptions) to study how goals are being attained. The key to a superior evaluation system, according to Ostrander, is the common agreement about the goals and objectives upon which the evaluation is based.

Some districts use evaluation as a basis for salary (Goodling 1985). This concept is commonly known as performance based compensation, or merit pay.

In a review of the literature relating to merit pay, Goodling (1985) cited arguments on both sides of the merit

pay issue. Those in favor of merit pay argue that an increase in monetary reward will result in better service to the district. They assert that accountability of administrators will be more effective. They also believe instructional problems will be monitored more closely. Proponents of merit pay also believe that creativity will be fostered and that the net result of increased effort will be a better program for students (Goodling 1985).

Opponents of merit pay argue that evaluation is often subjective and that merit pay evaluation would be time consuming and costly (Goodling 1985). They believe that the consistency throughout the district would be difficult to attain. Other arguments include added cost to the district, low morale of administrators and a fear of quota systems (Goodling 1985).

Principals' perceptions of merit pay are that the formal evaluation system is not the place to recognize and compensate personnel for outstanding work. A 1984 survey of principals revealed that the evaluation of principals should not be used for the purpose of salary determination since the consequence is

largely deference to sensitivity, outright dismissal for marginal performance, or a ritualistic personnel evaluation whereby mandates are filled. (Buser 1984, p.4)

There is some concern on the part of principals regarding the purposes for evaluation. In a Georgia study,

some principals were unsure or unaware of what process was used for the evaluation of their performance (McDonald 1984). In a California study, more than fifty percent of the principals surveyed did not know at least one criterion on which they were evaluated (Deal 1977). In an Oregon survey, principals and supervisors were asked the purpose of principal evaluation. Public accountability and promotion of professional development were the two most cited reasons by the principals. However, twice as many respondents felt that evaluation should promote professional development compared to those principals who felt that evaluation should provide public accountability (Duke 1987).

In summary, the purposes of evaluating school principals fit in the following categories: (1) professional growth; (2) fulfill legal mandates; (3) identify job targets or professional competencies; (4) employment status such as promotion, retention, dismissal or reassignment; (5) educational leadership; and, (6) salary determination. The literature points to varied opinions regarding these purposes. Purposes for evaluations will effect the processes which are used in evaluation models. The next section will discuss various evaluation processes, including data gathering, skills-based evaluations, counseling-type evaluations and self-evaluations.

THE PROCESS OF SKILLS EVALUATION

The process of evaluating principals deals with who evaluates, how many times a principal is evaluated, and how the evaluation is used. Licata defined the process of evaluation as "professional appraisal...which can be conceptually defined to include the generation of data for the development and evaluation of performance" (1980 p. 18). Licata (1980) discussed a need to organize the evaluation process, relating data collected for development to data collected for evaluation. In this way, principals can be helped to accomplish their organizational role expectations through a clear understanding of the purposes for specific data.

Banks (1981) stated that the process of evaluation rests on three assumptions. First, there must be some standards of administrative effectiveness. Second, there must exist an objective means of measuring those standards. And, finally, the evaluation process must accomplish some pre-set objectives. Following Banks' assumptions, further questions are raised about where the evaluation process begins, what objectives should be included in the evaluation, and who should be involved in the design of the evaluation.

Bolton (1980) described three areas which pertain to the process of evaluation. They are listed in chronological phases. The first phase in Bolton's model involves planning

for the evaluation. During this phase, both the principal and the supervisor analyze a specific situation. Together, they establish a purpose for evaluation and they set objectives for evaluation and, finally, they decide on a means for measuring the outcomes.

The second phase in Bolton's model involves the collection of information. This is usually a year-long phase and includes monitoring the activities planned by the supervisor and principal and measures outcomes which result from the activities.

Bolton's final phase involves the use of information. The principal and the principal's supervisor discuss the evaluation data and, together, they interpret the information and make decisions about the next steps to be taken based on the evaluation.

Redfern (1980) described a six-phase plan which is somewhat similar to Bolton's. The first phase in Redfern's model involves the clear understanding of job descriptions which are listed by objectives to be accomplished. Redfern called these "Responsibility Criteria" because they describe the duties and responsibilities of the principal.

Redfern's phase two is an identification of needs. In this phase, both the principal and supervisor identify the status of the principal's current performance with regard to specific objectives.

In phase three, objectives and action plans are drawn. This phase is designed to create a means to achieve a desired end. The ends are measured in behavioral terms and it is important that the principal and the supervisor pursue their actions cooperatively.

Phase four is carrying out of action plans. Redfern noted that it is necessary to distinguish between the monitoring (done in phase four) and evaluation which comes later. The monitoring involves measuring the performance outputs and gathering evidence. This phase is an on-going procedure and it is essential that the principals receive immediate feedback on their progress.

Phase five is an assessment of the results of phase four. This is the actual evaluation of data and it involves two parts: a self-assessment and an assessment done by another party or parties.

The final phase in Redfern's model involves the discussion of the results. In this phase both the principal and the supervisor discuss follow-up actions to the assessment and ways to improve in the next cycle of the process.

Roberson (1971) described a model which involves a cyclical process similar to Redfern's and Bolton's. The design is called a "Scheme for Evaluations." Four phases of the process are necessary according to Roberson. These phases are: Planning, Implementation, Product and Recycling.

Planning in the Roberson' design is perhaps the most important step (Roberson 1971). It involves identifying the setting and any variables which may affect the observation. Specific objectives are stated which relate to the person and to the organization. The evaluation design includes the methods of collecting data . A monitoring system is devised in order that checks can be made to determine how any planned procedures are actually implemented along the way. Finally, a calendar of events describes the dates, sequence and types of data which will be collected.

The Implementation Phases involves the observation, data collection and feedback activities. During this stage, modifications can be made which assist the principal in meeting the objectives.

The Product Phase examines the data collected. At this stage, decisions are made about the principal's effectiveness and recommendations are identified for future actions. After the Product Phase has been completed, the administrator returns to the original phase using information from the product phase to begin the cycle again.

Many of the models describing a cyclical evaluation process (Bolton 1980, Redfern 1980, Roberson 1971) follow a similar format which includes a pre-conference, collection of data and post conference. The origin of this format dates back to the developmental work of Morris Cogan at Harvard University (Goldhammer 1969), whose clinical supervision

model included five stages of (1) pre-observation conference; (2) observation; (3) analysis and strategy; (4) supervision conference; and, (5) post-conference.

McCleary (1979) suggested five different types of assessment processes. The types include informal ratings, a rating forms, performance contracts, ideal profiles or "Quadrant Assessments," and standardized instruments.

The informal rating uses an annual school plan to list needs, activities and the allocation of resources of expected results. Under this model there is a meeting between principal and supervisor three or four times a year. A final conference is usually held at year's end. It can be a goal-free approach in that it is intended to show the evidence of the administrator's progress, and it can be focused on results rather on any predetermined criteria.

A second format suggested by McCleary is the rating form. Rating forms are composites of how a principal is viewed by teachers, central office staff and other subordinate groups.

Performance contracts are often tied to annual school plans. Personal growth plans and management by objective considerations are built into performance contracts. One device used is the Staff-Performance Achievement Record (SPAR) (McCleary 1979). This type of evaluation is especially designed for school principals. The activities relate to school improvement and individual improvement

through a process of goal identification , specific objectives, activities, time lines, check points and evaluation procedures (McCleary 1979).

McCleary's (1979) Quadrant Assessment Model, or "QUAM" uses an "ideal" profile related to actual profiles of principal "ideals", created by a principal task force, using a Likert grid from the "high ideal" to the "low ideal." The QUAM is designed to be inclusive of self-appraisals, subordinate appraisals and supervisor ratings.

A final model described by McCleary (1979) is the standardized instrument. It uses four forms to be completed by principals, teachers, external observers, and central office personnel.

Planning is an important aspect of most evaluation models studied (Bolton 1980, McCleary 1979, Roberson 1971, Redfern 1971). The principal is usually included in the planning and goal-setting processes, and he or she plays an important role in the total process of evaluation.

Anzaldua (1984) described goal setting as the most critical element in the evaluation performance contract. He cited a need to look for a link between individual goals of the principal (which are based on descriptions and management functions), site goals and district goals. These goals must be established between the principal and the supervisor in the Anzaldua model.

Anzaldua made five assumptions which he deemed necessary for an effective principal evaluation process. First, he stated that people are basically hard working and their ideas, suggestions and input should be solicited by supervisors. The assessment is a joint venture between the administrator and the supervisor. Second, guidance and direction are provided by the district office. If a principal is expected to participate in the evaluation plan, time and help need to be provided in the development stage. Third, it is important to have management interaction and communication. Scheduled planning conferences between the principal, supervisor and other personnel involved in the process are critical. Free exchanges of ideas are encouraged in these conferences. Fourth, a specific set of expectations and standards should be established which are measurable. Last, Anzaldua stated that the principal is the key to instructional improvement.

Wells (1982) cited ten generic guidelines for establishing an assessment process. They are as follows:

1. Criteria selected are job related.
2. The appraisal is in an objective format.
3. Performance expectations are clear.
4. A similar system is used for all administrators.
5. There is a regular schedule for the process.
6. Appropriate people are involved in the

appraisal.

7. Documentation is formal and in writing.
8. The evaluators are knowledgeable and well trained.
9. There is a continual interaction between the evaluator and the evaluatee.
10. The principal has access to the results of the evaluation and the ability to add materials to the final document.

Anzaldua (1984), Wells (1982), and others concurred that the evaluation process needs to include goal-setting. On-going assistance for the administrator helps develop a sensitivity to his or her competencies throughout the process. It is important to identify general areas in behavior, adequacy and skills which show a need for improvement. Finally, job targets need to be realistic and within the reach of the administrator.

In summary, the processes of evaluation vary greatly. Evaluation may include a lengthy process which involves numerous people, forms, and plans; or it may simply provide for a single conference regarding one's accomplishments and needs. Most evaluation models appear to be cyclical with a focus on the planning stage of the evaluation. Collection of data comes from various sources including supervisors, staff, the community at large and the principals themselves. The time lines for evaluation vary, but ideally there appears to

be a need for on-going communication between the supervisor and the principal. Communication will include relevant information about the principal's progress and activities. This information is obtained through some form of data gathering, which is discussed in the following section.

Data Gathering in Evaluation Processes

Part of the evaluation process deals with gathering of data (Bolton 1980, Redfern 1980, McCleary 1979). The data are obtained through numerous means including observation or visitation by supervisors, self-evaluation, and surveys of staff community and students.

Numerous techniques are used to record data on the strengths or weaknesses of principals. A study by the Educational Research Service cited five of the most common techniques used (Nygaard 1974).

The first data collection technique mentioned in the ERS Study was graphic rating scales. This is normally a continuum of numbers (e.g., 1-5). The principal is evaluated according to behaviors that have been frequently observed, or by how accurately some statement reflects his or her workmanship. One of the weaknesses of this type of scale is that there is a tendency to rate a principal on one end or the other on all items, creating a "halo effect," or a "horn effect," depending on which end of the scale a principal is rated (Nygaard 1974).

A second data collection technique described in the ERS study is the essay appraisal (Nygaard 1974). This format uses a narrative description written by the supervisor. It covers the principal's strengths, weaknesses, potential or other relevant observations. It is difficult to make comparisons using this type of evaluation and it is obviously more subjective than other formats.

A third technique described in the ERS study is the field review. When making comparisons among principals in a district, this approach is used. It is a method that focuses on reliable and comparable evaluations. It uses essay and graphic ratings by several evaluators through a systematic review process. In the process, disagreements and agreements among the evaluators are identified and a final group consensus is sought. Though the process is designed to control any personal biases, the time needed for the evaluation is usually more than most districts can afford (Nygaard 1974).

A fourth method is a forced-choice method of skills evaluation (Nygaard 1974) which compares a principal with the principal's peers, one at a time on a given criterion. The comparison is done on a five point continuum and any choice will indicate preference for one person over another. The scores from each comparison are totaled and with computational functions, the end result is a quotient which rates the individual's total performance.

The fifth method described in the ERS study is the critical incident technique (Nygaard 1974). This process delineates activities that lead to success or failure and compares a principal's current and past performance. The principal's behavior is recorded at critical periods or when significant incidents occur. The principal can therefore see specific examples of success or failure. One problem with this approach is the danger of a principal patterning his or her activities after the critical incidents. The process also requires numerous critical observations and recording of administrative behavior (Nygaard 1974).

Bailey (1984) outlined important guidelines for soliciting feedback when seeking data from a broad base of evaluators. He stated that there are generally five types of feedback which include continuum, response, short answer, essay, true-false and multiple choice.

Bailey (1984) stated that when surveys are used, a continuum format is most frequently applied. Considerations for the continuum are as follows: (1) too many choices will confuse respondents; (2) extremes of scale need to be equal; (3) there is a possibility that neutral responses will force respondents to make a decision; and, (4) symbols or numbers need to precede the response item to facilitate the completion of the form.

Short answer or completion questions take more time. Complete sentences are used when using this format.

Sentences should also be used which contain statements capturing the maximum amount of information. Blanks are placed at the end or toward the end of the sentences to foster continuity. The blank length should be appropriate to the length of the desired answer (Bailey 1984).

Bailey (1984) argued that the most difficult of survey responses is the essay question. This type of survey is constructed to obtain the exact kind of information desired. The directions need to be explicit. For analysis purposes, several essays are better than one long one.

Multiple choice questions need to be specific, clear and brief. It is recommended that three to five choices be provided for each item. The words in each choice should be approximately the same length. The responses for multiple choice should come at the end of the item. Each choice is listed on a separate line and choices are labeled with capital letters (Bailey 1984).

True-false questions should avoid sweeping statements. They should also avoid trivial statements and there needs to be an equal number of true and false items. The directions should be as simple as possible, according to Bailey (1984).

When issuing survey-type evaluations, Bailey (1984) warned that there should be no risk to those being surveyed. There should be a guarantee of anonymity when necessary. The gathering of data needs to be appropriately timed such as the end of the semester or the end of the year. It also is

important that the person prepares him or herself for the feedback and is prepared to put the feedback into action where needed based on the data gathered (Bailey 1984).

Look (1984) supported Bailey's suggestions on the need for survey-type input and added that those surveyed should only be asked to evaluate what behaviors they have observed. This would alleviate judgments based on hearsay or second-hand information. Look further felt that the type of evaluation given depends on the number of people involved in the process. If only one person is responsible for the principal's evaluation, Look recommended that an appropriate response mode is an essay response. If there are numerous evaluators, a Likert scale may be preferred for purposes of accuracy and data tabulation.

Redfern (1980) stated that districts need different information at different times. Evaluations need not be confined to one type of input or survey. He suggested that school districts provide four separate forms. One form describes the responsibility of the principal's job and the descriptors of that job. A second form points to areas for improvement which are tied to the descriptors. A third form assists in the establishment of action plans containing the activities which lead to the achievement of meeting objectives and a final form provides a summative evaluation of the principal's skills.

In summary, data may be gathered through various means including continuum instruments, response questions, essay formats, short-answer formats and other surveys. Another means of gathering information relates to skills-based objectives by which a principal is evaluated. This type of format is discussed in the following section.

Skills-Based Evaluation Processes

Systems which rely on some measurable behavior are commonly referred to as Competency-Based Systems, or Skills-Based Systems. Zakrajsek (1979) stated that the following process should be used in the Competency-Based System:

1. The principal considers the competencies outlined.
2. The principal translates the competencies into educational objectives.
3. The objectives are made into some measurable components.
4. The behavioral products of the objectives are measured and analyzed.
5. An agreement is reached on whether or not competencies have been met.

The competencies in the above model are usually general and broad and it is the principal's responsibility to narrow them down to behavioral measurements. This approach is said

to help principals identify strengths and weaknesses and it provides a means for making long range plans from year to year. Duke (1987) stated that a competency based program will allow the demonstration of specific behaviors which are judged to be important for the principal or school.

An outgrowth of the individual competency-type evaluation is the evaluation known as Management by Objectives (MBO) (Anzaldua 1984). Reasons for adopting MBO, according to Anzaldua (1984) are that it is cost effective, and there is a continual need for more management information. The advantages of the MBO evaluation process are that it enhances job performance, provides for joint planning and decision making and it establishes on-going performance reviews.

In a typical MBO program, only agreed upon objectives are evaluated. Points of optimum behavior for each administrator are designed for each area of responsibility. The administrator designs objectives and these objectives become the standards of performance (Banks 1981).

Goals set by individual principals need to be directly related to district goals and objectives (Anzaldua 1984). This provides opportunity for principals to harmonize their individual goals with site and district goals. The MBO system provides for direction, support and guidance for the site administrator. This model includes a built-in component for personal and professional growth and focuses the

attention of the supervisor and the evaluatee on quality results by providing performance milestones and indicators (Anzaldua 1984).

In a Georgia study, principals preferred a combination of both management by objectives and a check lists as opposed to a single type process. The survey also indicated that the principals least preferred a single check list process. However, reasons for principals' responses were not cited in the study (Block 1980).

Results in one district where MBO was introduced were that principals tripled the number of classroom observations conducted annually (Anzaldua 1984). Principals developed school plans to improve the school test scores. Principals became heavily involved in clinical supervision. They were highly visible. Principals also had a clear understanding of what was expected of them and how they would be evaluated. Finally, the principals' management skills improved. (Anzaldua 1984).

Duke (1987) discussed some reservations about skill-based approaches to evaluation. A single method of skills analysis based on competencies or behavioral objectives may tend to simplify a very complex role, according to Duke (1987). Caution needs to be exercised when using a skills-based or objective-based model exclusively. Duke stated that it is extremely possible for a principal to master every specific leadership skill, but fail at putting

the skills together for effective leadership. Additionally, skills are not always equal or applicable. One principal's school may demand different skills than another school.

A variation of the MBO approach is the Faculty Team Model which uses a MBO format, but makes the principal and selected faculty team responsible for the carrying out of given objectives. In this model, the principal is the facilitator to the team and is judged only by his contributions to the team as a whole. (Banks 1981).

In summary, skills-based evaluations rely on measurable data. These data are based on principals' completion of certain competencies which have been predetermined. Instruments in skills-based evaluations are designed to be as objective as possible. Rosenberg (1973) believed the use of skills-based data alone might not give the principals as much support as they deserved. Therefore, Rosenberg and others proposed what could be called Counseling-Type models for evaluation which are discussed in the following section.

Counseling-Type Evaluation Processes

Rosenberg (1973) modified the MBO and Competency-Based models and developed what he called Criteria-Based approach to evaluating principals. He proposed a model using a self-evaluation by the principal, and evaluation from a panel consisting of professional educators, other principals, school staff members, central administrators, college

professors, community, parents' organizations and students. This model focuses on evidence relating to specific competencies.

There are three parts to Rosenberg's model: (1) evaluation by the team to determine the accomplishment of goals; (2) assessment of administrative competency based on the team's evaluation; and, (3) the superintendent's evaluation of the administrator. Rosenberg designed the evaluation process to be supporting and counseling, rather than distant and remote. The principal has partial responsibility in the make up of the team which ideally includes a cross-section of parents, students and professional educators. The team meets regularly with the principal to give the principal support and assist with services needed to help the principal meet the goals (Rosenberg 1973).

Another model built on the counseling paradigm is Licata's "Systemic Appraisal Model" (Licata 1980). Using a teacher assessment, he recommended separating the developmental component from the evaluative component. The development phase is a relatively non-judgmental system which allows the principal to gather data about his or her needs. The evaluation component takes teacher assessment results and combines them with results from two trained individuals observing the administrator's performance, which leads to an

evaluation conference offering recommendations and recognition (Licata 1980).

In summary, in an attempt to make evaluation supportive and non-threatening, some theorists proposed involving various groups and the principals themselves in the evaluation. Principals' self-evaluations can be part of the counseling-type model and they are discussed in the following section.

Self-Evaluation Processes

Some evaluation models include some type of self-evaluation process. This can be done in a diary format or a time sheet format which indicates data on how one spends time. One model uses a time sheet format (Leeper 1969). Once each quarter, the principal prepares evaluative materials for use at a conference with other colleagues. A final activity is the preparation of a summary which is made available to all subordinates and other colleagues. The principal attaches a questionnaire for evaluating the work along with the time sheet (Leeper 1969).

Self-evaluation, according to McCurdy (1983), is a vital element for effective evaluation systems. It can become a positive tool to use a principal's ability in the design an individual improvement program. The tool can also become valuable in that the principal has ownership in the process.

Bolton (1980) felt that self-evaluation tends to reduce the threat of an external evaluator, because the self-evaluation gives the principal some degree of control over the evaluation process. It also helps increase creativity and motivation on the part of the principal.

In summary, self-evaluations may prove useful to principals because they help principals focus on their individual needs in a positive and non-threatening setting. Of course, the objectivity of this model depends entirely on principals' ability to look at their skills honestly. The following section will discuss the content of evaluation, which deals with the substance of principals' evaluations.

CONTENT OF SKILLS EVALUATION

The content of principals' evaluation deals with the specific skills to be measured. As mentioned, in numerous models, various standards, objectives and goals are used to assess and evaluate performance.

Historically, the content of the principal's evaluations centered around various personality traits (McClure 1938, Lide 1938). Wells (1982) stated that "There is no doubt that factors such as initiative, enthusiasm, loyalty, cooperation, leadership ability, dependability and adaptability are important" (p. 777). He pointed out that they are also exceedingly difficult to define and measure and it is

exist, Wells stated that seventy-five percent of formal appraisal systems in use today are derivations of trait rating systems which place emphasis on personality characteristics and behavior patterns.

It may be difficult to avoid some form of subjective analysis of principals' talents. Edmonds (1979) in his search for school effectiveness, listed "Style of Leadership" as one of the five basic characteristics for effective schools. The other four are: Instructional Emphasis, School Climate, Implied Expectations of Teachers, and Use of Standardized Instruments for measuring pupil progress. It is noteworthy that of the five characteristics Edmonds emphasized, four are difficult to measure using objective instruments.

Due to what Redfern (1980) referred to as the subjective nature of evaluation content, he felt that the content of the evaluation is much less important than the actual evaluation process. Redfern stated that such items as objectives, goals, and competencies should be developed by individual districts and it is more important to have a thorough process which involves certain steps, than to simply fill out a form or meet minimum requirements for a given number of objectives.

Klopf and Scheldon (1982) stated that the principal must be able to do the following activities: (1) study and interpret social trends that demand curricular and instructional change; (2) assess needs of the learners that

are unique to the school and the community; (3) integrate goals and objectives of the school with the needs of the learner; (4) conduct formal assessment of current programs' adequacy to meet learning objectives; (5) utilize research and information in forming viable alternatives for change; (6) involve the central office staff and parents in identifying and setting goals for change; (7) allocate and assign building staff to accomplish instructional and curricular goals; (8) explain instructional curricular change to parents and community; (9) examine and recommend instruments for evaluating program processes and outcomes; and, (10) collect, organize and interpret data comparing past and present student performance.

Anderson (1984) concurred with Klopff and Scheldon, citing seven areas of principal performance which should be measured: (1) curriculum leadership;, (2) relations with staff, students and parents; (3) personnel functions; (4) student accounting and records; (5) public relations; (6) environmental health and safety; and, (7) personal professional development.

Block (1982) cited four major criteria for evaluating principal performance. The first area deals with curriculum development. This includes the successful implementation of new courses and the comparison of achievement test results both within and outside the district. A second area mentioned by Block is the supervision of personnel. This

includes a principal's ability to keep staff morale high. The third area deals with school management. This involves the regular communication process between district office and school. It also includes the writing and turning in of reports, schedules, etc. Last, Block (1982) cited the importance of community relations which is measured by the satisfaction of parents and students.

In a 1980 study, McIntyre and Grant asked superintendents, principals and teachers to rate how well a principal should perform and how well the principals in their schools actually did perform. All three groups agreed on the relative importance of principals' responsibilities including staffing, community relations, goal setting and time and space allocation. The authors noted that two other areas of importance lacking in actual performance were inservice training and program evaluation (McIntyre and Grant, 1980). Hammond (of the EPIC Evaluation Center at the University of Arizona) set six criteria for evaluating principals (Umans 1971). The criteria are outlined below. First, information to the evaluator needs to be relevant and relate to the needs of the organization and the administrator. Since one purpose of evaluation is to identify situations where changes or improvements are needed, irrelevant information only clouds the issue. An example of irrelevant information is "personality-type" inventories which passed for evaluation in the early part of the century.

Second, the information gathered about the administrator's performance needs to be significant. It is important to analyze and report only information which will be of the greatest value to the administrator, the supervisor and to the organization.

Third, the information gathered must have a sufficient scope to guide the decision maker. When evaluating personnel, it is important to observe and gather data over a long period of time to assure that the information is accurate.

Fourth, credibility is trust and must be established between the evaluator(s) and the principal. Part of the evaluator's responsibility is to continually inform the principal about the principal's progress.

Fifth, information must be provided on a systematic regular basis. Using evaluation as an on-going process helps to make changes where appropriate and keeps the principals accountable for their actions (Umans 1971).

Spelcher (1971) felt that a set of standards needed to be established for evaluation content and argued that no single approach satisfies everyone. He established three separate approaches to creating standards. These are listed below.

"The Characteristics of Traits Approach" (Spelcher 1971) defines administrative effectiveness in terms of personal attributes such knowledge, personality factors, and

appearance which are considered desirable in the accomplishment of administrative effectiveness. "The Process-Behavior Approach" (Speicher 1971) defines administrative effectiveness in terms of specific functions, such as the allocation of resources, supervision of staff, and communication with parents, and community. These functions are considered to be essential to the accomplishment of educational and administrative outcomes.

"The Administrative Outcome Approach" (Speicher 1971) defines administrative effectiveness in terms of the relative accomplishment of educational or administrative objectives. This approach requires the development of objectives which incorporate measurable objectives.

Speicher felt that once the role of the principal has been defined, it is possible to more clearly evaluate his or her effectiveness. Of the three approaches cited, the latter approach is the most objective. In this approach, the principal's effectiveness is measured by outcomes such as teacher performance, community acceptance, student achievement and other indicators.

In summary, it can be concluded that although data on principals' performance ideally should be objective and measurable, much of the information relating to what literature describes as important principals' skills is, indeed, subjective. Content areas focusing on principals' evaluation fall into three general categories: (1) the

personal characteristics of the principal such as leadership, knowledge, etc.; (2) the effectiveness of the principal as a manager-planner; and, (3) the principal's effectiveness as a leader in administrative responsibilities such as curriculum, instructional leadership, student activity programs, fiscal affairs and plant management. The area of instructional leadership requires further examination in relation to content and will be discussed in the following section.

The Principal as an Instructional Leader

The role of the principal as an instructional leader is often vague and ill-defined. Mullican and Ainsworth (1979) stated there is a dilemma in the analysis of instructional leadership because two connotations are given for the same term of instructional leadership. First, it is the role and behavior of the person in the role, and second, it is the evaluation of the individual's performance in that role. Mullican and Ainsworth (1979) stated that in all studies of instructional leadership the following two elements must be present according to the research: (1) strength of organizing and clarifying; and, (2) development of interpersonal relationships.

Goodlad (1984) disagreed with much of the focus on instructional leadership as a role of the principal. He stated that the maintenance and the planning of a school is a full-time task. The task of role modeling and instructional

leadership is also a full-time task and if principals are expected to take on both tasks, one task will suffer. Goodlad recommended that a "head teacher" work hand in hand with the principal to fulfill this instructional leadership role. Effective principals, according to Goodlad, may or may not have been effective teachers. It is "naive and arrogant", he claimed, to make the assumption that principals are able to assume a higher level of teaching expertise than those teachers who are working at their jobs every day (Goodlad 1984).

Ingram (1979) compared the instructional leader to what he called the "Educational Executive". He argued that knowing how to teach is not as important for the principal as knowing what the goals of the organization are, what the constraints are and how to meet the goals of the organization. Principals should not be considered quasi-faculty, according to Ingram (1979). Rather, they present more demanding sets of expectations for teachers and staff, according to Ingram. He contends that sound management skills over-rule the "instructional leader" role. Such skills as planning, organizing, controlling and evaluating need to relate to the the particular goals of the organization and because they form the basis for the content of principals' evaluations according to Ingram (1979).

Manasse (1984) supported Ingram's and Goodlad's positions. According to Manasse, principals spend relatively

little time directly on instruction-related activities and, instead, spend much more time simply managing the institution. Based on one Chicago study (Manasse 1984), Manasse reported that eighty percent of a principal's workday is spent on institution management and only twenty percent is spent on instructional concerns. Manasse therefore theorized that the principal should be evaluated on what he or she does the most--namely running the school.

Look (1984) used a similar research model to Manasse's and logged more than 30,000 hours of critical work activities by principals in schools participating in the School Improvement Model through Iowa State University. His results were surprisingly different from Manasse's. Look's purpose was to identify valid discriminating items for use in evaluating principals. Look concluded that the following items are important when evaluating principals: (1) instructional strategies of the principal; (2) the principal's emphasis on achievement; (3) support of teachers by the principal; (4) coordination of the instructional program; (5) orderly school atmosphere; (6) the promotion of professional growth; (7) maintenance of school-community relations; (8) evaluation of pupil progress; (9) maintenance of plant facilities; and, (10) supervision of student personnel.

In summary, the importance of the principals' role as an instructional leader involves numerous skills which include,

but are not limited to: (1) goal setting; (2) emphasis and monitoring of student achievement; (3) teacher support; (4) modeling; and, (5) organizational skills. There are conflicting opinions regarding principals' needs or abilities to be instructional leaders compared to their positions as managers of schools. Much of the school effectiveness literature (Blume 1984) points to instructional leadership as an important role for the principal. School effectiveness studies which relate to the principal are addressed in the following section.

SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS AND PRINCIPALS' SKILLS

A growing body of research in the area of school effectiveness correlates certain leadership attributes with high achievement (Blume 1984). This research began in the 1970's and is mostly correlational in that the research reports only typical behaviors of teachers and principals in schools where students demonstrated high achievement. Studies on effective schools do not necessarily reflect all schools. However, information gained from the effective schools studies may help in ascertaining desirable qualities which could assist in the evaluation of principals.

In a study conducted in four inner city schools where student reading levels were higher than the norm, Weber (1971) identified five factors relating to principals'

skills. These factors were: (1) strong leadership; (2) high expectations of students and staff; (3) good atmosphere; (4) strong emphasis on basic subjects of reading and mathematics; and, (5) instructional leadership by the principal.

In 1974, the State of New York undertook a State Performance Review (New York State Department of Education 1974), which included a study of schools with similar socio-economic climates where some schools demonstrated high achievement and others did not. The behaviors of principals in the schools appeared to have a significant impact on the effectiveness of the schools and the academic achievement of the students. In schools with a greater measurable improvement in student achievement and student behavior, principal leadership promoted a positive balance between instructional skills and management. The principals in the more effective schools demonstrated plans which focused on instruction, especially in reading and mathematics. The principals expected and promoted change, and goals in student achievement were clearly defined. (New York State Department of Education, 1974).

A California study (Madden 1976) similar to the New York review concluded that principals in higher achieving schools provided teachers with greater support compared to teachers in lower achieving schools. Such support included financial resources, training and development, and rewards for teaching excellence. Higher achieving schools also had a greater

degree of student monitoring of achievement by the principal. In rating the administration, teachers at the higher achieving schools gave higher support ratings to their principals than the teachers in the lower achieving schools (Madden 1976).

In 1977, Brookover and Lezotte studied six improving and two declining schools through the Michigan Department of Education (Brookover and Lezotte 1979). They found that in higher achieving schools, specific goals and objectives were emphasized. Schools with less achievement gave less emphasis to goals, especially in the areas of mathematics and reading. Staffs and administrators in the improving schools tended to believe that all students can master basic objectives. Staffs in the successful schools held high expectations for even their slowest students. Staffs in the high achieving schools placed responsibility for student learning on themselves; whereas, in the less successful schools, teachers tended to place responsibility for students' success on the parents or on the students.

The Michigan study also found a major difference in the principals' roles between the low achieving schools and the higher achieving schools. In the higher achieving schools, principals were seen as the instructional leaders. Teachers reported that their principals were more assertive and assumed the role not only of disciplinarian, but evaluator of the entire school. Principals in the lower achieving schools

were perceived by teachers to be more permissive and had more informal and collegial relationships with staffs. Their emphasis was on general public relations with less emphasis on evaluation of the school's basic educational program. Staffs in the more successful schools seemed to accept accountability more than the staffs in the declining schools. Edmonds (1979) worked with Harvard University and the New York Public Schools to focus on effective leadership in the schools. He cited five characteristics of an effective principal. First, principals in effective schools demonstrate what Edmonds referred to as style of managerial behavior. They move around the school and use what has come to be known as MBWA or "Management by Walking Around." Second, these principals emphasize instruction in as their primary focus and the primary focus of the entire staff. Principals in effective schools help to create a climate in the building which is pleasant and has a positive feeling tone. The climate includes obvious items such as paint and repair and equally important items such as cooperation and sense of family which make up the entire environment. Fourth, effective principals have high expectations for both pupil and teacher performance. Principals set a tone by creating an expectation that no student or group of children are expected to fall below the prerequisites for promotion. Fifth, there is a common method of assessing pupil progress by all teachers in the school. The school's consistent use

and dependence on standardized criterion referenced testing is used and emphasized by the principals in the more effective schools.

Edmonds concluded that schools which have high student achievement also have a high degree of administrative organization in developing plans and implementing plans in their schools. Edmonds also concluded that the more effective schools had administrators who paid attention to all elements of the school including school activities, managerial activities, and instructional activities.

McCleary (1979) noted thirteen characteristics which he believed were important to the effectiveness of the school's principal. Although the study related to secondary principals, it is assumed that these qualities can be representative of most principals regardless of school level. These qualities are:

1. the effective allocation of time.
2. proper understanding of the job.
3. approaching numerous tasks without fear.
4. allowance for sufficient autonomy to subordinate staff.
5. effective management of resources.
6. good human relations skills.
7. utilization of many styles in problem solving.
8. identification of goals and workable plans.
9. knowledge of effective scheduling and planning

10. creation of trust among staff and public.
11. effective communication with students.
12. involvement of parents
13. participation in P.T.A.

Rutter, et. al., (1982) studied English secondary schools, looking for patterns of leadership in the more effective schools. They found that the attitudes of the principals and teachers towards learning was consistently positive in the more effective schools. Principals in these schools rewarded performance of the students and the teachers. There was a greater emphasis placed on rewarding positive behavior than punishing negative behavior. The level of responsibility of participation by students was encouraged by the principals. High expectations were common throughout the school for both teachers and students. Finally, feedback from the principal to the teachers and from the teachers to the students was given on a regular basis.

Persell, et. al. (1982) identified certain characteristics of principals in high achieving schools. These authors reviewed effective schools studies which focused on secondary schools throughout the nation. They summarized the characteristics of effective principals as follows:

1. A demonstrated commitment to academic goals.
2. A creation of climate with high expectations.
3. Instructional leadership.

4. Demonstration of forceful and dynamic traits.
5. Principals consulted with others regularly.
6. Schools have a climate of order and discipline.
7. Principals use all resources available.
8. Time is well used.
9. Principals evaluate the results of their effectiveness regularly.

Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) concluded from a study of elementary school principals, that effective principals place the achievement and happiness of students first in their priorities. Effective principals view themselves as instructional leaders who have the ability to create positive change. Instructional leadership includes the following, according to Leithwood and Montgomery (1982): a knowledge of curriculum; clearly defined goals and objectives; involvement of staff in planning and the implementation of instructional programs; setting aside resources; and continual reviewing of programs. Effective principals articulate high expectations for teachers, students and for themselves. They aggressively seek out and develop parental support. They are actively involved in decisions about which teachers teach which students. They are concerned that their teachers establish clear student objectives which serve as a focus on instruction.

Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) found from their research that certain principal actions promote high student performance. They cited eight actions which they believed correlate with high academic achievement.

First, principals must have clear visions of where their schools are going. They must communicate these visions to their community, staff and students. The principals must have high expectations with clear objectives used in the establishment of their visions.

Principals must establish and maintain a curriculum which relates to the goals and priorities established. They are responsible for the allocation of time, and resources according to the priorities they have set. They must plan with their teachers and assist the teachers in reaching their goals.

The principals in effective schools demonstrate knowledge of quality instruction. They actively work with the staffs to improve the staff's skills.

Effective principals establish a safe and orderly environment which supports teaching and learning. They protect learning time from disruption and maintain a clean neat school.

Principals monitor school performance. They collect and use data to make improvements. They give feedback to the teachers and are in the classroom to make frequent observations.

The principals involve the staffs in decision making and planning. An environment of trust is established which allows the staff to share in decision making. Staffs are rewarded for their contributions to the school program.

Effective principals actively seek district help with improvements. They allocate resources and set up priorities. Finally, according to Leithwood and Montgomery (1982), principals in effective schools demonstrate efficiency in handling matters in a smooth and routine manner.

Purkey and Smith (1983) reviewed numerous studies on effective leadership in schools and concluded that although the research is non-experimental, certain similarities and conclusions can be drawn about principals who lead effective schools. They believed that the characteristics of effective principals are interrelated and cite the thirteen most common characteristics from their studies. According to Purkey and Smith (1983), effective principals:

1. possess school site management.
2. have a clear sense of expectations and vision.
3. maintain staff stability.
4. provide for curriculum articulation.
5. provide for staff development.
6. recruit and involve parents.
7. provide school-wide recognition for success
8. seek district support for their programs.
9. solicit collaborative planning

10. develop a sense of community
11. contribute to commonly shared goals
12. maintain order and discipline

Manasse (1984) also noted behavior characteristics of principals in effective schools. He called these "purposing behaviors" and they include (1) a personal vision of the school; (2) actions which reflect the implementation of that vision; (3) goal setting which includes a commitment of all participants in the school community; (4) expert information sensing and analysis skills which are used to develop agenda, monitor programs and behavior and provide feedback; and, (5) timely use of conflict management and problem solving skills. In summary, it can be said that the literature on effective schools leadership relates to the following themes: (1) Principals' are achievement-oriented and emphasize observable results from students. (2) Principals provide for an orderly, peaceful atmosphere which supports students' needs. (3) Principals have high expectations for all participants in the school's community including teachers, principal and students. (4) The principal helps in the creation of well-designed instructional goals and objectives and continually evaluates the system. (5) The principals work hard to support their teachers through incentives, recognition and rewards.

A study of effective schools research will produce many positive attributes for principals. The study is limited,

however, by the types of schools studied, their locations, and their histories. No attempt is made to draw generalizations about all schools or all principals from these studies.

Much of the school effectiveness literature focuses on principals' interaction with the teaching staff (Leithwood and Montgomery 1982; McCleary 1979; Purkey and Smith 1983). One by-product of this interaction might be the teachers' evaluation of principals, which will be discussed in the following section.

TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS' SKILLS

The review of the literature thus far, has examined content and processes of evaluation and principals' skills which can be related to their evaluation. This study focuses on teachers' perceptions of principals' skills, and therefore, it is relevant to examine issues related the evaluation of principals by teachers .

Many researchers believe that the best evaluators of principals' skills appear to be the teachers who work with the principal (ERIC Research Action Brief, 1980). In a Georgia study (Block 1982), results of a random survey of elementary principals indicated that elementary principals in Georgia believed that other persons should be involved in their evaluations as well as superintendents. These included students, parents, peers, and their staffs (Block 1982).

The effective schools research points to a need for principals and staffs to work together where there is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect. In this atmosphere, an evaluation of a principal's skills by the teaching staff can be most productive (Leithwood and Montgomery 1982).

Gaslin (1974) stated that there are three basic reasons for teacher evaluation of principals' skills. First, the evaluation provides the administrator with staff feelings and if the evaluation is done repeatedly, the principal can see how things change. Second, the evaluation helps establish credibility of the principal with teachers and others. Finally, teachers are in a strong position to judge how administrative actions affect children. Therefore their perceptions can provide important information.

Awender (1978) concluded from a study of principal, teacher and superintendent perceptions that there is a general lack of agreement on the elements of the leadership. Awender's study details perceptions regarding the "de facto" state of affairs in the principal's tasks, and compares these perceptions with perceptions of the ideal state of affairs.

In Awender's study, principals, teachers and superintendents all rated counseling and discipline as the perceived most important function in the the "de facto" state of affairs. Additionally, teachers and superintendents ranked supervision and public relations as two other

perceived important functions. In the area of budget preparation, teachers tended to rate budget functions higher in the de facto state than did the principals.

When looking at the role of the principal as it ought to be, both principals and teachers agreed that supervision, academic programming and decision making should be given the highest priority. The factors rated lowest in this portion of the study were highering, office management and budget.

Teachers in Awender's study seemed to feel that the principal should reduce the amount of time on budget and office management and place more emphasis on the facilitating of staff development.

Sanacore (1976) theorized that since school teachers have been able to improve through assessment and evaluation of principals, it must follow that principals could also improve through a teacher evaluation of principal's skills. In the Hauppauge School District in Long Island, N.Y., Sanacore and others in his school district created an evaluation instrument related to the philosophy of the district and to the administrators' job descriptions.

The final version of the Hauppauge assessment model was based on a forced choice scale which ranged from "Lacking in Information to Evaluate" (0), to "Always" (5) which indicated superior skill in a given area.

The following list summarizes the contents of Hauppauge's teacher evaluation of principals where teachers were asked to rate their principals in these areas:

1. The principal works individually with teachers, helping them to improve.
2. The principal makes use of faculty meetings to to improve instruction.
3. The principal informs the staff concerning educational matters.
4. The principal manifests the ability to suggest new techniques.
5. The principal accepts suggestions for improvement.
6. The principal shows an awareness of current ideas in educational literature.
7. The principal presents his ideas clearly.
8. The principal manifests self-control.
9. The principal exhibits physical stamina.
10. Teachers are given opportunities to participate in building policy.
11. The principal respects the rights of teachers.
12. The principal is sensitive to the feelings of others.
13. The principal provides for individual differences among students.
14. The principal respects the rights of students.
15. The principal is sensitive to the feelings of students.
16. The principal is an active member of the PTA.
17. The principal interprets the educational

program to the community.

18. The principal utilizes community resources.
(Sanacore 1976 pp.100-101)

The effect of teachers evaluating their principals is neither positive nor negative according to Daniel (1978). In a study to examine whether the evaluation of principals by teachers improved principals performance, Daniel compared principals' behavior occurring both after a teacher evaluation and before the teacher evaluation. He found that there was no significant change in the principals performance. Daniel also found that staff used this method of evaluation to give positive feedback to their principals.

Weldy (1961) cited certain outcomes which should be considered when using a teacher assessment tool.

- (1) Teachers will work diligently to make an honest effort to be fair in their evaluation.
- (2) Teachers will generally welcome the opportunity to help their principals improve.
- (3) Principals should expect a wide disagreement among teachers due to varying philosophical differences among teaching staff.
- (4) If the reactions are recorded anonymously, there is little opportunity to satisfy specific grievances. This can be frustrating to principals.
- (5) The principal should expect that not all

ratings will be "fair" on some issues since the teaching staff is not totally aware of all the components of the principal's job description.

- (6) In some cases, teachers will judge principals on one or two isolated instances where they have no personal knowledge of the principal's work (Weldy 1961 pp. 145-47).

In summary, the advocates of teacher evaluation of principals feel that the assessment of principals' skills by their subordinates is often more significant than a supervisor evaluation because the subordinates are in a position to continually observe the principal's skills first hand. Some districts use subordinate evaluations as part of a formal assessment, where others use a teacher evaluation at the will of the principals for the principals' personal use.

Because of the subjectivity of teachers' evaluations, the evaluations usually are more general compared to an in-depth assessment. Principals should be prepared to act on the results of the teachers' assessment of their skills.

Finally, if a principal is to use a teacher evaluation, that principal must recognize and accept his or her own weaknesses which will surface in the evaluation. Additionally, principals must recognize that the teachers' evaluation of their skills can be a valid method of achieving improvement and that teachers are not seeking to "get their

principal." There must also be a mutual trust between the principal and teachers which includes a belief that teachers are competent to make judgments about the principal in certain areas (Banks 1981).

The accuracy of teachers' opinions of principals' skills might be substantiated through a comparison with other evaluations. Part of this study compares teachers' perceptions with the COSA Assessment Center ratings of the principals in the study. The Assessment Center Model will be discussed in the following section.

THE NASSP ASSESSMENT CENTER MODEL

In the early 1970's, concern existed among educators that principals were being selected far too subjectively. Principals were appointed because they demonstrated exceptional teaching or coaching skills and often, no consideration was given to their leadership skills (Hersey 1977). In many cases this subjective selection process contributed to ineffective leadership in schools. More objective procedures were needed which would identify applicants with existing leadership and management skills.

In 1975, preliminary research was done by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, relating to the Assessment Center Concept. The model existed in the private sector and many businesses and corporations used the model. The early research done by NASSP included the collection of

information relating to job requirements from school systems throughout the country. The focus of information gathering was on principals and assistant principals (Hersey 1977).

Assessment centers were developed because in education a technique was needed which would simulate administrative practice involving teachers who wished to be administrators. Teachers who wish to become administrators do not have the opportunity to be observed or to be evaluated with respect to their administrative abilities. In many cases the placements of administrative personnel are made with decisions based on educated guesses and have little relationship to the candidate's actual administrative ability (Jeswald 1977).

According to Jeswald (1977), an initial concern of the assessment center was to study the tasks and responsibilities of practitioners. The NASSP national office assisted in this endeavor and solicited job descriptions, evaluation instruments and other performance instruments from districts throughout the country. Additionally, lengthy interviews were conducted with administrators and directors of the project's pilot studies in Prince William County, Virginia and Charlottesville, Virginia.

After involving organizations and interpreting a large number of facts and opinions regarding principal skills, specific abilities which could be more efficiently measured outside the assessment center were excluded and the final list of twelve behavior dimensions were included for

assessment. The twelve skills and their definitions are as follows (NASSP Assessment Handbook, 1983 p.6):

Problem Analysis is the ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; searching for information with a purpose.

Judgment is the ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions, based on available information; skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to evaluate critically written communications.

Organizational Ability is the ability to plan, schedule and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on one's time.

Decisiveness is the ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly.

Leadership is the ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to interact with a group effectively and to guide them to the accomplishment of a task.

Sensitivity is the ability to perceive the needs, concerns, and personal problems of others; skill in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.

Stress Tolerance is the ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet.

Oral Communication is the ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts or ideas.

Written Communication is the ability to ex-

press ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences--students, teachers, parents et.al.

Range of Interest is the competence to discuss a variety of subjects--educational, political, current events, economic, etc.; desire to actively participate in events.

Personal Motivation is the need to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing.

Educational Values relate to the possession of a well reasoned philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change.

A typical assessment center has between ten and fifteen candidates who have been sent by school districts. These participants are evaluated and observed by at least six assessors. The assessors are skilled and trained using the NASSP model. The participants in the center attend for various reasons which include promotion, individual development, or selection by a district (Howard 1974). Generally, the centers are designed to identify participants for advancement to a principal or assistant principal.

Jeswald (1977) summarized five uses of the NASSP Assessment Center. These are (1) identification of teachers for administrator openings; (2) provision for an objective procedure to identify applicants for administrative potential; (3) assistance in training assessors in interviewing techniques; (4) development of administrators skills; and, (5) assistance with district recruitment of principals and assistant principals.

The technology of the assessment center concept has been subjected to at least two tests for reliability and validity. Huck (1973) found that predictions of candidates' success were moderately high in accuracy. Huck found that the assessment center had high reliability potentials for $.68 < r < .99$ (Huck 1973). Huck's study focused on assessment centers which had been in existence for more than three years and were not related to the NASSP model.

In 1982, a three year validity study of the NASSP model was concluded by Schmitt at Michigan State University. Among other findings, the Michigan State study focused on data relating the ratings of assessment center skills to ratings on later job performance as determined by teachers, students, staff and supervisors. Schmitt found that ratings on Leadership, Organizational Ability, Oral Communications, Decisiveness, Judgment, and Problem Solving were most highly correlated with job performance ratings (Schmitt 1982).

Howard (1974) listed some concerns for possible negative outcomes regarding participants in the assessment center process. These would include the following:

"The Crown Prince/Princess" describes assessment center participants who do extremely well in the center. These candidates may find that they have become the "fair-haired administrator" and might be treated so by management to such a degree that their future in the organization could become a self-fulfilling prophecy. This could lead to a decline in

morale in those individuals who have not achieved such status.

The "Kiss of Death Candidate" is one who has done poorly in the assessment center and he or she may feel that there is no future in the organization because of a low assessment score.

A stress factor is also important to consider in the outcome of the candidate. When candidates feel that their entire careers are on the line or that they are "on stage" the effects of stress can be severe.

Employee attitudes towards the assessment center program can be negative if some employees who applied to become candidates were turned down and consequently considered themselves in the "out group."

Due to the relative recent formation of the NASSP Assessment Center Model it is too early to make judgments as to the concept's success or failure in the field of education. The literature does indicate, however, that the predictions made in the assessment center are generally accurate when measured in actual job experiences.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The school principal plays a vital role in the success or failure of the school program (Brookover, et.al., 1973; Edmonds 1979; Weber 1971; Wynne 1981). Duke (1987) stated that, "Virtually every [school effectiveness] report singled

out the school principal as the key to successful reform" (p.4). The principal performs numerous roles for which numerous traits are desirable. The evaluation of principals' skills is complex and intricate. On one hand, the literature points to objective measurable data as the best way to evaluate. On the other hand, recent studies on school improvement point to subjective data such as school climate, instructional leadership and leadership style as indicators of effective principals. In the ideal design for assessing principals' skills, effort should be made to be as exact and explicit as possible. Specific objectives, skills or competencies will result in more usable data than essays or descriptions of principals' behavior.

The ideal evaluation should also include a broad base of data and as many evaluators as possible. A collective judgment of a principal's skills can help offset any personal biases which might arise in a single evaluation. Because of their closeness to the principal, teachers have been recognized by some authorities as the best evaluators of principals' skills. The roles of other personnel in the evaluation process will depend on the type of evaluation design.

Self-evaluations by the principal are useful because they give the principal a sense of direction and provide a basis on which to make goals. How a principal thinks he or

she is doing can be as important to the evaluator as how well the principal is actually doing.

Content of an assessment of skills should be measurable; but some research indicated that items to be evaluated should also include such traits as style, staff relationships and other "personality" indicators. There is a tendency to move away from the early personality inventories of the 1920's and 1930's, but no evaluations can be totally objective and without personal bias. Principals continue to be evaluated in a variety of categories which range from communication skills to personal appearance and emotional stability (Duke 1987).

Many researchers agree that subordinate evaluations of principals can be useful. However, there is conflicting support among administrators to incorporate teacher evaluations in the formal assessment process.

The Assessment Center has provided one means of examining skills which are needed for effective principals. The twelve skills listed by the Assessment Center are not totally inclusive; however, they provide one means to measure principals' effectiveness.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an examination of the procedures and methods used to investigate the research problem of determining differences in principals' and teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership skills and validating the accuracy of COSA Assessment Center ratings for Assessment Center participants. Areas of discussion included: (1) Method of Research; (2) Research Design; (3) Research Questions; (4) Population and Sample Size; (5) Development of the Instrument; (6) Validation of the Instrument; (7) Data Collection; and, (8) Data Analysis.

METHOD OF RESEARCH

This was a descriptive study. It was designed to determine the differences between principals' perceptions of their leadership skills and teachers' perceptions of the same skills. Additionally, this study attempted to determine the criterion-related validity of the ratings assigned by the Confederation of Oregon Schools Administrators (COSA) Assessment Center by comparing Assessment ratings with

ratings assigned by teachers working with former participants in the center.

Best (1970) argued that the purpose of a descriptive study is to interpret what currently exists. A descriptive study is designed to examine current relationships, practices or trends. Best (1970) pointed out that it is important not to manipulate any variables or arrange any events in a descriptive study. He concluded that a descriptive study has the potential to make a positive change in factors which affect the study.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Since 1984, twenty-eight educators who participated in the COSA Assessment Center, have been promoted to a principalship. Part of their Assessment Center experience involved a numerical rating which predicted the participants' abilities in each of the twelve skill areas mentioned in Chapter II. As practicing principals, these individuals have the opportunity to demonstrate the skills or lack of skills which were predicted by the Assessment Center. The research design for this dissertation was a post hoc study focusing on principals who were promoted to their positions subsequent to their participation in the Assessment Center.

The literature indicated that teaching staffs can be a source for evaluating principals' skills (Eric Research Action Brief 1980). This study was designed to measure the

perceptions of teachers who work with the principals, and to compare their perceptions with those perceptions of their principals and the Assessment Center.

The search of the literature revealed that in 1982, a study comparing perceptions of teachers, students, principals, and principal supervisors was conducted at Michigan State University. A copy of the Michigan State Instrument was obtained, and the Michigan State instrument served as a model for this investigation.

The research was designed to investigate two areas: (1) the importance of the twelve skills; and, (2) the ratings of principals in each of the skill areas. Respondents were asked to rate their responses on Likert-type scales as follows:

Importance	Skills
5 = Vitally Important	5 = Extremely high
4 = Very Important	4 = High
3 = Important	3 = Moderate
2 = Moderately Important	2 = Little skill shown
1 = Unimportant	1 = No skill shown
	0 = No opportunity to observe (teachers only)

The target group for this investigation was a group of twenty-eight principals, who, out of 307 Assessment Center participants, were promoted to principalships during the four years the Assessment Center has been operating. In order to obtain a representative sampling of teachers from all grade levels, teachers were chosen from grade level lists, taking the first name on each grade level list. This ensured that

approximately the same number of grade levels would be represented in the teachers' group.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Five research questions gave direction to this study. The questions concerned the content of principals' evaluation and focused on principals' and teachers' perceptions of general skills dealing with principal tasks. The following research questions were examined:

- (1) Is there a statistically significant difference between teachers' actual ratings of skills importance and principals' predictions of how teachers would rate skills?
- (2) Is there a statistically significant difference between teachers' ratings of skills importance and principals' ratings of skills importance?
- (3) Is there a statistically significant difference between teachers' ratings of their principals' skills and the principals' predictions of how teachers would rate the skills?
- (4) Is there a statistically significant difference between teachers' ratings of principals skills and principals' self-ratings of the same skills?

- (5) Is there a statistically significant difference between COSA ratings of Assessment Center principals and teachers' ratings of the same principals' skills?

POPULATION

There are currently twenty-eight principals in the state of Oregon who were assigned to their positions after completing the Assessment Center. Each of these principals was surveyed. Additionally, one classroom teacher per grade level in each principal's school was surveyed. Only classroom teachers were selected because many schools in the survey did not have comparable specialists. Teachers' names were selected, taking the first teacher on grade level lists. This method was used to ensure that all grade levels were satisfactorily represented since, in some cases, only one teacher taught a given grade level. The total number of teachers surveyed was one hundred eighty-nine teachers.

Thirteen districts are represented in the study with a total population of approximately 10,200 students and 512 teachers. Districts ranged in size from 50,000 students to 500 students. Most geographical parts of the state of Oregon are represented including the Portland metropolitan area, Willamette Valley, Southern Oregon, Oregon Coast and Central Oregon. The distribution of participating districts is as follows:

TABLE I
PARTICIPATING DISTRICTS

Type of District	n	Percent of Schools in Study
Metropolitan/City	4	14%
Suburb	7	25%
Medium City (20-50k)	11	40%
Rural	6	21%
Total N	28	100%

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

A questionnaire was developed based on the twelve leadership skills used in the NASSP and COSA Assessment Center Model. This study is modeled after a national validation study done at Michigan State University in 1982 and uses a similar format. The Michigan State study attempted to correlate twelve Assessment Center leadership skills with specific behaviors which fall under nine dimensions. These dimensions are (Schmitt 1982, p. 36):

- (1) Curriculum and Instructional Leadership
- (2) Student Activities
- (3) Support Services
- (4) Staff Selection, Evaluation and Development
- (5) Community Relations
- (6) Coordination with District and Other Schools

- (7) Fiscal Management
- (8) School Plant Maintenance
- (9) Communication

One of the purposes of the Michigan State Study was to determine whether the assessment center ratings actually measured a candidate's job performance potential using the above leadership dimensions as correlates to the assessment center skills. The behaviorally-anchored ratings were chosen based on data gathered from a survey used at schools in Fairfax County, Virginia, and from task inventories of various principals in the pilot project.

The Michigan State study focused on seven districts and 167 individuals who were either promoted after the assessment center participation or who were already in an administrative role. Ratings were collected on work dimensions from the individuals themselves, their immediate supervisor, two teachers in their building, two support staff in their building and four students.

Correlations between teacher ratings of performance and assessment center ratings were somewhat difficult to understand since the research was done comparing similar, but not exact skills in the Michigan State study. For this reason, the COSA study focuses on the comparisons among only the leadership skills defined by the Assessment Center. In order to give a similar understanding to each respondent, and to make the questionnaire as unambiguous as possible,

definitions and examples of skills were included in the instrument.

This study attempted to follow the format and design of the Michigan State study because the validity and reliability of the instrument had been established (Schmitt 1982). The Michigan State study was designed with fifteen questions each relating to one of the nine dimensions of principal leadership. It was assumed that the number of items supported face validity to the instrument. Respondents in the Michigan State Study were asked read definitions of each behavior; read examples of typical high, average, and low behavior, and rate principals' behavior accordingly.

The first part of this investigator's instrument measured respondents' perceptions of the importance of each skill based on a five point Likert-type scale (5= Vitally Important, 1= Unimportant). The second part of the instrument measured respondents' perceptions of principals' actual skills. Principals rated themselves and teachers rated their own principals. Principals were also asked to rate their perceptions of what they thought teachers in their buildings would indicate in the areas of importance of skills and perceptions of their actual skills. Teachers rated twenty-four items (twelve for importance and twelve for actual skills). Principals rated forty-eight items because they also rated their own perception of teachers' opinions for each item. A five point Likert-type scale was used to

measure the respondents' perceptions about the degree of skill a principal demonstrates (5= extremely high degree of skill, 1= No skill demonstrated, 0= No opportunity to observe skill). A five point scale was chosen in order that comparisons could be made with the Assessment Center rating which rated principals from 5 (Outstanding) to 1 (Unsatisfactory). An example of a typical rating might include rating of Problem Analysis as a very important skill (5); and a principal's particular skill in problem analysis as moderately demonstrated (3). This research instrument is included as Appendix A.

Direction of the scale items was not alternated. Due to the format of the design, the complexity of the examples, and following the Michigan State model, it was decided that respondents could best understand the items if they followed a consistent pattern.

Respondents were asked to supply minimum demographic and personal data including size of school, present position, number of years experience and gender. Responses were kept strictly confidential. Information was reported by category of respondents rather than by name or place. Interpretation of all data was based on codes provided COSA.

VALIDATION OF THE INSTRUMENT

It was important to establish construct and content validity of the instrument before the questionnaires were

administered. An initial draft of the instrument was reviewed by a panel of four experts that consisted of two professors from Portland State University, the Director of the COSA Assessment Center and the Director of Planning and Program Evaluation for the Beaverton, Oregon, School District. After making revisions based on suggestions from the above group, the instrument was field tested with three principals and twenty-eight teachers. Based on suggestions from the principals and teachers group, the following revisions were made: (1) Specific examples were added to the instrument for clarity; (2) Instruments were color coded to separate groups; (3) wording was changed to clarify meanings; and, (4) the instruments were printed back to back in an attempt to make them less cumbersome.

Reliability was determined by asking the field-test group to respond to questions regarding interpretations of items and scale of the instrument. When asked questions such as, "What number signifies a very important skill?", or "What do you think the instrument is measuring?", the field-test group responded with similar responses, and reliability was assumed.

DATA COLLECTION

A list of all Oregon Assessment Center participants was provided by COSA. Twenty-eight principals were identified as having been promoted to a full-time principalship after

participation in the Assessment Center. School Districts provided names of teachers whose names appeared first on grade level lists. One teacher per grade level was selected.

Principals were phoned and the purpose of the survey was explained. Additionally, superintendents in each district were sent letters of explanation and copies of the survey instruments.

The first letters and accompanying surveys were sent to twenty-eight principals and 189 teachers in Oregon. A total of 134 responses (62%) was received within two weeks of the initial survey. A second letter was sent out with a duplicate survey to those individuals who did not return the initial survey. Forty-two more responses (81% total) resulted from the second mailing. Final responses were received from all twenty-eight principals (100%) and 148 teachers (80%). Correspondence relating to data collection appears in Appendix B.

DATA ANALYSIS

The questionnaire data were coded for computer analysis. Data were reported in terms of means and standard deviations. The data were analyzed through the use of descriptive procedures described in the literature (Best 1970; Huck et. al., 1974). A comparative analysis of means and differences was made as they related to the research questions and the principals' and teachers' responses to the instrument.

The null hypotheses were tested with a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) model to examine the existence of differences between variables. The MANOVA collapsed all information, and using Hotelling's T^2 test, a measure of the presence of a group effect was determined (Huck, et.al., 1974).

The level of significance for the overall group effect was set at .05. However, since there was possible danger of false significance of the results of the Hotelling's T^2 test, the .01 level of significance, rather than the .05, was chosen for analysis of variance within each sub-group (e.g., Teachers' Ratings of Importance, Principals' Ratings of Importance of Problem Solving Skills).

All data were entered by hand in a Compaque Desk-Pro computer system and were analyzed by the computer program "Statistics Package for the Social Sciences" (S.P.S.S.). A discussion of the analysis and results follows in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter reported the results of the comparative analysis applied to the questions generated from this study. The information utilized in the analysis was derived from the data. Results of the study were stated in terms of teachers' and principals' responses to twelve skill areas listed in the instrument and ratings assigned to principals by the COSA Assessment Center. Data were organized according to the research questions listed in Chapter III.

DESCRIPTIONS OF RESPONDENTS

The participants surveyed for this study consisted of 217 Oregon public school principals and teachers. The selected principals were individual participants in the COSA Assessment Center who were promoted to principalships after their participation in the Assessment Center. Each of the principals was rated by the Assessment Center in the twelve areas of principal skills. Teachers selected included one teacher from each grade level in each of the participant principal's buildings. Instruments were mailed to each of the subjects. Usable responses were returned by eighty percent (176) of those surveyed.

TABLE II
NUMBER, GENDER, AND RESPONSE PERCENTAGE OF SUBJECTS SURVEYED

Respondent Group	Number Surveyed	Number Responding	Percent of Group Responding
Male Principals	8	8	100%
Female Principals	20	20	100%
Total Principals	28	28	100%
Male Teachers	29	16	55%
Female Teachers	160	132	82%
Total Teachers	189	148	78%
Total	217	176	80%

SKILLS IMPORTANCE: TEACHERS' RATINGS AND PRINCIPALS'
PREDICTIONS OF TEACHERS' RATINGS

This section addresses the research question, "Is there a statistically significant difference between teachers' actual ratings of skills importance and principals' predictions of how teachers would rate the skills?" Teachers were asked to rate importance of twelve skills determined by the Assessment Center Model. Principals were asked to rate how they believed teachers would rate the skills importance.

The following scale was used for principals and teachers:

- 5 = A vitally important skill
- 4 = A very important skill
- 3 = An important skill
- 2 = A moderately important skill

1 = An unimportant skill

Data showing teachers' perceptions of skills importance and principals' predictions of how they believed teachers in their buildings would rate skills are shown in TABLE III (see p. 97).

In the overall rating, comparing all twelve skill areas, the two-sample T^2 statistic had the value of .33; the associated F was 4.56, with degrees of freedom 12 and 163. The significance of F was .000. Under the hypothesis of equal mean vectors (i.e., a series of two means one for each dependent variable), the probability of exceeding such an F value would be less than .05, and the null hypothesis should be rejected at the conventional five percent level (Morrison 1967). In follow-up univariate tests, at the .01 level of significance, there was a significant difference between teachers' perceptions and principals' opinions of how principals thought teachers would rate the skills in eight out of twelve skill areas. Principals' opinions of teachers' ratings were lower than teachers' ratings in all twelve areas of importance. Principals' perceptions of teachers' ratings were significantly lower than the actual teachers' ratings in the following areas: Problem Analysis, Judgment, Leadership, Stress Tolerance, Oral Communication, Written Communication, Range of Interest, and Educational Values.

Areas of closest agreement between principals' opinions of teachers' ratings and actual teachers' ratings were

TABLE III

SKILLS IMPORTANCE: COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' RATINGS AND
PRINCIPALS' PREDICTIONS OF TEACHERS' RATINGS

Teachers' Rating				Principals' Prediction of Teachers' Rating				
Skill	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	Dif.	F Sig.
Problem Analysis	148	4.34	.771	28	3.79	.833	.56	.001*
Judgment	148	4.70	.567	28	4.37	.780	.33	.007*
Organizational Ability	148	4.50	.724	28	4.39	.685	.11	.498
Decisiveness	148	4.37	.810	28	4.14	.848	.23	.176
Leadership	148	4.66	.556	28	4.29	.854	.37	.004*
Sensitivity	148	4.86	.387	28	4.79	.418	.07	.371
Stress Tolerance	148	4.41	.627	28	3.82	.723	.59	.000*
Oral Communication	148	4.30	.744	28	3.89	.685	.41	.007*
Written Communication	148	4.16	.771	28	3.54	.693	.62	.000*
Range of Interest	148	3.35	.856	28	2.75	.752	.60	.001*
Personal Motivation	148	3.54	.914	28	3.32	.819	.22	.239
Educational Values	148	4.41	.698	28	3.64	.911	.77	.000*

* $p < .01$

Organizational Ability and Sensitivity. Areas of greatest difference were Educational Values, Written Communication, and Stress Tolerance.

The data represented in TABLE III reflected substantial differences between teachers' actual ratings of leadership skills and principals' opinions of how teachers would rate those skills. One might conclude that these principals do not accurately know their teachers' opinions regarding the importance of some principal skills. It is noteworthy that principals believed teachers would rate the importance of skills lower than the teachers actually rated them. In reality, teachers' ratings of these skills were very similar to principals' actual ratings of importance (TABLE IV).

SKILLS IMPORTANCE: TEACHERS' RATINGS AND PRINCIPALS' RATINGS

This section addresses the research question, "Is there a statistically significant difference between teachers' ratings of skills importance and principals' ratings of skills importance?" TABLE IV (see p. 99) compared teachers' actual ratings of importance of skills with principals' actual ratings of importance. The same scale of importance was used as in TABLE III.

In the overall rating, comparing all twelve skill areas, the two-sample T^2 statistic had the value .17; the associated F was 2.37, with degrees of freedom 12 and 163.

TABLE IV

SKILLS IMPORTANCE: A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS'
RATINGS AND PRINCIPALS' RATINGS

Teachers				Principals				
Skill	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	Dif.	F Sig.
Problem Analysis	148	4.34	.771	28	4.62	.56	-.28	.068
Judgment	148	4.70	.567	28	4.79	.49	-.09	.391
Organizational Ability	148	4.50	.724	28	4.69	.471	-.19	.162
Decisiveness	148	4.37	.810	28	4.28	.841	.09	.564
Leadership	148	4.66	.556	28	4.79	.412	-.13	.207
Sensitivity	148	4.86	.387	28	4.76	.511	.10	.233
Stress Tolerance	148	4.41	.627	28	4.56	.572	-.15	.268
Oral Communication	148	4.30	.744	28	4.35	.721	-.05	.787
Written Communication	148	4.16	.771	28	4.24	.68	-.0	.578
Range of Interest	148	3.35	.856	28	3.52	.738	-.17	.331
Personal Motivation	148	3.54	.914	28	4.14	.743	-.60	.001*
Educational Values	148	4.41	.698	28	4.31	.806	.10	.515

* $p < .01$

The significance of F was .008. Under the hypothesis of equal mean vectors, the probability of exceeding such an F value would be less than .05, and the null hypothesis should be rejected at the conventional five percent level (Morrison, 1967).

In follow-up univariate tests, at the .01 level of significance, there was only significant difference in one area--Personal Motivation-- where principals rated the importance of personal motivation significantly higher than did teachers. Principals rated nine out of the twelve areas higher in importance than did the teachers. Areas rated lower in importance by principals were Decisiveness, Sensitivity, and Educational Values.

A strong similarity existed between principals' and teachers' perceptions of the importance of leadership skills. With one exception, both groups rated skills in the same category consistently. This was not surprising, because the skills selected were judged important enough by NASSP to categorize and focus in the Assessment Center Model. The skills list was obtained from acting principals in the field who listed skills they felt were important in their jobs (Jeswald, 1977).

The fact that Personal Motivation stood out as the single significant difference could be attributed to principals' stronger feelings about their personal motivation. All principals were new to the job within a

three year time span, and it is likely that they perceived their own personal motivation as very high which could, in turn, have affected their perceptions of the importance of Personal Motivation.

SKILLS RATINGS: TEACHERS' RATINGS OF PRINCIPALS' SKILLS AND PRINCIPALS' PREDICTIONS OF TEACHERS' RATINGS

This section addresses the research question, "Is there a statistically significant difference between teachers' ratings of their principals' skills and the principals' predictions of how teachers would rate their skills?" Teachers were asked to rate their perceptions of their own principals' skills using the twelve Assessment Center skills. Principals were asked to rate their perceptions of how they believed teachers in their buildings would rate their skills. The following scale was used for teachers:

- 5 = Principal demonstrates an extremely high degree of skill.
- 4 = Principal demonstrates a high degree of skill.
- 3 = Principal demonstrates a moderate amount of skill.
- 2 = Principal demonstrates little skill.
- 1 = Principal demonstrates no skill.
- 0 = No opportunity to observe skill.

Principals were given the same scale as teachers. However, the last category, "No opportunity to observe skill," was omitted from the principals' instrument.

Data showing teachers' perceptions and principals' predictions of how they thought teachers would rate their skills are shown in TABLE V (See p.103).

In the overall rating, comparing all twelve skill areas, the two sample T^2 statistic had the value of .19; the associated F was 2.37, with degrees of freedom at 12 and 163. The significance of F was .151. Under the hypothesis of equal mean vectors, the probability of exceeding such an F value would be less than .05, and the null hypothesis should be accepted at the conventional five percent level (Morrison 1967).

In follow-up univariate tests, at the .01 level of significance, there were no significant differences between teachers' opinions of their principals' skills and the principals' predictions about teachers' ratings. The greatest difference (though not statistically significant) was in the area of Organizational Ability where teachers rated principals higher than principals thought they would. In nine out of twelve cases, teachers rated principals lower than the principals believed they would rate them.

Teachers and principals were generally in close agreement between teacher ratings of principals and principals' predictions of the teacher ratings. It is a tribute to the principals that all ratings were in the high moderate to high skilled area. The highest rating by the teachers' group was in Organizational Ability. The highest category in the

TABLE V

SKILLS RATINGS: A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' RATINGS OF
PRINCIPALS' SKILLS AND PRINCIPALS'
PREDICTIONS OF TEACHERS' RATINGS

Teachers				Principals' Perceptions				
Skill	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	Dif.	F Sig.
Problem Analysis	148	3.65	1.063	28	3.82	.548	-.17	.422
Judgment	148	3.71	1.142	28	3.79	.686	-.08	.736
Organizational Ability	148	4.18	.871	28	3.82	.723	.36	.043
Decisiveness	148	3.78	1.046	28	3.86	.756	-.08	.684
Leadership	148	3.82	.969	28	3.96	.693	-.14	.456
Sensitivity	148	3.81	1.089	28	4.07	.716	-.26	.219
Stress Tolerance	148	3.95	1.120	28	4.07	.663	-.12	.585
Oral Communication	148	4.17	.782	28	4.00	.816	.17	.310
Written Communication	148	3.99	1.187	28	4.00	.720	-.01	.976
Range of Interest	148	3.19	1.696	28	3.56	1.034	-.3	.248
Personal Motivation	148	4.11	1.125	28	4.14	.651	-.03	.888
Educational Values	148	4.03	1.070	28	3.89	.832	.14	.509

principals' prediction group was Personal Motivation, which is similar to their prediction rating of Personal Motivation Importance in TABLE III.

SKILLS RATINGS: PRINCIPALS' SELF-RATINGS AND TEACHERS' RATINGS

This section addresses the research question, "Is there a statistically significant difference between teachers' ratings of principals' skills and the principals' self-ratings of their skills?" TABLE VI (see p. 105) compares principals' ratings of their own skills with teachers' perceptions of the principals' skills. The same scale was used as in TABLE V.

In the overall rating, comparing all twelve skill areas, the two-sample T^2 statistic had the value of .16; the associated F was 2.16, with degrees of freedom 12 and 163. The significance of F was .016. Under the hypothesis of equal mean vectors, the probability of exceeding such an F value would be less than .05, and the null hypothesis should be rejected at the conventional five percent level (Morrison 1967).

In follow-up univariate tests, at the .01 level of significance, there was one significant difference between teacher ratings and principal ratings. In the area of Sensitivity, teachers rated principals significantly lower than the principals rated their own skills in that area. In

TABLE VI
SKILLS RATINGS: A COMPARISON OF TEACHERS' RATINGS
AND PRINCIPALS' SELF-RATINGS

Teachers				Principals				
Skill	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	Dif.	F Sig.
Problem Analysis	148	3.65	1.063	28	4.07	.539	-.42	.045
Judgment	148	3.71	1.142	28	4.04	.508	-.33	.142
Organizational Ability	148	4.18	.871	28	4.1	.612	.08	.997
Decisiveness	148	3.78	1.046	28	4.21	.738	-.43	.034
Leadership	148	3.82	.969	28	4.21	.568	-.39	.039
Sensitivity	148	3.81	1.088	28	4.39	.685	-.58	.007 *
Stress Tolerance	148	3.95	1.120	28	4.14	.591	-.19	.381
Oral Communication	148	4.17	.782	28	4.14	.705	.03	.887
Written Communication	148	3.99	1.187	28	4.04	.744	-.05	.855
Range of Interest	148	3.19	1.696	28	3.86	1.044	.67	.045
Personal Motivation	148	4.11	1.125	28	4.54	.637	-.43	.054
Educational Values	148	4.03	1.070	28	4.04	.693	.01	.995

* Significance $p < .01$

nine out of the twelve areas, principals rated their skills higher than did the teachers.

Out of the twelve skill areas, principals rated themselves in the high category eleven times. The area where principals felt least skilled was Range of Interest. Principals, again, scored themselves highest in the area of Personal Motivation.

Teachers rated principals in the moderate to high moderate category in eight out of twelve skills. Teachers' highest rating was in Oral Communication (mean = 4.16) and their lowest rating was in the area of Range of Interest (mean = 3.19).

With the exception of a significant difference in Sensitivity skills, teachers and principals generally agreed regarding their perceptions of principals' leadership skills. Teachers' difference in this rating area may have reflected teachers' dissatisfaction with principals' approach to stressful situations at the time the instruments were filled out. After the instruments were returned, teachers in two of the responding districts went on strike and a third district in the survey announced massive lay-offs for the coming school year.

Notwithstanding the significant difference in Sensitivity skills, this portion of the study generally reflected a similar understanding of principals' skills by both principals and teachers. This may be attributed to (1)

the close proximity within which elementary personnel work;
(2) open communication between principals and their staffs;
(3) a willingness of principals to share their strengths and
their weaknesses; or, (4) a combination of the above.

SKILLS RATINGS: ASSESSMENT CENTER RATINGS AND TEACHERS' RATINGS

This section addresses the research question, "Is there a statistically significant difference between the COSA Assessment Center ratings of Assessment Center principals and teachers' ratings of the same principals' skills?" TABLE VII (see p. 108) displays ratings assigned to principals when they participated in the COSA Assessment Center in comparison to teachers' ratings of the same principals. COSA ratings were assigned before the participants became principals. The COSA ratings were designed to predict the participants' skills in each of the twelve areas. The COSA rating scale is as follows:

- 5 = Performance level of an outstanding administrator
- 6 = Performance level of an above average administrator
- 3 = Performance level of an average administrator
- 2 = Performance level of a below average administrator
- 1 = Performance level of a poor administrator

TABLE VII

SKILLS RATINGS: A COMPARISON BETWEEN TEACHERS'
RATINGS AND COSA ASSESSMENT CENTER
RATINGS OF PRINCIPALS

Teachers' Ratings				Assessment Center Ratings				
Skill	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	Dif.	F Sig.
Problem Analysis	148	3.65	1.063	28	3.65	.499	0	1.00
Judgment	148	3.71	1.142	28	3.56	.551	.15	.494
Organizational Ability	148	4.18	.871	28	3.80	.531	.38	.024
Decisiveness	148	3.78	1.046	28	4.26	.449	-.48	.014
Leadership	148	3.82	.969	28	4.08	.597	-.26	.167
Sensitivity	148	3.81	1.088	28	3.78	.451	.03	.741
Stress Tolerance	148	3.95	1.120	28	3.79	.488	.16	.444
Oral Communication	148	4.17	.782	28	4.32	.573	-.15	.312
Written Communication	148	3.99	1.187	28	3.92	.648	.07	.740
Range of Interest	148	3.19	1.700	28	3.70	.720	-.51	.112
Personal Motivation	148	4.11	1.125	28	4.29	.488	-.18	.392
Educational Values	148	4.03	1.070	28	3.78	.473	.25	.218

The scale for teachers was the same scale as in TABLES V AND VI (rating perceptions of skills from "Highly Skilled" to "Skill Not Observed"). An attempt was made to match the COSA scales and the teacher scales by citing examples from NASSP Assessment Center Handbook in the instrument. Examples of high skills (4.0-4.99), were taken from NASSP examples of skills rated as above average (4.0-4.99); examples of moderate skills (3.0-3.99) were taken from skills rated as average (3.0-3.99), etc.

In the overall rating, comparing all twelve skill areas, the two-sample T^2 statistic had the value of .21; the associated F was 2.91, with degrees of freedom 12 and 163. The significance of F was .001. Under the hypothesis of equal mean vectors, the probability of exceeding such an F value would be less than .05, and the null hypothesis should be rejected at the conventional five percent level (Morrison 1967).

In follow-up univariate tests, at the .01 level of significance, there were, however, no significant differences between the teachers' perceptions of principals skills and the predictive performance of principals by the COSA Assessment Center.

In six out of the twelve skill areas, COSA rated principals lower than the teacher ratings of principals (though not significantly). Areas rated lower than the teachers' ratings were: Judgment, Organizational Ability,

Sensitivity, Stress Tolerance, Written Communication, and Educational Values.

In five out of the twelve skill areas, COSA rated principals higher than the teachers' ratings (though not significantly). Areas rated higher than the teachers' ratings were: Decisiveness, Leadership, Oral Communication, Range of Interest, and Personal Motivation. In the area of Problem Analysis, COSA ratings and teacher ratings were identical.

Out of the twelve skills, Assessment ratings of principals were in the above average area four out of twelve times. The Assessment Center rated principals highest in the area of Oral Communication (mean = 4.32) and lowest in the area of Judgment (mean = 3.56). Teachers' ratings and COSA ratings fell within the same range eight out of twelve times).

Data taken from the COSA ratings and Teacher ratings favorably compared with the early validation studies done for Assessment Centers, nationally (Schmitt 1982). The fact that there are no significant differences in teachers' perceptions and those predictions strongly indicates that COSA predictions are accurate--at least from the perspective of the teachers who work with principals.

COMPARISONS OF RATINGS BY SKILL AREA

TABLE VIII displays data comparing ratings in each skill area for Importance. Ratings are organized from highest to lowest in the following categories:

PPI = Principals' Perception of Teachers Ratings
for Importance of Skills

PI = Principals' Actual Ratings for Importance
of Skills

TI = Teachers' Actual Ratings for Importance of
Skills

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF IMPORTANCE RATINGS BY SKILLS

Skill	Ratings Comparison				
Problem Analysis	PI	>	TI	>	PPI *
Judgment	PI	>	TI	>	PPI
Organizational Ab.	TI	>	PI	>	PPI
Decisiveness	PI	>	TI	>	PPI
Leadership	PI	>	TI	>	PPI
Sensitivity	TI	>	PPI	>	PI
Stress Tolerance	PI	>	TI	>	PPI
Oral Commun.	PI	>	TI	>	PPI
Written Commun.	PI	>	TI	>	PPI
Range of Inter.	PI	>	TI	>	PPI
Personal Motiv.	PI	>	TI	>	PPI
Educational Values	TI	>	PI	>	PPI

*Read: Principals rated the importance of problem analysis higher than teachers, who rated the importance of problem analysis higher than principals believed they would.

The data indicated that with one exception, Principals' Perceptions of Teachers' Skills Rating was the lowest in each of the skill areas. With three exceptions, principals' placed a higher importance on skills than did teachers. One

might conclude from this information that principals in this study, generally believed that the NASSP/COSA skills are more important than teachers believed, and that principals do not have an accurate perception of how teachers view the importance of these skills.

TABLE IX displays data comparing teachers' perceptions of principals' skills and COSA predictions of those same skills. Ratings were taken in the following categories:

COSA = COSA Assessment Center Ratings of Skills

PS = Principals' Self-Ratings of Skills

PPS = Principals' Perceptions of Teachers' Skills Ratings

TS = Teachers' Ratings of Principals' Skills

TABLE IX
COMPARISON OF SKILLS RATINGS

Skill	Ratings Comparison						
Problem Analysis	PS	>	PPS	>	TS	=	COSA *
Judgment	PS	>	PPS	>	TS	>	COSA
Organizational Ab.	PS	=	TS	>	PPS	>	COSA
Decisiveness	COSA	>	PS	>	PPS	>	TS
Leadership	PS	>	COSA	>	PPS	>	TS
Sensitivity	PS	>	PPS	>	TS	>	COSA
Stress Tolerance	PS	>	PPS	>	TS	>	COSA
Oral Commun.	COSA	>	TS	>	PS	>	PPS
Written Commun.	PS	>	PPS	>	TS	>	COSA
Range of Interest	PS	>	COSA	>	PPS	>	TS
Personal Motiv.	PS	>	COSA	>	PPS	>	TS
Educational Values	PS	>	TS	>	PPS	>	COSA

*Read: Principals rated their skills higher than they believed teachers would rate them. Teachers rated principals lower than principals thought they would. The teachers' ratings were the same as the rating assigned by COSA.

The data indicated that in seven out of twelve cases, COSA ratings were somewhat lower than ratings by the principals, teachers, or principals' perceptions of teachers' ratings. Principals generally gave themselves higher ratings than the other three classifications, though not significantly. It may be concluded that principals' perceptions of their own skills are generally higher (though not significantly) than COSA ratings, teacher ratings, or principal perceptions of teacher ratings.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

In summary, it may be concluded that there is a significant difference between perceptions of principals and teachers as follows:

1. Principals believe that teachers rate the importance of Problem Analysis lower than teachers actually rate the skill's importance.
2. Principals believe that teachers rate the importance of Judgment lower than the teachers actually rate the skill's importance.
3. Principals believe that teachers rate the importance of Leadership lower than teachers actually rate the skill's importance.
4. Principals believe that teachers rate the importance of Stress Tolerance lower than the teachers actually rate the skill's importance.
5. Principals believe that teachers rate the importance of Oral Communication lower than the teachers actually rate the skill's importance.
6. Principals believe that teachers rate the importance of Written Communication lower than

teachers actually rate the skill's importance.

7. Principals believe that teachers rate the importance of Range of Interest lower than the teachers actually rate the skill's importance.
8. Principals believe that teachers rate the importance of Educational Values lower than the teachers actually rate the skill's importance.
9. Principals believe that Personal Motivation is of greater importance than teachers believe it to be.
10. Principals rate their own skills in Sensitivity significantly higher than do teachers.

The summary above includes all of the significant differences between principals' perceptions and teachers' perceptions as they relate to the twelve leadership skills defined by COSA and the NASSP. The following chapter will include a discussion of conclusions and implications from this study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains a summary of the research study which dealt with principals' and teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership skills related to the COSA/NASSP Assessment Center model. The following sections will be covered in this chapter: (1) Summary and Conclusions; (2) Limitations of the Study; and, (3) Recommendations for Further Study.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purposes of this study were to measure principals' and teachers' perceptions which relate to the skills of the principalship, and to assess the validity of the COSA/NASSP Assessment Center rating by comparing teachers' perceptions of principals' skills with predictions of principals' skills made at the Assessment Center. The investigator sought to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a statistically significant difference between teachers' actual ratings of skills importance and principals' predictions of how teachers would rate skills?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference between teachers' ratings of skills importance and principals' ratings of skills importance?

3. Is there a statistically significant difference between teachers' ratings of their principals' skills and the principals' predictions of how teachers would rate the skills?
4. Is there a statistically significant difference between teachers' ratings of principals' skills and the principals' self-ratings of the skills?
5. Is there a statistically significant difference between the COSA ratings of Assessment Center principals and teachers' ratings of the same principals?

The findings of this study suggest there is a general agreement between principals and teachers regarding principals' leadership skills, when examining individual skills. Additionally, the predictions made regarding principals' skills by the COSA Assessment Center accurately reflected teachers' perceptions of the same principals' skills in the field.

Areas of strong agreement were discovered between teachers' ratings of principals' actual skills and principals' predictions of the teachers' ratings. Those areas were Judgment, Decisiveness, Stress Tolerance, Written Communication, Personal Motivation and Educational Values.

Areas of strong agreement were also discovered among principals' self-ratings and teachers' ratings. Those areas were Organizational Ability, Oral Communication, Written Communication, and Educational Values.

The comparison of teachers' ratings and COSA Assessment Center ratings produced fewer strong agreements than either

principals' predictions, or principals' self-ratings. However, in the area of Problem Analysis, teachers' ratings and the COSA ratings were identical. Strong agreement also was found in the area of Written Communication.

Most areas of agreement related to the rating and prediction of principals' skills rather than to the rating and prediction of the importance of those skills. There were no strong agreements in the area of principals' predictions and teachers' ratings of skills importance. The comparison of principals' actual importance ratings and teachers' importance ratings did indicate a strong agreement in the areas of Decisiveness, Written Communication, and Educational Values.

The fact that principals in this study were relatively "new" (first, second, or third year) principals could have a bearing on the strong agreement between teachers and principals. There is a possibility that teachers did not fully recognize their principals' skills, and gave the principals high scores, assuming they were strong in the given areas. This might be particularly true with first year principals, who represented nearly half of the principal respondents.

Even though the study indicates a pattern of agreement, areas of disagreement might be considered important in an effort to maintain smooth-working relationships within a school. Categories of sharpest disagreement between principals and teachers were in the area of Skills

Importance. Strong disagreement was found in principals' predictions of teachers' ratings in Problem Analysis, Leadership, Written Communication, Range of Interest and Educational Values. Additionally, there was substantial disagreement between teachers and principals over the importance of personal motivation as a leadership attribute.

It is significant that principals generally believed teachers would rate the importance of leadership skills lower than teachers actually rated the skills importance. Principals could have misjudged teachers' views for many reasons. One explanation might be that principals did not give teachers credit for fully understanding the numerous dimensions of principals' jobs, when in fact, teachers' ratings of performance were not significantly different than the COSA ratings done by trained experts in their field. Another explanation might be a belief on the part of principals that teachers generally do not care about principals' responsibilities and hence, would rate them lower.

It is highly unlikely that teachers and principals will have the same perceptions in all areas of principal leadership skills. Differences of opinions can be positive and stimulate growth. It is important that, even though they may not agree, principals and teachers engage in on-going dialogue regarding the principals' skills in an effort to encourage a dynamic and creative school setting.

The consequences of principals and teachers misunderstanding each other can be negative if there is no discussion between the parties. However, with a willingness to provide open communication, principals can work much more effectively with teachers if they have knowledge of teachers' belief systems. Also, teachers who have an understanding of their principals' belief systems, might strive to support their principals in areas which principals feel are important. There is also increased opportunity for dialogue as each group seeks to understand the other's perceptions.

The value which teachers place on their perceptions depends on the manner in which the perceptions are handled by their principals. If teachers feel threatened, or coerced, it is likely that they will place little value in the process. If, on the other hand, teachers feel an atmosphere of trust and openness, they will possibly seek to work constructively with the principal to build a stronger, more effective school.

A study of teachers' perceptions of principals' skills is most useful if encouraged by the principal. The climate set by the principal will dictate the practical results and use of the study. Principals who demonstrate their desire for honest, constructive feedback, will receive important information for their own professional growth and for the success of the school. Principals who solicit subordinate evaluations will probably earn the respect and cooperation

of teachers, whereas those principals who use the evaluations out of an obligatory response to district policy will probably gain little useful information.

This study should prove useful to principal supervisors and to superintendents who are interested in subordinate evaluation of principals. First, the study indicated that teachers' perceptions are generally accurate, compared to both the principals' self-ratings and to the COSA Assessment Center ratings. Second, the high response rate of teachers might indicate an interest by teachers to participate in a rating of their principals' skills on some regular basis. Third, the literature indicates that teachers who participate in a principal evaluation system, are generally not out to "get their principal." Instead, the evaluations are used for positive feedback as well as constructive criticism.

The most surprising aspect of this research was the close comparison between the COSA Assessment Center predictions and the teacher perceptions. Since there were no significant differences between the COSA Assessment Center ratings and teacher perceptions of principals' skills, it may be concluded that teachers' perceptions are appropriate descriptions of principals' skills. Their first-hand experiences with the principals provide a legitimate position to evaluate principals' skills.

The close teacher-rating and Assessment Center comparisons provide a strong indication that the Assessment

Center process is credible. If teachers' perceptions are accurate, the Assessment Center is able to correctly predict individuals' leadership skills within only a two or three day period. This is obviously valuable to the participants in the Assessment Center as well as to districts which are interested in hiring the participants.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

A single survey may have limited the reliability of the data. A more reliable but more costly method could have used two or more surveys at different times in the school year.

Given the scale instrument, some teachers may not have had sufficient knowledge to adequately assess principals' skills and duties in relation to the principals' total responsibilities.

In some instances, the self-reporting format of the survey may have precluded a totally objective response.

In order to maintain confidentiality, this study did not attempt to ascertain the reasons for respondents' answers to questions, nor was there any attempt to verify the accuracy of the respondents' perceptions.

Finally, the study was limited only to those full-time principals who participated in the COSA Assessment Center and teachers in those principals' schools. The study may not necessarily reflect the perceptions of all principals and teachers in Oregon.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Relatively few studies pertain to principal evaluation and even fewer relate to teacher evaluation of principals' skills. The focus of this study was on a select group of principals and teachers. Because larger inferences could not be drawn from such a select study, a larger, state-wide survey, might give more credibility to the conclusion that teachers and principals' perceptions of principals' leadership skills are highly similar.

This study focused on principals who were new in their positions. A similar study done with the same principals at some future date would further validate the findings of this study or suggest that there were other outcomes possible.

Teachers are only one source of evaluation for principals' skills. Since most principals are officially evaluated by immediate supervisors (Duke, 1987), a comparison of supervisors' perceptions to principal and teacher perceptions would be useful. If the study suggested that supervisors' perceptions are similar to principals' and/or teachers', a strong basis could be made for continuing the status quo. If, on the other hand, the study suggested that supervisors' perceptions are markedly different than teachers' and principals', one might conclude that changes are needed.

Finally, a search of the literature reveals some apparent dichotomies. On one hand, the literature states

that principals need to be evaluated with objective, measurable data (Anzaldua 1984, Zakrajsek 1979). On the other hand, effective schools studies indicate that strong principal leadership is exemplified by such subjective actions as providing an orderly climate, providing instructional leadership, placing emphasis on basic skills, and closely monitoring student progress (Purkey 1983). One might conclude that there is no single answer to what makes a good principal; however, there is an apparent need to determine how to measure a good principal.

This study has measured a select group's perceptions which relate to principal leadership skills. For purposes of this group, the study concluded that the COSA Assessment Center provides accurate data, and that teachers' and principals' perceptions of leadership skills are generally similar. From a larger focus, however, numerous questions remain unanswered. Does a principals' tenure affect teachers' perceptions of the principals' leadership skills? Do principals generally, have inaccurate perceptions regarding teachers' ratings for importance? Do principals' supervisors have similar perceptions as principals and teachers? Is there a correlation between strong principals and similar perceptions of leadership skills between principals and teachers? These and other questions form the basis for further studies on principals' and teachers' perceptions of principal leadership skills.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, R. C. & Bartlett, C. Clearing up the evaluation process for the high school principal. The NASSP Bulletin, 1984, 68, 10-13.
- Anzaldua, D. National school district principal performance contracts. Thrust, 1984, 14, 15-17.
- Awender, M. A. The principal's leadership role: perceptions of teachers, principals, and superintendents. Education, 1978, 99, 172-179.
- Bailey, Gerald D. Faculty feedback for administrators: a means to improve leadership behavior. The NASSP Bulletin, 1984, 68, 5-9.
- Baltimore City Public Schools. Performance evaluation of school-based administrators. Baltimore, Maryland, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 177 687).
- Banks, Freddie A. The evaluation of the principal as perceived by principals, superintendents, and teachers. Unpublished dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois: 1981.
- Best, John. Research methods in education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Block, Alan W. The role of elementary principals: a summary of research. Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1982.
- Blume, Robert E. (edt.) Effective schools practices: a research synthesis. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Educational Laboratory, 1984.
- Bolton, D. L. Evaluating administrative personnel in school systems. New York, New York: Teachers College Press, 1980.
- Bradford, David L. & Cohen, Allan R. Managing for excellence. New York, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1984.

- Bradley, Jack & McClelland, James. Basic statistical concepts. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1963.
- Brighton, Staynor F. & Rose, Gale. Increasing your accuracy in teacher evaluation. Handbook for successful school administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1974.
- Brookover, W. B., Gigliotti, R. J., Henderson, R. P. & Schnieder, J. M. Elementary school social environments and achievement. East Lansing, Michigan: College of Urban Development, Michigan State University, 1973.
- Brookover, W. B., & Lezotte, L. W. Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, College of Urban Development, 1979.
- Buser, R. L. The why, what, how and by whom of evaluating principals. The NASSP Bulletin, 1984, 68, 1-5.
- California Elementary School Administrators' Association. C.E.S.S.A.A. reviews evaluation procedures for the school administrator. San Francisco, California: C.E.S.S.A.A., 1958.
- Cross, R. What makes an effective principal? Principal, 1981, 61, 19-22.
- Daniel, Keith Hardin. The perceived effect of teachers' evaluations on the performance of the principal. Unpublished dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1978.
- Deal, T., Dornbush, Sanford, & Crawford, Robert. Villains as victims: evaluating principals. Phi Delta Kappan, 1977, 59, 273-274.
- Duke, Daniel L. School leadership and instructional improvement. New York, New York: Random House, 1987.
- Dwyer, M. David C., Barnett, Bruce, G., & Lee, Ginny V. The school principal: scapegoat or the last hope? Leadership, Examining the Elusive--ASCD Yearbook. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Curriculum Development, 1987, 30-45.
- Edmonds, Ronald. Some schools work and more can. Social Policy, 1979, 9, 28--32.

- _____. Programs of school improvement: an overview. Educational Leadership, 1982, 40, 4-11.
- ERIC reserch action brief. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1980
- ERS (Educational Research Service). American Association of School Administrators and NEA Research Division. Evaluation of Administrative Performance. ERS Circular No. 5, 1964.
- _____. American Association of School Administrators and NEA Research Division. Evaluation of Administrative Performance. ERS Circular No. 6, 1971.
- Ezeadi, Sunday O. Evaluation of the principal: a systematic approach. Unpublished dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska: 1984.
- Gaslin, William L. Evaluation of administrative performance by a school's teaching staff. The NASSP Bulletin, 1974, 58, 72-81.
- Gephart, William J. The evaluation of administrative performance: parameters, problems, and practices. A CEDR Monograph, Phi Delta Kappan, 1975.
- Goldhammer, Robert. Clinical supervision. New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Good, Carter.(edt) Dictionary of Education. New York, New York: Mc-Graw-Hill, 1973.
- Goodlad, John I. A place called school. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.
- Goodling, Edward. Report to the board on performance-based compensation. Unpublished report. Beverton, Oregon, 1985.
- Gutherie, H. D. & Willower, J. Ceremonial congratulations: an analysis of principals' observations and reports of classroom teaching. High School Journal, 1972, 56, 284-290.
- Hersey, Paul W. NASSP's assessment center, from concept to practice. The NASSP Bulletin, 1977, 61, 74-76.

- Hooper, Helen Joyce. Performance evaluation of elementary public school principals in Kansas. Unpublished dissertation, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas: 1984.
- Howard, Ann. An assessment of assessment centers. Academy of Management Journal, 1974, 17, 115-134.
- Howsam, Robert & Franco, John M. New emphasis in evaluation of administration. National Elementary Principal, 1965, 44, 36-50.
- Huck, James R. Assessment centers: view of the external and internal validities. Personnel Psychology, 1973, 26, 191-212.
- Huck, S. W., Cormier, William H., & Bounds, William. Statistics. New York, New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1974.
- Ingram, R. L. Principal: instructional leader, site manager, educational executive. Thrust, 1979, 8, 23-25.
- Jeswald, Thomas A. A new approach to identifying administrative talent. The NASSP Bulletin, 1977, 61, 79-83.
- Klopf, G. & Scheldon, E. The essentials of effectiveness: a job description for principals. Principal, 1982, 62, 35-38.
- Lane, Howard & Beaucamp, Mary. Understanding human development. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Leeper, Robert R. (edt) Supervision: emerging profession. Washington, D.C.: Association for Curriculum Development, 1969.
- Lemon, Nigel. Attitudes and their measurement. New York, New York: John Wiley Publishers, 1972.
- Leithwood, K. A. & Montgomery, D. J. The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, 1982, 52, 309-339.
- Lester, James D. Writing research papers. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1987.

- Licata, J. W. Systematic appraisal of educational leadership personnel. Ohio State University, 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 197 423).
- Lide, E. S. Personality traits of school administrators. Educational Research Bulletin, 1938, 8, 143.
- Look, E. Evaluating principal performance with improved criteria. The NASSP Bulletin, 1984 68, 77-81.
- Madden, J. School effectiveness study: State of California. Sacramento, California: State of California Department of Education, 1976.
- Manasse, A. L. Improving conditions for principals' effectiveness. Elementary School Journal, 1984, 85, 439-463.
- McCleary L. The senior high school principalship. Reston, Virginia: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.
- McClure, Worth. Helping the principal to grow professionally. Elementary School Journal, 1938, 96, 344.
- McCurdy, Jack. The role of the principal in effective schools: problems and solutions. Sacramento, California: American Association of School Administrators, 1983.
- McDonald, Milton S. Administrator evaluation: a look at Georgia and the nation. Issues for Education Series. Georgia Professional Standards Commission. 1984 (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 180 106).
- McGeown, V. Selected leadership functions of the school principal. Educational Administration, 1979, 18, 153-179.
- McIntyre, Kenneth E. & Grant, E. Performance review: how principals, teachers, and superintendents view the principalship. The NASSP Bulletin, 1980, 64, 44-49.
- Mendenhall, William. Introduction to probability and statistics. North Scituate, Massachusetts: Duxabury Press, 1979.

- Miller, Richard. A description of satisfactory principal leadership from the perspective of teachers. Unpublished dissertation, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, North Carolina: 1984.
- Morris, John E. Accountability: watchward for the 70's. The Clearing House, 1971, 45, 323-327.
- Morrison, D. F. Multivariate Statistical Methods. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Mullican, F. & Ainsworth, L. The principal as an instructional leader. Theory into Practice, 1979, 18, 33-37.
- Murphy, J. Academic press: translating high expectations into school policies and classroom practices. Educational Leadership, 1982, 40, 22-26.
- NASSP assessment center handbook. Reston, Virginia: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1983.
- New York State Department of Education. Reading achievement related to educational and environmental conditions in twelve New York City elementary schools, Albany, New York: Division of Educational Evaluation, 1974.
- Noll, Victor H. Introduction to educational measurement. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.
- Nygaard, Deborah D. Evaluation of administrative performance. Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, 1974.
- Oberg, Winston. Make performance appraisal relevant. Harvard Business Review, 1972, 50, 61-67.
- ORS (Oregon Revised Statutes), 1985.
- Ostrander, Raymond H. & Dethy, Ray C. A values approach to educational administration. Huntington, New York: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company, 1973.
- Persell, Caroline, Hodges, Cookson, & Peters, W. The effective principal in action. The effective principal: a research summary. Reston, Virginia: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1982.

- Pharis, William L. Evaluation of school principals. National Elementary Principal, 1973, 52, 36-38.
- Principal evaluation research action brief. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Eugene, Oregon: 1980, 1-12.
- Purkey, S.C. & Smith, M.S. Effective schools--a review. Elementary School Journal, 1983, 83, 427-452.
- Redfern, George B. Evaluating teachers and administrators: a performance objectives approach. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1980.
- Roberson, E. Wayne. Educational accountability through evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technologies Publications, 1971.
- Robinson, John J. & Lee, John H. Jr. Evaluation: can we agree? The NASSP Bulletin, 1976, 60, 77-84.
- Rosenberg, Max. How to evaluate your principals without scaring (or turning) them off. The American School Board Journal, 1973, 6, 35-36.
- Rutherford, W. L. School principals as effective leaders. Phi Delta Kappan, 1985, 67, 31-34.
- Rutter, Michael, Maughn, Barbara, Mortimore, Peter & Ouston, Janet. Fifteen-Thousand Hours. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Sanacore, Joseph. How teachers can evaluate their principal. The NASSP Bulletin, 1976, 60, 98-101.
- Schaefer, William & Read, Bruce. Use this plan to evaluate--and pay--administrators. Executive Educator, 1982, 4, 22-24.
- The School Executive's Guide. Prepared by Prentice-Hall editorial staff. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Schmitt, Neal. Criterion-Related and content validity of the NASSP assessment center. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1982
- Schmuck, Richard A., Runkel, Philip J., Saturen, Steven L., Martell, Ronald T., & Deer, C. Brooklyn. Handbook on Organization development in schools. Palo Alto, California: Maryfield Publishing Company, 1972.

- Sclara, Frank J. & Jantz, Richard K. Accountability in American education. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.
- Smith, Joseph M. An assessment of elementary school principal behaviors as perceived by selected elementary school principals and teachers in North Florida. Unpublished dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida: 1984.
- Solomon, Gloria. Teachers evaluate their principals. Principal, 1983, 63, 14-17.
- Speicher, Dean. Evaluation of administrative and supervisory personnel. Personnel News for School Systems, 1971, 40, 9-10.
- Stoops, E., Rafferty, M., & Johnson, R.E. Handbook of education administration. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1975.
- Strickler, Robert W. The evaluation of the public school principal. The NASSP Bulletin, 1957, 41, 55-56.
- Stufflebeam, Daniel L. (edt.) Educational evaluation and decision making. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappan, Inc., 1971.
- Todd, Donald F. & Manning, Patrick M. Job evaluation goes to school. Personnel, 1974, 51, 53-59.
- Tyler, Ralph W. Educational evaluation: new roles, new means. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- Umans, Shelly. The management of education. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1971.
- Weber, G. Inner city children can be taught to read: four successful schools. Occasional Paper No. 18. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1971.
- Weldy, Gilbert R. Teachers evaluate their principals. The NASSP Bulletin, 1961, 55, 145-150.
- Wells, R. C. Guidelines for effective and defensible performance appraisal systems. Personnel Journal, 1982, 61, 776-782.

Wiersma, William. Research methods in education. Itasca, Illinois: F .E. Peacock Publishers, 1975.

Wynne, E. Looking at schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 1981, 62, 371-381.

Zakrajsek, Barbara. Evaluation systems: a critical look. The NASSP Bulletin, 1979, 63, 100-111.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE INSTRUMENTS

SECTION I -- PERSONAL INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS

Please check the responses which best describe your current position:

1. Your present position is (check one):
 - ☐ a. Elementary teacher
 - ☐ b. Junior High or Middle School teacher
 - ☐ c. High School teacher
 - ☐ d. Other (please specify) _____

2. Number of years you have taught (including this year):
 - ☐ a. Three or less
 - ☐ b. Between four and ten
 - ☐ c. More than ten

3. Gender:
 - ☐ a. Female
 - ☐ b. Male

4. Number of students in your school (approximate):
 - ☐ a. Less than 100
 - ☐ b. Between 101 and 150
 - ☐ c. Between 151 and 199
 - ☐ d. Between 200 and 299
 - ☐ e. Between 300 and 399
 - ☐ f. More than 400

SECTION II -- IMPORTANCE OF SKILLS

DIRECTIONS: The National Association of Secondary School Principals has defined twelve skill areas which relate to the principalship. Please rate each area as you perceive its importance to being an effective principal. Circle "5" if you feel the skill is vitally important; "4", if you feel the skill is very important; "3", if you feel the skill is important; "2", if you feel the skill is moderately important, and "1" if you feel the skill is unimportant. Please read each item carefully and consider each skill separately.

		Vitally Important	Very Important	Important	Moderately Important	Unimportant
1. PROBLEM ANALYSIS	Ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; searching for information with a purpose.	5	4	3	2	1
2. JUDGMENT	Ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information; skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to evaluate critically written communications.	5	4	3	2	1
3. ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY	Ability to plan, schedule and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on one's time.	5	4	3	2	1
4. DECISIVENESS	Ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly.	5	4	3	2	1
5. LEADERSHIP	Ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to interact with a group effectively and to guide them to the accomplishment of a task.	5	4	3	2	1
6. SENSITIVITY	Ability to perceive the needs, concerns and personal problems of others; skill in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.	5	4	3	2	1
7. STRESS TOLERANCE	Ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet.	5	4	3	2	1
8. ORAL COMMUNICATION	Ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts or ideas.	5	4	3	2	1
9. WRITTEN COMMUNICATION	Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences — students, teachers, parents, et al.	5	4	3	2	1
10. RANGE OF INTEREST	Competence to discuss a variety of subjects — educational, political, current events, economic, etc.; desire to actively participate in events.	5	4	3	2	1
11. PERSONAL MOTIVATION	Need to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing.	5	4	3	2	1
12. EDUCATIONAL VALUES	Possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change.	5	4	3	2	1

SECTION III -- SKILLS PERCEPTION

DIRECTIONS

PLEASE CONSIDER YOUR PRINCIPAL IN YOUR CURRENT ASSIGNMENT when answering the questions in the following section. Read the examples of typical high behavior and typical low behavior. Read each item carefully and consider each skill separately.

Decide whether YOUR PRINCIPAL has (5) an extremely high degree of skill, (4) a high degree of skill, (3) a moderate amount of skill, (2) little skill, or (1) no skill.

If you have not had the opportunity to observe your principal in a particular skill area, please circle "0".

	5= Extremely high degree of skill	4= High degree of skill	3= Moderate amount of skill	2= Little skill shown	1= No skill shown	0= No opportunity to observe skill
<p>(1) PROBLEM ANALYSIS</p> <p>The ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem; searching for information with a purpose.</p> <p>(Typical High Behavior) Consistently recognizes and corrects errors. Seeks all relevant information before making decisions. Recognizes relevant data from large quantities of information.</p> <p>(Typical Low Behavior) Is unable to recognize and correct own errors. Cannot distinguish relevant from irrelevant information. Seeks no information prior to making decisions.</p> <p>(Circle One)</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1 0</p>						
<p>(2) JUDGMENT</p> <p>The ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information; skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to evaluate critically written communication</p> <p>(Typical High Behavior) Prioritizes problems accurately. Consistently informs superiors regarding sensitive matters. Develops sound logical arguments to support position.</p> <p>(Typical Low Behavior) Jumps to conclusions. Keeps information to self. Operates by opinion with few facts.</p> <p>(Circle One)</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1 0</p>						
<p>(3) ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY</p> <p>The ability to plan, schedule and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on time</p> <p>(Typical High Behavior) Consistently punctual. Makes plans based on immediate, short-term and long-term goals. Keeps appointments. Sets time lines for project completion.</p> <p>(Typical Low Behavior) Is seldom on time. Operates only on immediate needs. Seldom uses a calendar to make appointments or follow through with projects.</p> <p>(Circle One)</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1 0</p>						
<p>(4) DECISIVENESS</p> <p>The ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly.</p> <p>(Typical High Behavior) Frequently takes calculated risks. Makes decisions on all problems. Gives clear, concise direction with no ambiguity.</p> <p>(Typical Low Behavior) Is overly cautious. Seldom takes any risks. Delays actions on problem-solving. Gives ambiguous directions frequently needing clarification.</p> <p>(Circle One)</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1 0</p>						
<p>(5) LEADERSHIP</p> <p>The ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to interact with a group effectively and to guide them to the accomplishment of a task.</p> <p>(Typical High Behavior) Initiates discussion of problems. Regularly clarifies and restates points from group members. Takes action to reach consensus. Avoids irrelevant discussion. Supports other members who are effectively leading group to a solution.</p> <p>(Typical Low Behavior) Waits for group to recognize problems. Seldom solicits input from group. Makes no effort to reach consensus or reach conclusion to problems. Often gets involved in irrelevant discussion to problem solution.</p> <p>(Circle One)</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1 0</p>						
<p>(6) SENSITIVITY</p> <p>Ability to perceive the needs, concerns and personal problems of others; skill in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.</p> <p>(Typical High Behavior) Shows courtesy and respect to others. Shows tact with difficult or aggressive group members. Frequently uses compromises to reach solutions.</p> <p>(Typical Low Behavior) Seldom shows respect for members of the group. Often interrupts; does not listen. Usually does not address staff members by name.</p> <p>(Circle One)</p> <p>5 4 3 2 1 0</p>						

	5- Extremely high degree of skill	4- High degree of skill	3- Moderate amount of skill	2- Little skill shown	1- No skill shown	0- No opportunity to observe skill
(7) STRESS TOLERANCE Ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet.		(Typical High Behavior) Deals with opposition in a calm, reasoned fashion. Tries to put opposition at ease. Keeps goal in mind. Maintains calm voice control and a sense of humor.		(Typical Low Behavior) Displays a "short fuse." Frequently loses temper and loses track of goals. Easily irritated.		
	5	4	3	2	1	0
(8) ORAL COMMUNICATION Ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts and ideas.		(Typical High Behavior) Shows confidence in speaking. Calm. Ideas are conveyed with clarity and conviction. Speech is paced, using effective pauses, tone and volume.		(Typical Low Behavior) Glib speech. Frequently uses clichés. Speaks with out thinking. Poor sentence structure and grammar usage. Poor eye contact, volume and tone.		
	5	4	3	2	1	0
(9) WRITTEN COMMUNICATION Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences--students, teachers, parents, et al.		(Typical High Behavior) Grammar, syntax and punctuation are generally correct. Writing is clear and concise. Varies the tone of the communication to the audience.		(Typical Low Behavior) Has frequent grammatical, spelling and syntax errors. Writes either too much or not enough. Often unclear.		
	5	4	3	2	1	0
(10) RANGE OF INTEREST Competence to discuss a variety of subjects -- educational, political, current events, economic, etc.; desire to actively participate in events.		(Typical High Behavior) Informally discusses outside interests (e.g. current events, books, music, ideas.) Has membership in civic organizations.		(Typical Low Behavior) Shows no known outside interest. Shows no desire to participate in any activity outside of school setting.		
	5	4	3	2	1	0
(11) PERSONAL MOTIVATION Need to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing.		(Typical High Behavior) Shows high degree of enthusiasm. Exemplifies self-discipline (e.g. stopping smoking, losing weight, advancing education, etc.) Enjoys competition. Seeks challenging tasks.		(Typical Low Behavior) Shows no enthusiasm. Has no self-discipline. Backs away from any competition and avoids challenging assignments.		
	5	4	3	2	1	0
(12) EDUCATIONAL VALUES Possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change.		(Typical High Behavior) Conveys educational philosophy on regular basis. Discusses instructional philosophy, management philosophy, and school organization. Frequently shares ideas from conferences or educational journals.		(Typical Low Behavior) Staff does not know what principal considers important or unimportant. Principal does not take a stand on any issues and rarely shares ideas.		
	5	4	3	2	1	0

SECTION I -- PERSONAL INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS

Please check the responses which best describe your current position:

1. Your present position is (check one):

- ☐ a. Elementary School Principal
- ☐ b. Junior High or Middle School Principal
- ☐ c. High School Principal
- ☐ d. Other (please specify) _____

2. Number of years you have been a principal (including this year):

- ☐ a. One year or less
- ☐ b. Two years
- ☐ c. Three years
- ☐ d. Four years or more

3. Gender:

- ☐ a. Female
- ☐ b. Male

4. Number of students in your school (approximate):

- ☐ a. Less than 100
- ☐ b. Between 101 and 150
- ☐ c. Between 151 and 199
- ☐ d. Between 200 and 299
- ☐ e. Between 300 and 399
- ☐ f. More than 400

SECTION II -- IMPORTANCE OF SKILLS

DIRECTIONS

The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators Assessment Center and National Association of Secondary School Principals have defined twelve skill areas which relate to the principalship. On the following page, please rate each skill by (1) your perception of its importance and (2) by your perception of what teachers in your school think is important. Please read each item carefully and consider each skill separately.

IN THE LEFT COLUMN, MARKED "PRINCIPAL'S RATING," PLEASE RATE EACH AREA AS YOU PERSONALLY PERCEIVE ITS IMPORTANCE TO BEING AN EFFECTIVE PRINCIPAL. (This is not an assessment of your own skills.) Circle "5", if you feel the skill is vitally important; "4" if you feel the skill is very important; "3", if you feel the skill is important; "2", if you feel the skill is moderately important, or "1", if you feel the skill is unimportant.

IN THE RIGHT COLUMN, MARKED "PRINCIPAL'S PERCEPTION OF TEACHERS' RATING," PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBERS WHICH BEST INDICATE WHAT YOU THINK TEACHERS IN YOUR BUILDING PERCEIVE AS IMPORTANT. Circle "5", if you think teachers in your building would feel the skill is vitally important; "4", if you feel teachers in your building would feel the skill is very important; "3", if you feel the teachers in your building would feel the skill is moderately important; and "1", if you feel teachers in your building would rate the skill as unimportant.

IMPORTANCE OF SKILLS

Principal's
Rating of
Importance

Principal's
Perception of
Teachers' Rating

Vitality Important Very Important Important Moderately Important Unimportant		Vitality Important Very Important Important Moderately Important Unimportant
5 4 3 2 1	(1) PROBLEM ANALYSIS Ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; searching for information with a purpose.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	(2) JUDGMENT Ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information; skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to evaluate critically written communications.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	(3) ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY Ability to plan, schedule and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on one's time.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	(4) DECISIVENESS Ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	(5) LEADERSHIP Ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to interact with a group effectively and to guide them to the accomplishment of a task.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	(6) SENSITIVITY Ability to perceive the needs, concerns and personal problems of others; skill in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	(7) STRESS TOLERANCE Ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	(8) ORAL COMMUNICATION Ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts or ideas.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	(9) WRITTEN COMMUNICATION Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences--students, teachers, parents, et al.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	(10) RANGE OF INTEREST Competence to discuss a variety of subjects--educational, political, current events, economic, etc.; desire to actively participate in events.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	(11) PERSONAL MOTIVATION Need to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing.	5 4 3 2 1
5 4 3 2 1	(12) EDUCATIONAL VALUES Possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change.	5 4 3 2 1

SECTION III -- SKILLS PERCEPTION

DIRECTIONS: There are two parts under each item in Section III. Please consider your personal skills when answering the questions in this section. Read the examples of a typical high degree of behavior and a typical low degree of behavior for each item. Read each item carefully and consider each skill separately.

BESIDE THE LINE TITLED "PRINCIPAL'S VIEW" IN EACH ITEM, INDICATE YOUR PERCEPTION OF HOW YOU PERSONALLY VIEW YOUR OWN SKILLS by circling the appropriate number. Decide whether you have (5) an extremely high degree of skill, (4) a high degree of skill, (3) a moderate amount of skill, (2) little skill, or (1) no skill.

BESIDE THE LINE TITLED "TEACHERS' VIEW OF PRINCIPAL" IN EACH ITEM, INDICATE HOW YOU THINK TEACHERS IN YOUR BUILDING WOULD RATE YOUR SKILLS by circling the appropriate number. Decide whether you think your teachers perceive you as having (5) an extremely high degree of skill, (4) a high degree of skill, (3) a moderate amount of skill, (2) little skill, or (1) no skill.

EXAMPLE: If, under item (1), you feel you have a high degree of skill in PROBLEM ANALYSIS, but you feel your teachers perceive you as having a moderate amount of skill in this area, you would indicate your choices as follows:

	5= Extremely high degree of skill	4= High degree of skill	3= Moderate amount of skill	2= Little skill shown	1= No skill shown	0= No opportunity to observe skill
(1) PROBLEM ANALYSIS The ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem; searching for information with a purpose.		(Typical High Behavior) Consistently recognizes and corrects errors. Seeks all relevant information before making decisions. Recognizes relevant data from large quantities of information.			(Typical Low Behavior) Is unable to recognize and correct own errors. Cannot distinguish relevant from irrelevant information. Seeks no information prior to making decisions.	
		(Circle One in Each Row)				
Principal's View:	5	4	3	2	1	
Teachers' View of Principal:	5	4	3	2	1	0

	5- Extremely high degree of skill	4- High degree of skill	3- Moderate amount of skill	2- Little skill shown	1- No skill shown	0- No opportunity to observe skill
(1) PROBLEM ANALYSIS The ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem; searching for information with a purpose.	(Typical High Behavior) Consistently recognizes and corrects errors. Seeks all relevant information before making decisions. Recognizes relevant data from large quantities of information. (Circle One in Each Row)					
Principal's View:	5	4	3	2	1	
Teachers' View of Principal:	5	4	3	2	1	0
(2) JUDGMENT The ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information; skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to evaluate critically written communication	(Typical High Behavior) Prioritizes problems accurately. Consistently informs superiors regarding sensitive matters. Develops sound logical arguments to support position. (Circle One in Each Row)					
Principal's View:	5	4	3	2	1	
Teachers' View of Principal:	5	4	3	2	1	0
(3) ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY The ability to plan, schedule and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on time	(Typical High Behavior) Consistently punctual. Makes plans based on immediate, short-term and long-term goals. Keeps appointments. Sets time lines for project completion. (Circle One in Each Row)					
Principal's View:	5	4	3	2	1	
Teachers' View of Principal:	5	4	3	2	1	0
(4) RANGE OF INTEREST Competence to discuss a variety of subjects -- educational, political, current events, economic, etc.; desire to actively participate in events.	(Typical High Behavior) Informally discusses outside interests (e.g. current events, books, music, ideas.) Has membership in civic organizations. (Circle One in Each Row)					
Principal's View:	5	4	3	2	1	
Teachers' View of Principal:	5	4	3	2	1	0
(5) PERSONAL MOTIVATION Need to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing.	(Typical High Behavior) Shows high degree of enthusiasm. Exemplifies self-discipline (e.g. stopping smoking, losing weight, advancing education, etc.) Enjoys competition. Seeks challenging tasks. (Circle One in Each Row)					
Principal's View:	5	4	3	2	1	
Teachers' View of Principal:	5	4	3	2	1	0
(6) EDUCATIONAL VALUES Possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change.	(Typical High Behavior) Conveys educational philosophy on regular basis. Discusses instructional philosophy, management philosophy, and school organization. Frequently shares ideas from conferences or educational journals. (Circle One in Each Row)					
Principal's View:	5	4	3	2	1	
Teachers' View of Principal:	5	4	3	2	1	0

	5= Extremely high degree of skill	4= High degree of skill	3= Moderate amount of skill	2= Little skill shown	1= No skill shown	0= No opportunity to observe skill
<p>(7) STRESS TOLERANCE</p> <p>Ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet.</p> <p>(Typical High Behavior) Deals with opposition in a calm, reasoned fashion. Tries to put opposition at ease. Keeps goal in mind. Maintains calm voice control and a sense of humor.</p> <p>(Typical Low Behavior) Displays a "short fuse." Frequently loses temper and loses track of goals. Easily irritated.</p> <p>(Circle One in Each Row)</p> <p>Principal's Views: 5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>Teachers' View of Principals: 5 4 3 2 1 0</p>						
<p>(8) ORAL COMMUNICATION</p> <p>Ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts and ideas.</p> <p>(Typical High Behavior) Shows confidence in speaking. Calm. Ideas are conveyed with clarity and conviction. Speech is paced, using effective pauses, tone and volume.</p> <p>(Typical Low Behavior) Glib speech. Frequently uses clichés. Speaks with out thinking. Poor sentence structure and grammar usage. Poor eye contact, volume and tone.</p> <p>(Circle One in Each Row)</p> <p>Principal's Views: 5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>Teachers' View of Principals: 5 4 3 2 1 0</p>						
<p>(9) WRITTEN COMMUNICATION</p> <p>Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences--students, teachers, parents, et al.</p> <p>(Typical High Behavior) Grammar, syntax and punctuation are generally correct. Writing is clear and concise. Varies the tone of the communication to the audience.</p> <p>(Typical Low Behavior) Has frequent grammatical, spelling and syntax errors. Writes either too much or not enough. Often unclear.</p> <p>(Circle One in Each Row)</p> <p>Principal's Views: 5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>Teachers' View of Principals: 5 4 3 2 1 0</p>						
<p>(10) DECISIVENESS</p> <p>The ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly.</p> <p>(Typical High Behavior) Frequently takes calculated risks. Makes decisions on all problems. Gives clear, concise direction with no ambiguity.</p> <p>(Typical Low Behavior) Is overly cautious. Seldom takes any risks. Delays actions on problem-solving. Gives ambiguous directions frequently needing clarification.</p> <p>(Circle One in Each Row)</p> <p>Principal's Views: 5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>Teachers' View of Principals: 5 4 3 2 1 0</p>						
<p>(11) LEADERSHIP</p> <p>The ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to interact with a group effectively and to guide them to the accomplishment of a task.</p> <p>(Typical High Behavior) Initiates discussion of problems. Regularly clarifies and restates points from group members. Takes action to reach consensus. Avoids irrelevant discussion. Supports other members who are effectively leading group to a solution.</p> <p>(Typical Low Behavior) Waits for group to recognize problems. Seldom solicits input from group. Makes no effort to reach consensus or reach conclusion to problem. Often gets involved in irrelevant discussion to problem solution.</p> <p>(Circle One in Each Row)</p> <p>Principal's Views: 5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>Teachers' View of Principals: 5 4 3 2 1 0</p>						
<p>(12) SENSITIVITY</p> <p>Ability to perceive the needs, concerns and personal problems of others; skill in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.</p> <p>(Typical High Behavior) Shows courtesy and respect to others. Shows tact with difficult or aggressive group members. Frequently uses compromises to reach solutions.</p> <p>(Typical Low Behavior) Seldom shows respect for members of the group. Often interrupts; does not listen. Usually does not address staff members by name.</p> <p>(Circle One in Each Row)</p> <p>Principal's Views: 5 4 3 2 1</p> <p>Teachers' View of Principals: 5 4 3 2 1 0</p>						

APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE

THE COSA FOUNDATION

707 13th Street SE Suite 100 Salem, Oregon 97301
(503) 581-3141

January 30, 1987

Dear Superintendent,

My name is Mark Carlton. I am a principal with the Beaverton School District and a doctoral student at Portland State University. The topic of my dissertation deals with teachers' and new principals' perceptions of principals' leadership skills. I am currently working with Dr. Wayne Robbins, Director of the COSA Assessment Center, in an effort to follow up new principals who participated in the COSA Assessment Center.

There are currently 28 principals in the state who have been hired after participating in the Assessment Center. Your district currently employs at least one of these principals. I would like to survey these principals and a selection of teachers in the principals' schools. The purpose of the survey is to assess principals' and teachers' opinions with regard to principals' leadership skills. Data from the surveys will be compared to data taken at the Assessment Center. All responses will be kept strictly confidential and information will be reported by category of respondent rather than by name or place. My interpretation of information will be based on codes provided by COSA and not names of respondents.

I would appreciate your support in this endeavor. My surveys will be mailed to principals and teachers during the next two weeks. I would be happy to share the results of my study with you. If you are interested in obtaining information relating to principals' and teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership skills, please feel free to call me at 629-5746. I am enclosing copies of both teachers' and principals' surveys.

Sincerely,

Mark Carlton,
Doctoral Candidate, Portland State University

THE COSA FOUNDATION

707 13th Street SE Suite 100 Salem, Oregon 97301
(503) 581-3141

January 30, 1987

Dear Colleague,

My name is Mark Carlton. I am a principal in the Beaverton School District and a doctoral student at Portland State University. The topic of my dissertation deals with teachers' and principals' perceptions of principals' leadership skills. My focus is on principals who have completed the COSA Assessment Center and a random sample of teachers in those principals' schools. As a participant in the Assessment Center, you are one of thirty principals chosen to respond to this survey. The purpose of the survey is to assess your opinions with regard to your own skills and to assess your perception of teacher opinions of your skills. A random sample of teachers in your school will also be surveyed. Since the number of participants is small, it is especially important that you respond.

I would appreciate your taking a few moments to fill out the questionnaire and return the completed form in the enclosed envelope. ALL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL AND INFORMATION WILL BE REPORTED BY CATEGORY OF RESPONDENT RATHER THAN BY NAME OR PLACE. My interpretation of information will be based on codes provided by COSA and not names of respondents.

I would be happy to share the results of my study with you. If you are interested in obtaining information relating to principals' and teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership skills, please feel free to call me at 629-5746. Thank you, in advance, for your assistance.

PLEASE NOTE - Survey is printed on both sides.

Sincerely,

Mark Carlton,
Doctoral Candidate, Portland State University

THE COSA FOUNDATION

707 13th Street SE Suite 100 Salem, Oregon 97301
(503) 581-3141

January 30, 1987

Dear Teacher,

My name is Mark Carlton. I am a principal in the Beaverton School District and a doctoral student at Portland State University. The topic of my dissertation deals with teachers' and principals' perceptions of principals' leadership skills. My focus is on principals who have completed the COSA Assessment Center and a random sample of teachers in those principals' schools. Your principal has completed the Assessment Center and you have been randomly selected to respond to this survey. The purpose of the survey is to assess your opinions with regard to your principal's leadership skills. Your principal will also be surveyed with regard to his or her perception of leadership skills. Since the number of participants is small, it is especially important that you respond.

I would appreciate your taking a few moments to fill out the questionnaire and return the completed form in the enclosed envelope. ALL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL AND INFORMATION WILL BE REPORTED BY CATEGORY OF RESPONDENT RATHER THAN BY NAME OR PLACE. My interpretation of information will be based on codes provided by The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators and not names of respondents.

I would be happy to share the results of my study with you. If you are interested in obtaining information relating to principals' and teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership skills, please feel free to call me at 629-5746. Thank you, in advance, for your assistance.

PLEASE NOTE - Survey is printed on both sides.

Sincerely,

Mark Carlton,

Doctoral Candidate, Portland State University

THE COSA FOUNDATION

707 13th Street SE Suite 100 Salem, Oregon 97301
(503) 581-3141

February 13, 1987

Dear Colleague,

Just a reminder that I have not as yet received the survey I sent you on January 30. Your input is greatly needed for a successful study of your perceptions of principal leadership skills. ALL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL AND INFORMATION WILL BE REPORTED BY CATEGORY OF RESPONDENT RATHER THAN BY NAME OR PLACE. My information is based only on codes provided by COSA.

If you have already mailed your survey, thank you. I realize what a busy time of year this is and how stressful one more request can be. The survey is short and should take no more than a few minutes of your time. I would be very grateful for your contribution. I am enclosing another copy of the survey with a stamped envelope for your convenience. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 629-5746.

Sincerely,

Mark Carlton,
Doctoral Candidate, Portland State University

PLEASE NOTE THAT SURVEY IS PRINTED ON BOTH SIDES.

THE COSA FOUNDATION

707 13th Street SE Suite 100 Salem, Oregon 97301
(503) 581-3141

February 13, 1987

Dear Teacher,

Just a reminder that I have not as yet received the survey I sent you on January 30. Your input is greatly needed for a successful study of teacher perceptions of principal leadership skills. ALL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL AND INFORMATION WILL BE REPORTED BY CATEGORY OF RESPONDENT RATHER THAN BY NAME OR PLACE. My information is based only on codes provided by COSA.

If you have already mailed your survey, thank you. I realize what a busy time of year this is and how stressful one more request can be. The survey is short and should take no more than a few minutes of your time. I would be very grateful for your contribution. I am enclosing another copy of the survey with a stamped envelope for your convenience. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 629-5746.

Sincerely,

Mark Carlton,
Doctoral Candidate, Portland State University

PLEASE NOTE THAT SURVEY IS PRINTED ON BOTH SIDES.