IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
Digital Repository

1989

The impact of a state pilot teacher evaluation system on teacher performance, attitudes, and behaviors

Connie Hathorn
Iowa State University

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17″ x 23″ black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6″ x 9″ black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

The impact of a state pilot teacher evaluation system on teacher performance, attitudes, and behaviors

Hathorn, Connie, Ph.D.

Iowa State University, 1989

The impact of a state pilot teacher evaluation system

on teacher performance, attitudes, and behaviors

by

Connie Hathorn

A Dissertation Submitted to the

Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Educational Administration)

Approved:

In Charge of Major Work

For the Major Department

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Teacher evaluation is one of the most important and challenging tasks facing administrators. The demand for accountability no longer focuses on broad issues such as finance and program management---it has shifted to a concern for teacher performance (Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983). One of the most important issues today centers on state-mandated teacher evaluation. The American public wants to improve our schools and they are willing to pay the bill. Ellett (1986) reported that many states have invested large amount of human, financial, and technical resources to develop comprehensive, legally defensible, and sound teacher evaluation systems. However, despite the millions of dollars and human resources expended annually on teacher evaluation, it still apparently suffers from at least one major shortcoming-there was little data validating that evaluation systems make a difference, that they improve the quality of teaching in America's schools.

There are those who question the utility of teacher evaluation. Sapone (1981) noted that because of the limited research and validation procedures used in current

teacher appraisal and evaluation systems, most teacher
appraisal and evaluation models fall short of their
intended outcomes. He further noted that the limited data
indicate that today's teacher appraisal practices seem to
make little difference in improving teachers' performance.
As recently as five years ago research support this view;
teachers reported that evaluation has little impact on
their performance (Lawton, Hickox, Leithwood, & Musella,
1984). There is a need to examine the efficacy of teacher
evaluation systems.

Background

This study emanated from school reform efforts in
Delaware. The Delaware agenda for School Improvement took
form in 1985 as a State Department of Public Institution
response to legislation enacted by the Delaware General
Assembly. Among reform measures, there was legislation
that called for (a) the development of a state-wide
teacher evaluation system based upon the effective teacher
research, and (b) the training of all Delaware public
school teachers, principals, and instructional supervisors
in the concepts inherent in that research and in the
classroom applications of these concepts.

To meet the first mandate, an advisory committee to the State Board of Education was established during the 1985-86 school year. With technical assistance from Research for Better Schools, Inc. of Philadelphia, the committee developed evaluation instruments and procedures based on effective teaching research.

Activities were initiated during the 1985-86 school year to address the second purpose of the Delaware Agenda: training all public school teachers and administrators for the state-wide evaluation system. This effort was initiated by the Department of Public Instruction with assistance from the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). The (ASCD) videotape, "Effective Teaching for Higher Achievement," served as the foundation for the initial training and the development of further training materials.

During the spring and summer of 1986, nationally-recognized experts prepared a cadre of trainers from each school district. Forty-five hours of training in the areas of academic learning time, classroom organization and management, influencing student behavior, teacher expectations, lesson design, and instructional delivery was provided for the cadre.

In addition to the training of teachers, administrators from each district were required to receive thirty clock-hours of training in order to become evaluators. This training began during the summer of 1986. ASCD provided eighteen of the thirty hours of training in the elements of effective teaching. The remaining twelve hours of training were in the areas of appraisal and supervision provided by Dr. Jim Sweeney, of Iowa State University.

Prior to the start of the 1986-87 school year, a cadre of trainers from each school district returned to their districts to train sub-cadres of teachers and principals, representing each school in the state, in the elements of effective instruction cited above. Three hundred teachers and one hundred and fifty principals were trained in this manner.

During the 1986-87 school year, the sub-cadres of teachers and principals provided a minimum of 18 hours of training to every teacher in the state using the elements of effective instruction. Training was conducted during in-service days and in after school workshops.

At the same time the training was being delivered, the pilot evaluation system was initiated. Four districts agreed to pilot the appraisal process during the school

year 1986-87: Delmar, Smyrna, Christina and New Castle
County Vocational Technical School Districts. After the
first year of the pilot teacher evaluation system, data
were gathered and analyzed. As a result of the findings,
changes in the instruments and procedures were made. It
was also decided to pilot the system for one more year,
incorporating the revisions. Another district, Seaford,
was added to the original four to be piloted during the
1987-88 school year.

Table 1 shows the demographics of the pilot
districts. Christina was the largest with 16,979 students
and Delmar, the smallest had 593 students.

Table 1. Demographic of the pilot districts

	Elementary Principals	Secondary Principals	Elementary Teachers	Secondary Teachers	Student Enrollment
DELMAR	0	2	0	36	593
SMYRNA	3	5	68	97	2913
CHRISTINA	21	21	548	378	16979
NEW CASTLE VO. TECH.	0	18	0	239	3241
SEAFORD	3	5	89	99	3251
Total	27	51	705	849	26977

Statement of the Problem

The evaluation of teachers is not new. On the contrary, it has been conducted for most of this century. What is new and needed, is an intense search to determine the relationship between the effectiveness of the evaluation system and teacher improvement.

Despite the commitment of resources to teacher evaluation we know little about the effect of the evaluation process on teacher performance. There is a lack of information validating the efficacy of teacher evaluation system. The impact of a state's teacher evaluation system was addressed in this study.

Purpose of the Study

It was the primary purpose of this study to determine the impact of a teacher evaluation system on teachers' performance. The secondary purpose was to determine if the appraisal system for teachers in the pilot districts made a difference in teacher attitudes and behaviors.

The study examined the effect to which the implementation of the pilot evaluation system influenced:

1) Teacher perception of their classroom performance and relationship with their supervisor.

2) Teacher attitudes about teaching and the work environment.

3) Teacher behavior in the classroom and workplace.

Research Questions

Below are the questions that guided this study:

1) Did the implementation of the appraisal system make a difference in teachers' performance in the classroom?

2) Did the appraisal system influence teachers' behavior?

3) What effect did the appraisal system have on teachers' attitude?

4) Did the appraisal system have an effect on the relationship between teachers and supervisors?

5) Do elementary teachers have different perceptions of the affect of the appraisal system than do secondary teachers?

6) Do tenured teachers perceive the effect of the appraisal system differently than do non-tenured teachers?

Hypotheses to be Tested

This study was designed to gather data to test the following hypotheses:

1) Teachers will report that the appraisal system was significant more help than hindrance.

2) Elementary teachers will exhibit a significantly more positive perception of the effects of the appraisal system than do secondary teachers.

3) Non-tenured teachers will report a significantly more positive perception of the effects of the appraisal system than do tenured teachers.

Basic Assumptions

The study was predicated on the following basic assumptions:

1) The instruments, survey procedures, and data collection method used in this study were reliable.

2) Respondents to the assessment instrument replied honestly.

3) Teachers' perception of the appraisal system were measured accurately.

4) The statistical procedures used were appropriate for the data and hypotheses.

Delimitation of the Study

The following factors limited the scope of this study.

1) The study was conducted with a limited number of teachers from one state.

2) The selected teachers were obtained from pilot districts.

CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This study was conducted to assess the impact a teacher evaluation system had on teacher performance, attitudes, and behaviors. The field of teacher evaluation is broad, but the literature on its outcomes is limited. This review of literature includes: (1) a brief historical background of teacher evaluation, (2) challenges that affect evaluation systems, (3) impact of evaluation systems on teacher performance, and (4) teacher attitudes, and behaviors.

Teacher Evaluation - Historical Background

The evaluation of teacher performance is influenced by past practices; by movements in government, industry, and research; and by sociological factors influencing the values, sentiments, and preferences of American society (Sweeney & Manatt, 1986). The scrutiny of teachers appears to have been given its initial thrust in the English grammar school of the seventeenth century, when the competency was operationally defined as the teacher's proficiency in classroom and student management.

Earlier literature published by Hoole (1907) pointed out that the burden for learning was placed on the pupil, not the teacher. Educators assumed that all children were equally capable of learning; the differences in student achievement were attributable to the extent to which students applied themselves.

The early 1900s brought drastic changes on the educational scene. The principles of scientific management espoused by Frederick Taylor (1911) persuaded leadership personnel, including educators across the nation that specialization, standardization and other scientific principles were the key to organizational success. School administrators were urged by Bobbitt (1912) and Cubberly (1916) to work toward turning out a standard product with scientific measurement of the product. The child was, tabula rasa, raw material to be molded.

The first study of an instrument to measure teacher efficiency was reported by Boyce (1915). Teacher evaluation instruments of this type presented the supervisor with a list of criteria thought to be related to teacher effectiveness. The supervisor rated the teacher on each criteria by recording a number

representing his/her opinion of the teacher's effectiveness.

During the 1930s and 1940s teacher evaluation reflected the theme that human relation was more influential in producing results than was scientific principles. Social relations, personal characteristics, and non-instructional school services were the three items most frequently used for rating teachers (Reavis and Cooper, 1945). Teacher evaluation in the 1950s was marked by self-evaluation, ceremonial congratulations and neglect. The 1960s and early 1970s were a search for relevance in the classroom and a thirst for individuality and human dignity (Sweeney & Manatt, 1986).

Teacher evaluation programs and practices have been championed by many as the ultimate means for educational improvement during the era of reform. Earlier approaches to increasing the accountability of schools, such as MBO and other results-oriented models have given away to programs and policies targeting improvements in teacher certification, selection and job performance (Riley, 1985). Community and governmental demands for visible education results, effectiveness, and efficiency have resulted in a growing number of legislative mandates designed to make educational systems more accountable.

Teacher accountability has been a major legislative
activity. The public wants evidence that teachers are
doing their job or that efforts are being made to either
improve their performance or remove them (Bolton, 1980).
Various proposals for teacher evaluation have been adopted
by boards of education and state legislatures. These
include career ladders, merit pay, master teachers, mentor
teacher, clinical supervision, and assessment centers
(Bell, 1983; Astuto & Clark, 1985; Allen, 1986).

Unfortunately, despite all these effort there is
still little evidence that teacher evaluation systems are
working. The section which follows will identify some of
the challenges facing teacher evaluation systems.

Challenges of Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation is replete with problems. A
number of factors have contributed to the lack of
effective practices. Two of these impeding factors are
addressed in this section: (1) conflicting purpose, and
(2) teacher acceptance.

Conflict in Purpose

A consistent finding in almost all successful
evaluation systems is the importance of establishing a

clear understanding of the purpose of the system, which must then be reflected in procedures and processes (McGreal, 1983; Wise & Darling-Hammond, 1984).

Although perspectives differ, most writers (Bolton, 1973; Denham, 1987; Harris, 1986; Redfern, 1980) seem to agree that the major purposes of teacher evaluation are to:

1. Provide a process that allows and encourages supervisors and teachers to work together to improve and enhance classroom instructional practices.

2. Provide a process for bringing structured assistance to marginal teachers.

3. Provide a basis for making more rational decisions about the retention, transfer, or dismissal of staff members.

4. Provide a basis for making more informed judgements about differing performance levels for use in compensation programs such as merit pay plans or career ladders programs.

5. Provide information for determining the extent of implementation of knowledge and skills gained during staff development activities and for use in judging the degree of maintenance of the acquired knowledge and skills (p. 2).

An examination of these five purposes reveals that there are conflicting purposes. Popham (1986), a noted expert, contended that teacher evaluation in American education has two separate purposes. The first centers on the improvement of teachers' skills so that they can perform their job more effectively. He noted this type of

evaluation is frequently described as formative
evaluation, for it helps modify teachers' instructional
behaviors. The formative evaluation concentrates on
pinpointing teachers' weakness and strengths toward making
them better teachers. Weber (1987) noted that there
should be no tenure or termination decisions associated
with formative teacher evaluation; it is exclusively
improvement focused.

The second purpose of teacher evaluation, according
to Popham, centers on such decisions as whether to dismiss
a teacher, whether to grant tenure to a teacher, or
whether to place a teacher on probation. Popham noted
this type of evaluation is typically called summative
teacher evaluation because it deals with more final,
summary decisions about teachers. Summative evaluation
may be convenient for ranking teachers according to merit
and eliminating incompetent teachers; these evaluations
models also appeal to advocates of merit pay or master
teacher plans (Weber, 1987).

The two type of systems differ in breadth of
coverage. The formative system exposes teachers' plans
and style in considerably more detail while the summative
systems is less detailed and may reach many more teachers.
They differ in the way in which each recognizes good.

teaching; formative methods use a context-specific, individualized approach; summative methods use a standardized approach. They also differ in the kinds of evidence they gather about teachers' abilities (Stiggins, 1986).

Weber (1987) maintained that it is a mistake to think that one purely formative or summative system can serve the purpose of growth, accountability, school improvement, and personnel decisions. Most districts, however, claim to be meeting all these goals with a single evaluation system, that is, single measurement instrument and a single supervision process.

Blumberg (1974) noted that those responsible for evaluating teachers are required to perform, seemingly, conflicting functions of helping teachers teach and then of appraising that teaching. He described this situation as, "a private cold war."

Teacher Acceptance

Attempts to change teachers and school which have originated from the outside have often met with resistance or rhetoric rather than the reality of change (Bolam, 1985). Bolam observed that resistance to innovation and a lack of commitment may be caused because teachers themselves have played no significant part in the

appraisal system creation and development. Day (1987) noted that where teachers are not involved in decisions regarding the design, process and use of appraisal from the beginning, then it is quite likely that this enterprise upon which so much has been endowed by government and others in terms of finances, resources and expectations will have a negative effect on teacher performance.

Joyce and Showers (1983) noted that the growing recognition that teachers must be empowered may be the harbinger of a new collaborative organizational structure where evaluation is used with discretion. Organizational literature suggests that, under certain conditions, the particular work of an organization (its technology) needs to be protected from outside influence or the work will not be done as well as it otherwise might (Thompson, 1967). This insight has particular relevance for teacher evaluation. When external forces intrude on the work process, the means carefully devised by the workers to attain ends are often upset. For those conducting the work of teaching, the increased inspection of the classroom may well have interrupted the relationship between instructional means and instructional ends (Sheppard & Krietzer, 1987). They further concluded

that when determination of appropriate instructional methods and ends is made outside the classroom, the capacity of teachers to develop appropriate means and. ends for students is diminished.

A number of researchers agree that when the process of teacher evaluation is supportive and collegial, and when the organizational structure is more open than closed, allowing teacher input and rational outcomes, the evaluation process will be perceived by teachers to be more positive (Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985; Wise, Darling-Hammond, & McLaughlin 1985; Blumberg, 1974).

Impact of Evaluation Systems on Teacher Performance

Improving the performance of teachers is accepted by policymakers, business and industry, and educators as a key to improving schools. Each year millons of dollars and human resources are used to enhance teacher evaluation systems. However, there is a major concern about the impact this complex activity has on teacher effectiveness.

Simplistically, it would seem that teacher performance should be reflected in student achievement scores, but a substantial amount of research does not support this. This shortcoming is discussed first

followed by a description of other methods of assessing the effectiveness of the evaluation system.

Use of Student Test Score as a Measure

There is great public and political pressure to include measures of student achievement in the evaluation of teachers (Robinson, 1984). This particular method of using student achievement data to evaluate teachers has gained acceptance increasingly by legislators and professionals, since student outcomes are perceived as evidence of a teacher's effectiveness (Redfield, 1987).

Teacher incentive programs that rely on student achievement gains have been referred to as "new style merit pay" (Bacharch, Lipsky & Shedd, 1984), as opposed to "old style merit pay," which bases teacher pay on principals' evaluations. Wingate (1987) contended that these programs which may appear to be good educational practices on the surface may, in effect, produce little in the way of significant changes in student performance.

Articles by Berk 1987; Haertel 1986; Medley, Coker, & Soar 1984; Glasman and Biniaminov 1981 summarized the problems with using student achievement scores to measure teacher performance as the primary explanation for changes in student performance. These are factors that can

influence a teacher's measured effectiveness which are beyond his/her control. They can be clustered into three categories: (1) student characteristics, (2) school characteristics, and (3) test characteristics.

Student characteristics -- there are at least seven types of student characteristics that can positively or negatively affect student achievement: (1) intelligence, (2) attitude, (3) socioeconomic level, (4) race/ethnicity, (5) sex, (6) age, and (7) attendance. Students possess these characteristics when they enter the classroom; most of them cannot be manipulated by the teacher.

School characteristics -- Student achievement gains can also be affected by the school conditions. School conditions include the following: school library, class size, size of school enrollment, age of building, and expenditures. Instructional personnel can affect student achievement which includes teacher background, personal characteristics, and attitude variables that influence student achievement. These variables include: education degree, teaching experience, race, sex, and undergraduate education type.

Test characteristics can have an effect on what is actually measured, how it is measured, and the extent to which student performance reflects teacher effectiveness.

The pertinent test characteristics are subsumed under three headings: (1) type of achievement test, (2) curricular and instructional validity, and (3) test score metric (Schmidt, 1983).

In conclusion, Berk (1987) pointed out that the inability of research of these highly interactive and interrelated factors indicates that the use of student achievement is an unworthy measure of teacher performance.

Teacher Performance, Attitudes, and Behaviors

If test scores are not valid a measure of teacher performance then performance evaluation may be the best way to assess their impact. But, how effective is the evaluation system?

Over the years considerable research has been conducted to determine the effectiveness of teacher evaluation systems. Different models have been implemented and considerable time and money spent on this complex activity. There have also been efforts to use student test scores as a measure of teacher effectiveness. However, there is little evidence that teacher evaluation systems really make a difference. Given this shortcoming, it seems only reasonable to ask teachers if evaluation systems really work.

During the 1960s educators undoubtedly disagreed among themselves on the exact attributes of a good school, but they generally agreed that, if such attributes could be identified and cultivated, student performance would improve as a result.

For the purpose of this study eleven concepts were chosen to assess teachers' perceptions as to the effect of an evaluation system. Many of these, such as performance and commitment to teaching, directly measure the effect of the evaluation system. Four are indirect measures that represent important intervening variables which influence teacher effectiveness. The four indirect measures and their support in the literature follows: (1) collaboration, (2) sense of efficacy, (3) relationship with supervisor, and (4) expectations.

Collaboration

Rosenholtz (1985) defined collaboration as the extent to which teachers engage in help related exchange. Little (1982 as cited by Smith and Scott, 1987) described the kinds of interactions believed to be related to improved teaching and learning:

1. "Teachers engage in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete and precise talk about teaching practices (as opposed to simply gossiping about teachers, administrators, and

students).

2. "Teachers are frequently observed and provided with useful (if potentially frightening) critques of their teaching".

3. "Teachers plan, design, research, evaluate and prepare teaching materials together".

4. "Teachers teach each other the practice of teaching" (p. 49).

School improvement research supports Rosenholtz views. Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston and Smith's (1979) analysis of performance by students in London's city schools, revealed that the most successful schools were characterized by intellectual sharing, collaborative planning, and collegial work between and among teachers. Over a two-year period, Coleman (1983) administered a project intended to improve the educational climate in nine British Columbia elementary schools. In a preliminary report on the project, he asserted that "norms of collegiality and continuous improvement are clearly essential to school self-renewal."

Other researchers have conducted research which support contribution of collaboration to productivity in schools. Little (1982) conducted case studies of four schools identified as successful on the basis of student achievement on standardized achievement scores, and two schools identified as unsuccessful on the basis of the

same criteria. She found that the successful schools were characterized by teachers talking with one another about teaching, teachers working together to design their classes, and teachers teaching each other about teaching. All of these collaborative practices were absent in the unsuccessful schools.

Little (1986) studied two staff development programs designed by the same specialist and addressing the same teaching practices. One produced substantial long-term results in the schools that participated, whereas the other had little or no effect on its participants. Little attributed the difference in results to differences in the extent to which program coordinators, teachers, and principals worked together to develop and implement the programs. In the unsuccessful program, Little observed, teachers participated in training sessions lasting a few days and then returned to their classrooms to implement the programs on their own. In the successful program, the program coordinator, teachers, and principals worked together on training and implementation. She further observed over a three year period following the initial training session, the coordinator, teachers, and principals all played active roles in refining the program and carrying it out. In essence, the successful program

was the one that incorporated collaborative practices into the manner in which it was carried out.

Ashton and Webb (1986) suggested that schools should; (1) encourage collaborative planning among teachers, (2) require teacher participation in school decisions (3) give teachers extended periods of time to influence student growth, which will likely have a positive effect on teachers' sense of efficacy.

In a recent analysis of 78 schools in Tennessee on attitudes in schools, Rosenholtz (forthcoming) found that teachers felt they continued to learn about their profession throughout their career where the following condition existed: principals and faculties shared values about teaching, and collaboration between principals and faculties and among faculty members was the norm.

Sense of Efficacy

The construct of teachers' sense of efficacy refers to teachers' situation-specific expectation that they can help students learn. Teachers' sense of efficacy, according to Bandura (1981), influences their thoughts and feelings, their choice of activities, the amount of effort they expend and the extent to their persistence in the face of obstacles.

The work of Patricia Ashton and her colleagues (Ashton & Webb, 1982; Ashton, Webb & Doda, 1983; Buhr, Ashton & Coker 1983) at the University of Florida and Sherri Gibson and Myron Dembo (1984) at the University of Southern California has provided great clarity to the understanding of teachers' sense of efficacy and how it is related to teacher productivity.

Ashton et al. (1983) conceptualized teachers' sense of efficacy in a hierarchically organized, multidimensional model that also emphasized the differing dimensions of teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy. They defined teaching efficacy as the way teachers view the general relationship between teaching and learning. Personal teaching efficacy, however, is represented by an integration of teaching efficacy and personal efficacy. They maintained personal teaching efficacy is the best predictor of teacher behavior.

Ashton and Webb (1986) stated that when teachers are successful in getting across a difficult concept to students they believed could not learn it, they may modify both their personal assessment of their ability to teach such students (sense of personal teaching efficacy) and also their belief that such students cannot be taught (sense of teaching efficacy). The experience might also

increase their generalized belief regarding the relationship between action and outcome and their sense of self-efficacy.

In another study, Gibson and Dembo (1984) factor analyzed responses from 208 elementary school teachers on a 30 item Teacher Efficacy Scale. This analysis yielded two factors: The first factor represented a teacher's sense of teaching efficacy or belief that any teacher's ability to bring about change is limited by factors external to the teacher. This includes such factors as home environment, family background, and parental influence. This factor was indicated by such items as: "The hours in my class have little influence on students compared to the influence of their home environment," and "A teacher is very limited in what he/she can achieve because a student's home environment is a large influence on his or her achievement." The second factor represented a teacher's sense of personal teaching efficacy or belief that she/he has the skills and abilities to bring about student learning. This factor indicated items such as "When the grades of my students improve it is usually because I found more effective teaching approaches," and "If a student masters a new math concept quickly, this

might be because I knew the necessary steps in teaching that concept."

A number of researchers noted that a sense of efficacy is an important element linking knowledge and behavior. They maintained that this sense affects performance by generating coping behavior, self-regulation of refractory behavior, perseverance, responses to failure, growth of intrinsic interest and motivation, achievement striving, and career pursuits (Bandura, 1982; Bandura and Schunk, 1981; and DiClemente, 1981). "A sense of efficacy is not an entirely internal construct; it requires a responsive environment that allows for and rewards performance attainment" (Bandura, 1982, p. 140).

Relationship with Supervisor

The supervison of teachers is moving from the role of an inspector toward the role of a friendly critic or collegial observer. The responses to surveys of teachers and supervisors in several countries have indicated that this is the kind of relationship teachers and many supervisors are seeking (Acheson and Gall, 1987). Relationship with supervisor in this study is defined as the extent to which there is rapport and collaboration with supervisor.

Blumberg (1974) maintained that teachers do not mind supervisors telling, suggesting, or criticizing as long as they put equal weight on asking the teacher for information or opinion, or on reflecting on the teachers' performance. Brady (1985) stated that when teachers perceive the supervisor working with them, the entire climate of the school is improved: the staff feels more cohesive, expresses more satisfaction with innovations, and interacts more with one another.

Acheson and Gall (1987) maintained that the goal of supervision is to get the teachers to change their behaviors in ways to improve performance that both they and their supervisor regard as desirable. Sweeney (1982) stated that if principals are to improve teacher performance, it must be in a helping rather than authoritative relationship. He noted that some individuals possess that innate ability to communicate empathy, understanding, and a desire to help, most principals need to work on their behaviors in this regards. Sweeney further maintained that supervisors must be able to exhibit behaviors consistent with sound human relations and management principles. He recommended that supervisors be sensitive to teachers' professional pride, as well as to their attitudes and feelings. To be

successful, supervisors must develop a climate of engendering confidence and trust, and exhibit excellent interpersonal skills.

The level of trust between supervisor and teacher is a major factor in determining the quality of assistance the supervisor will be able to provide to teacher (Acheson & Gall, 1987). Duke and Stiggins (1987) indicated that trust is a key factor in the success of the supervisor in helping teachers to change their behaviors. Although, it is difficult to identify specific supervisors behaviors that promote trust. Several factors have been correlated with trust: confidentiality, how the supervisor deals with complaints, consistency, honesty, and sincerity, and the development of collaboration and collaboration in the supervision process.

Lewis (1985) identified three kinds of trust important in "excellent" organizations which can be applied to teacher-supervision interactions. Teachers must believe that information shared in the supervisory process will not used to hurt them. When this trust is present, teachers feel free to share information and feelings related to their job with supervisors because they believe that their supervisor is honest, trustworthy, and sincere, and that by sharing ideas and information,

problems can be solved. Teachers must also believe that
supervisors have a high degree of respect and integrity.
Such trust may be diminished when teachers feel their
supervisors are "checking up" on them rather than dealing
with them openly and honestly. Lewis furthered maintained
that teachers must believe that written and verbal
agreements between supervisor and teacher can be relied
upon. Teachers seek to verify their trust in their
contradictions between written and verbal statements and
actual performance. High levels of trust are developed
when consistency is seen between what the supervisor
writes and says and what he/she actually does.

Expectations

The most consistent finding in the majority of
studies of school effectiveness is the crucial connection
between expectations and student achievement. Rosenthal
and Jacobson (1968) noted that an expectation is in one
sense a "self-fulfilling prophecy", when teachers express
attitudes of confidence in students' ability to succeed,
they expect students to do their best. For the purpose of
this study, expectations is defined as "the extent to
which teachers expect students to do their best".

A number of researchers have reported a relationship between high expectations and student achievement. Brophy and Evertson (1974) found similar characteristics of teachers in their study of low and high socio-economic status schools. Teachers who were more successful in producing student learning gains tended to have high expectations and assumed personal responsibility for making sure that their students learned. When these teachers encountered difficulties, they viewed them as obstacles to overcome by discovering teaching methods that would succeed, not as indications that the students were incapable of learning. They did not hesitate to use supplementary or alternative methods and materials when they thought it was necessary.

In another study, Edmonds (1979) found that when test scores declined in suburban schools, policies, programs, and instructional methods changes rapidly. On the other hand, when test scores went down in urban schools, nothing changed, and the decline was attributed to race and economic status. In other words, in suburban schools declining test scores were viewed as the fault of the schools, but in urban schools declining test scores were viewed as the fault of the students.

The research on teachers' sense of teaching efficacy is relevant to the understanding of how teachers' expectations and behaviors affect student achievement. Cooper and Good (1983) stated that teachers' sense of teaching efficacy is an expectancy construct. It refers to the learning outcomes teachers expect will result from teaching. They noted that teachers' sense of teaching efficacy is an integrating construct that mediates the relationship between teachers' expectations about the efficacy of teaching specific students and teachers' classroom interactions with these students. Cooper and Good further maintained that when teachers have low expectations regarding the ability of students to learn certain concepts, those expectations will influence their expectation of effectiveness in teaching specific concepts to those students in their class. The low expectations will then be translated into nonteaching behaviors. The teachers may pay less attention to those students, call on them less often to answer questions, wait less time for them to answer questions, give them less assistance in failure situations, criticize them more frequently for incorrect responses, praise them less frequently for correct responses, and demand less work and effort from them.

Summary

Few issues in education are more potentially explosive than teacher evaluation. The evaluation of teachers is a timely and controversial topic. However, almost everyone agrees that some way should be found to ensure the competence of teachers in public schools. Legislatives and state boards of education have instituted some type of teacher evaluation system in almost every state.

Unfortunately, the design, development, implementation, and the evaluation of any innovation intended for public school systems is usually fraught with frustration. The results of teacher evaluation systems, however, may not yield the hoped-for intent because too little thought has been given to the purpose of evaluation and the potential impact it has on teacher performance, attitudes and behaviors.

In the absence of research or validating information to support the impact teacher evaluation has on teacher performance, the following topics were discussed: (1) conflict in purpose, (2) teacher acceptance, (3) use of student test score as a measure, and (4) teacher attitudes and behaviors.

CHAPTER III.   METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the methods and procedures that were used to gather and analyze the data required for this study.   It has been divided into two major sections.   The first section, "Collection of Data," describes the sample, the instrumentation used to collect data for this study, and data collection procedures.   The second section, "Analysis of Data," reviews the analysis of the data · procedures and the statistical methods used in the treatment of the data.

Collection of Data

The Sample

Four school districts participated in this study, all from within the state of Delaware.   Four of the districts, Delmar, Smyrna, Christina, and New Castle County Vocational Technical, had piloted a performance appraisal system during the 1986-87 school year.   During the 1987-88 school year the other school district, Seaford, was added to the original four to be piloted.

Table 2 shows a breakdown of the questionnaires mailed and returned to and from each district.   Five hundred and thirty valid surveys were returned. Five hundred and five respondents completed all the demograhic information, the remaining 25 were included in the analysis where the

appropriate information was needed. New Castle did not
return any of the survey instruments and therefore was not
included in the study.

Table 2. Questionnaires returned by district and
position

	Mailed		Returned & Percentage	
Pilot Districts	Elementary Teachers	Secondary Teachers	Elementary Teachers	Secondary Teachers
DELMAR	0	36	0	32 (88%)
SMYRNA	68	97	31 (45%)	20 (20%)
CHRISTINA	548	378	160 (29%)	92 (24%)
NEW CASTLE	0	239[a]	0	0
SEAFORD	110	99	98 (89%)	72 (73%)
Total	726	610	289 (40%)	216 (35%)

[a] New Castle was deleted from the study

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study was the Delaware
Performance Appraisal System Survey (Teachers). It was
designed specifically for this study after a thorough
examination of the literature and existing instruments

pertinent to teachers' perceptions of teacher evaluation systems. The instrument was modified several times for clarity and concept validity. The preliminary draft of the instrument was mailed to the Director of Teacher Evaluation, Delaware Department of Public Instruction. Further suggestions and revisions to incorporate local terminology and concepts were made by the Delaware Director of Teacher Evaluation.

A description of the instrument follows.

Performance Appraisal System Survey (Teachers) - This thirty-four-item instrument was designed to gather data to assess teachers' perceptions as to the effects of the appraisal system on teacher performance, attitudes, behaviors. Eleven concepts measuring teacher performance, attitudes, and behaviors, were used to obtain this information. The concepts are as follows: (1) Sense of Efficacy, (2) Commitment to Teaching, (3) Reflective, (4) Growth Orientation, (5) Esprit, (6) Sense of Isolation, (7) Collegiality, (8) Relationship with Supervisor, (9) Teacher Performance, (10) Expectations, and (11) Goal Orientation.

Each of the thirty-four items was used to measure one of the eleven concepts. The definition of the concepts and items representing each may be seen in Appendix A. A nine-point Likert scale was used for this instrument.

Respondents were given a statement and asked to indicate the extent the appraisal system "helped" or "hindered" them with the given statement. For example, given the statement, "Be more successful with students," they were asked to respond on the scale below:

Please circle one number
Hindered   Helped
    -4   -3   -2   -1   0   1   2   3   4

The respondents were asked to circle only one number for each statement. If the appraisal system had neither helped nor hindered, the respondents were to indicate by circling "0".

During March 1989, the instrument was field tested utilizing teachers from four of the pilot districts and teachers from other districts within the state of Delaware. A total of fifty teachers were used for the field test: Christina (20 teachers), New Castle Vo-Tech (5 teachers), Seaford (5 teachers), Smyrna (5 teachers), and others (15 teachers).

Table 3 presents the analysis of the reliability test for each concept. The table shows the degree to which the measure yielded similar results for the subjects at different times, i. e., the consistency of concepts. The reliability coefficient alphas for all concepts, except one, indicates that the composites of the concepts are highly free of variance. The concept "sense of

isolation", which had two items, had low correlating

.(14) with an alpha of .24 upon examination it is evident

the two items measure different concepts. The reliability

coefficient alphas were obtained using the Cronbach's

Coefficient Alpha test.

Table 3. Reliability of concepts for rating teacher
perceptions as to the effects of the appraisal
system

CONCEPTS	NUMBER OF ITEMS	ITEM NO.	AVERAGE ITEM CORRELATION	ALPHA
Sense of Efficacy	3	1 2 3	.79	.90
Commit. to Teaching	2	25 26	.88	..94
Reflective	4	4 8 10 9	.80	.92
Growth Orientation	4	13 14 15 16	.82	.92
Esprit	3	24 27 28	.86	.93
Sense of Isolation	2	11 12	.14	.24
Collegiality	6	17 18 19 20 22 23	.78	.92
Relation with Super.	3	29 30 31	.90	.95
Teacher Performance	3	5 6 7 21	.76	.89
Expectations	1	32	1.00	
Goal Orientation	2	34 35	.90	.94

Data Collection Methods and Procedures

On April 7, 1989, the Director of Teacher Evaluation mailed the informational letters and teachers' survey instruments to five representatives, one representative from each pilot district. The informational letter may be seen in Appendix B and the survey instrument in Appendix C. The representative from each district was a volunteer supervisor who took the responsibility for the following: (1) dissemenating an informational letter and the teachers' survey instruments, (2) responding to teacher questions regarding the questionnaires, (3) collecting all completed teacher instruments, and (4) return all survey instruments to the Director of Teacher Evaluation.

Participants were asked to complete the instrument and return them to the representative of their district before May 1, 1989. These procedures obtained results from 505 (37%) of the 1336 teachers in the study. The Delaware Director of Teacher of Evaluation determined that 37% was sufficient for them to make inferences about effects of the appraisal system.

Analysis of Data

After the instruments were completed, they were returned to the Delaware Director of Teacher Evaluation.

Institutional Research Associates, Inc. coded and keypunched the data for computer analysis. Statistical treatment of the data was completed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (Norusis, 1983) computer program. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, means, and standard deviations) were computed to study the relative value of study variables. One-tailed t-test statistical techniques were used to determine significant statistical differences.

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

The primary purpose of this study was to examine
teachers' perceptions of the extent to which an appraisal
system influenced teacher performance, attitudes, and
behaviors. The data reported in this chapter were
compiled from the Delaware Performance Appraisal Survey
(Teachers). The data were collected from 530 Delaware's
teachers, including 289 elementary teachers and 216
secondary teachers, 25 of the teachers did not indicate
whether they were elementary or secondary teachers. These
teachers were employees of one of the four districts that
piloted the Delaware Performance Appraisal System during
1986-87 and 1987-88 school years.

Each individual that completed the survey was asked
to respond to a series of thirty-four statements.
Respondents were to indicate the extent the appraisal
system hindered or helped them with the given statement
and respond on the scale below:

```
Hindered                                    Helped
   -4    -3    -2    -1    0    1    2    3    4
```
If the appraisal system had neither a positive or negative
influence, they were to indicate by circling "0".

Demographic data and other information concerning the
respondents were also collected. Participants indicated

the district in which they taught, level (elementary/
secondary), and status (tenured/non-tenured). Table 4
shows the number of elementary/secondary and tenured/
non-tenured teachers from each district.

Table 4. Number of elementary, secondary, tenured and
non-tenured teachers in the study

Districts	No.	Ele.	Sec.	Tnd	N-Tnd
Seaford	174	98	72	137	32
Smyrna	51	31	20	45	6
Christina	256	160	92	216	38
Delmar	34	0	32	24	9
N. C. Vo-Tech	0	0	0	0	0
(Missing cases)	15[a]		25[b]		23[c]
Total	530	289	216	422	85

[a]Did not indicate which district
[b]Did not indicate elementary or secondary level
[c]Did not indicate tenured or non-tenured

Analysis of Data

The data in this chapter are reported in four
sections related to the effect of the appraisal system on
the followings: (1) the concept(s) measuring teacher
performance, attitudes, and behaviors, (2) teacher
performance, (3) teacher attitudes, and (4) teacher

behaviors. Each section includes the means and standard deviations and the percentage of teachers rating the extent to which the appraisal system helped or hindered.

It was determined that it was important to determine if the effects of the evaluation system were significant. One-tailed t-tests were used to determine if the extent to which the difference was systematic or occurred by chance. These results are reported in this chapter.

Effect of the Appraisal System on Concept(s) Measuring
Teacher Performance, Attitudes, and Behaviors

Table 5 shows the means and standard deviations for the effects of the appraisal system on each concept measuring teacher performance, attitudes, and behaviors. The appraisal system had an equal effect on teacher performance (1.34) and teacher behavior (1.34) and the least effect on teachers' attitudes (.95). However, the appraisal system influenced teachers' reflection (1.69) more than any other concept, which is a measure of teachers' attitudes.

TABLE 5. Distribution of means and standard deviations
          of concept(s) measuring teacher performance,
          attitudes, and behaviors

CONCEPTS	NUMBER	MEAN	S. D.
PERFORMANCE			
1. Teacher Performance	515	1.34*	1.40
ATTITUDES			
1. Sense of Efficacy	518	.92*	1.27
2. Reflective	520	1.69*	1.43
3. Sense of Isolation	512	.38*	1.49
4. Commitment to Teaching	501	.86*	1.83
5. Esprit	498	.99*	1.79
6. Relationship/Supervisor	493	.87*	2.11
Overall	507	.95*	1.65
BEHAVIORS			
1. Growth Orientation	514	1.29*	1.54
2. Collegiality	493	1.12*	1.46
3. Expectations	496	1.33*	1.72
4. Goal Orientation	496	1.61*	1.70
Overall	499	1.34*	1.61

     9 point scale from -4 to + 4:
    -4 to -1 = Hindered
       0   = No hindrance or help
    +4 to +1 = Helped

*.05.

Table 6 shows the percentage of teachers who
indicated the appraisal system helped or hindered their
performance, attitudes, and behaviors. The appraisal
system had the greatest influence was on teacher
performance; sixty-three percent of the teachers indicated

that the system helped improved their teaching. Sixty one-percent reported that the appraisal system positively influenced their behaviors and it improved the attitudes of fifty-four percent.

TABLE 6. Percentages of teachers rating the effects of the appraisal system on the concepts reflecting teacher performance, attitudes and behaviors

ITEMS	TEACHERS ALL	HIND	PERCENTAGE NO INFLUN	HELP
PERFORMANCE				
1. Teacher Performance	515	2%	35%	63%
ATTITUDES				
1. Sense of Efficacy	518	2%	49%	49%
2. Reflective	520	2%	25%	73%
3. Sense of Isolation	512	11%	57%	32%
4. Commitment to Teaching	501	8%	41%	51%
5. Esprit	498	9%	42%	49%
6. Relationship/supervisor	493	14%	31%	55%
Overall Attitudes	507	7%	39%	54%
BEHAVIORS				
1. Growth Orientation	514	4%	35%	61%
2. Collegiality	493	4%	39%	57%
3. Expectations	496	3%	39%	58%
4. Goal Orientation	496	3%	31%	66%
Overall Behaviors	499	3%	36%	61%

```
9 point scale from  -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0     = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped
```

Teacher Performance

Teacher performance was assessed by rating four items. The definition and items representing this concept may be seen in Appendix A.

Table 7 shows the means and standard deviations on the four items measuring teacher performance. Teachers reported that teacher performance was helped by the appraisal system. The items, utilizing teaching strategies more effectively and utilize new or different teaching methods had the highest mean scores (1.65) and (1.50) respectively.

Table 7. Distribution of means and standard deviations to the effect of the appraisal system on teacher performance

ITEMS	N	MEAN	S. D.
1. Utilize teaching strategies more effectively	521	1.65*	1.44
2. Teach specific skills to students	522	1.09*	1.33
3. Teach specific concepts to students	521	1.10*	1.36

*.05.

Table 7.   Continued

ITEMS	N	MEAN	S. D.
4. Utilize new or different teaching methods	495	1.50*	1.46
Overall	515	1.34*	1.40

9 point scale from -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 8 shows the percentage of teachers who indicated the appraisal system helped or hindered their performance. Sixty-three percent of the teachers perceived that the appraisal system had a positive effect on their performance. Nearly three-fourths of all teachers indicated that appraisal system positively influenced their performance in two areas: (1) utilizing teaching strategies more effectively, and   (2) utilizing new or different teaching strategies.

Table 8. Rating percentages of teachers to the effect of
          the appraisal system on teacher performance

ITEMS	TEACHERS K-12	HIND	NO INFLUEN	HELP
1. Utilize teaching strategies more effectively	521	2%	25%	73%
2. Teach specific skills to students	522	2%	45%	53%
3. Teach specific concepts to students	521	2%	45%	53%
4. Utilize new or different teaching methods	495	2%	26%	72%
Overall	515	2%	35%	63%

9 point scale from -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Teacher Attitudes

Six items were used to assess the effects the
appraisal system had on teacher attitudes. The definitions
and items representing each concept may be seen in Appendix
A.

Table 9 shows the means and standard deviations of the
ratings by teachers reflecting their perceptions of how the
appraisal system affected their attitudes. The appraisal

system had a positive overall effect on attitudes (1.03).

The appraisal system had the greatest on teacher reflection

(1.69) and the least effect on teacher isolation (.38).

Table 9.   Distribution of means and standard deviations as
            to the effect of the appraisal system on
            teachers' attitudes

ITEMS	N	MEAN	S. D.
SENSE OF EFFICACY			
1. Be more successful with students	520	1.13*	1.35
2. Be more successful with below-average students	516	.88*	1.26
3. Reach more unmotivated students	519	.77*	1.21
Overall sense of efficacy	518	.92*	1.27
REFLECTIVE			
4. Reflect on strategies after teaching the lesson	521	1.70*	1.40
5. Think more about teaching strategies	522	1.86*	1.44
6. Reflect prior to selecting teaching strategies	518	1.67*	1.45
7. Reflect on strategies during the lesson	518	1.52*	1.44
Overall reflective	520	1.69*	1.43

*.05.

Table 9.   Continued

ITEMS	N	MEAN	S. D.
SENSE OF ISOLATION			
8. Feel isolated in the classroom	504	.03	1.25
9. Feel that someone understands my classroom situation	520	.73*	1.73
Overall sense of isolation	512	.38*	1.49
COMMITMENT			
10. Want to stay in teaching	504	.84*	1.82
11. Satisfied with decision to remain in teaching as a profession	498	.88*	1.83
Overall commitment	501	.86*	1.83
ESPRIT			
12. Feel pride in being a teacher	504	1.10*	1.81
13. Enjoy being in the classroom	495	1.03*	1.84
14. Feel enthused about t'ching each day	494	.84*	1.73
Overall esprit	498	.99*	1.79

Table 9. Continued

ITEMS	N	MEAN	S. D.
RELATION/SUPERVISOR			
15. See adm'strator as a helping person	493	.86*	2.11
16. See the administrator as interested in what I do	492	.98*	2.11
17. Trust my administrator	494	.79*	2.12
Overall relationship	493	.87*	2.11
OVERALL	508	1.03*	1.64

9 point scale from −4 to + 4:
−4 to −1 = Hindered
   0   = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 10 shows the effects of the appraisal system on teacher attitudes in percentages. Fifty-four percent of the teachers indicated that the appraisal system had a positive effect on them. If one deletes "feeling isolated" where seventy-two percent indicated the system made no difference, then fifty-seven percent of the teachers reported the appraisal system was positive. Only seven percent of the teachers saw the appraisal system as a hindrance and thirty-nine percent indicated it made no difference. The most powerful effect of the appraisal

system was influencing teachers to think more about
teaching (79%). Seventy percent or more of the teachers
also indicated that the appraisal system helped them in
three other areas: (1) reflect on strategies after
teaching the lesson, (2) reflect prior to selecting
teaching strategies, and (3) reflect on strategies during
the lesson.

Table 10. Percentages of teachers rating the effects of
the appraisal system on teachers' attitudes

ITEMS	TEACHERS ALL	PERCENTAGE HIND	PERCENTAGE NO	PERCENTAGE HELP
SENSE OF EFFICACY				
1. Be more successful with students	520	2%	43%	55%
2. Be more successful with below-average students	516	2%	49%	49%
3. Reach more unmotivated students	519	2%	55%	43%
	---	---	---	---
Overall sense of efficacy	518	2%	49%	49%
REFLECTIVE				
4. Reflect on strategies after the lesson	518	2%	28%	70%
5. Think more about teaching strategies	522	2%	19%	79%

Table 10. Continued

ITEMS	TEACHERS ALL	PERCENTAGE		
		HIND	NO	HELP
6. Reflect prior to selecting teaching strategies	518	2%	24%	74%
7. Reflect on strategies during the lesson	518	2%	28%	70%
Overall reflective	520	2%	25%	73%
SENSE OF ISOLATION				
8. Feel isolated in the classroom	504	10%	72%	18%
9. Feel someone understands my classroom situation	520	11%	42%	47%
Overall sense of isolation	512	11%	57%	32%
COMMITMENT				
10. Want to stay in teaching	504	9%	43%	48%
11. Feel satisfied with decision to remain in teaching as a profession	498	8%	40%	52%
Overall commitment	501	8%	41%	51%
ESPRIT				
12. Feel pride in being a teacher	504	7%	39%	54%
13. Enjoy being in the classroom	495	8%	40%	52%
14. Feel enthused about teaching each day	494	9%	43%	48%
Overall esprit	498	9%	42%	49%

Table 10. Continued

	ITEMS	TEACHERS ALL	PERCENTAGE		
			HIND	NO	HELP
	RELATION/SUPERVISOR				
15.	See the administrator as a helping person	493	15%	30%	55%
16.	See the administrator as interested in what I do	492	13%	27%	60%
17.	Trust my administrator	494	14%	35%	51%
Overall relationship		493	14%	31%	55%
	OVERALL	508	7%	39%	54%

9 point scale from -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
  0   = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Teacher Behavior

The category teacher behavior reflects selected
behaviors associated with effctiveness and productivity in
and out of the classroom. Teachers' perception related to
the effect of the appraisal system on their behaviors was
assessed by self-rating of thirteen items representing four
concepts. The definitions and items representing each
concept may be seen in Appendix A.

Table 11 shows the means and standard deviations for
the effects of the appraisal system on teachers' behaviors.

The appraisal system had a positive overall effect on teachers' behaviors (1.27). Its most powerful influence was helping teachers to strive for excellence in teaching (1.68) and to set goals to improve their teaching (1.65).

Table 11. Distribution of means and standard deviations the effects of the appraisal system on teachers' behaviors

ITEMS	N	MEAN	S. D.
GROWTH ORIENTATION			
1. Utilize professional development activities to improve my teaching	523	1.16*	1.49
2. Want to learn more about teaching	517	1.08*	1.60
3. Set some goals for myself to improve my teaching	522	1.65*	1.56
4. Participate in activities to improve my teaching	494	1.28*	1.52
Overall growth orientation	514	1.29*	1.54
COLLEGIALITY			
5. Share ideas about teaching with other teachers	496	1.29*	1.48
6. Share my instructional materials with other teachers	494	1.11*	1.44
7. Obtain ideas about teaching from other teachers	494	1.27*	1.47
8. Obtain instructional materials from other teachers	492	.97*	1.42

*.05.

Table 11. Continued

ITEMS	N	MEAN	S. D.
9. Receive suggestions for improvement from other teachers	494	.87*	1.33
10. Receive suggestions for improvement from administrator	489	1.23*	1.66
Overall collegiality	493	1.12*	1.46
EXPECTATIONS 11. Set high standards for student achievement	496	1.33*	1.72
GOAL ORIENTATION 12. Strive to enhance student learning	495	1.54*	1.66
13. Strive for excellence in teaching	496	1.68*	1.73
Overall goal orientation	496	1.61*	1.70
OVERALL	500	1.27*	1.54

9 point scale from   -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 12 shows the effects of the appraisal system on

teachers' behaviors in percentages. Sixty-one percent of

the teachers indicated that the appraisal system had

positive effects on their behaviors. Seventy-three percent

of the teachers indicated that the appraisal system helped

them to set some goals to improve their teaching. While

sixty-five percent of the teachers indicated that the
system helped them to receive suggestions for improvement
from the administrator, only forty-eight percent indicated
they got help for improvement from other teachers.

Table 12. Percentages of teachers rating the effects of
the appraisal system on teacher behaviors

ITEMS	TEACHERS ALL	PERCENTAGE		
		HIND	NO	HELP
GROWTH ORIENTATION 1. Utilize professional development activities to improve my teaching	523	4%	39%	57%
2. Want to learn more about teaching	517	4%	42%	54%
3. Set some goals for myself to improve my teaching	522	3%	24%	73%
4. Participate in activities to improve my teaching	494	3%	33%	64%
Overall growth orientation	514	4%	35%	61%
COLLEGIALITY 5. Share ideas about teaching with other teachers	496	2%	36%	62%
6. Share my instructional materials with other teachers	494	3%	40%	57%
7. Obtain ideas about teaching from other teachers	494	3%	35%	62%

Table 12. Continued

	ITEMS	TEACHERS ALL	PERCENTAGE HIND	NO	HELP
8.	Obtain instruct. materials from other teachers	492	3%	43%	54%
9.	Receive suggestions for improvement from other teachers	494	3%	49%	48%
10.	Receive suggestions for improvement from administrator	489	6%	29%	65%
		---	--	---	---
Overall collegiality		493	4%	39%	57%
	EXPECTATIONS				
11.	Set high standards for student achievement	496	3%	39%	58%
	GOAL ORIENTATION				
12.	Strive to enhance student learning	495	2%	33%	65%
13.	Strive for excellence in teaching	496	3%	29%	68%
		-----	--	----	----
Overall growth orientation		496	3%	31%	66%
	OVERALL	500	3%	36%	61%

```
    9 point scale from   -4 to + 4:
   -4 to -1 = Hindered
      0     = No hindrance or help
   +4 to +1 = Helped
```

The analysis of the data for school level (elementary/ secondary) and status (tenured/non-tenured) teachers may be seen in Appendix D. The administrators' perceptions related to the effects of the appraisal system were also surveyed but were not received in time to be included in this study. The concepts and items representing each, survey instrument, and the tabulation may be seen in Appendix E, F, and G respectively.

Hypotheses Testing

The three hypotheses which provided focus for this study are stated in the operational form below and in the null later in the chapter.

Hypothesis: 1

Teachers will report that the appraisal system was significantly more of help than a hindrance in influencing their performance, attitudes, and behaviors..

Hypothesis: 2

Elementary teachers will exhibit a significantly more positive perception of the effects of the appraisal system than do secondary teachers.

Hypothesis: 3

Non-tenured teachers will report a significantly
more positive perception of the effects of the
appraisal system than do tenured teachers.

Below are the null hypotheses and the results of
hypotheses testing. To test hypotheses and the effects of
the appraisal system on teachers, as reflected in the
scores of the eleven concepts which reflect teacher
performance, attitudes and behaviors were analyzed using
t-tests. It was determined a priori that seven of the
eleven scores must be significantly different to concluded
that the evaluation system made a difference. Where
significance was found in seven or more, the hypothesis was
rejected. Significance was set at the .05 level.

Ho 1   There will be no significant difference in the
        perception of teachers as to whether the
        appraisal system helped or hindered teacher
        performance, attitudes, and behaviors.

This hypothesis was developed to determine if the
appraisal system made a difference in teacher performance,
attitudes, and behaviors. Table 13 shows that the
evaluation system had a significant effect in all eleven
concepts which reflect teacher performance, attitudes, and
behaviors. Since the appraisal system had a significant

effect on each of the eleven concepts the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 13. Summary of means and pooled t-value for teachers' perceptions of the effects of the appraisal system

CONCEPTS	N	MEAN	POOLED t-value	CONCLUSION
Sense of Efficacy	521	.92	18.24*	REJECT
Commitment	518	.86	10.74*	REJECT
Reflective	521	1.69	30.26*	REJECT
Growth Orientation	517	1.29	21.50*	REJECT
Esprit	497	.99	13.02*	REJECT
Isolation	512	.38	7.65*	REJECT
Collegiality	492	1.12	19.77*	REJECT
Relationship	493	.87	9.39*	REJECT
Teacher Performance	515	1.34	25.09*	REJECT
Expectations	496	1.33	17.36*	REJECT
Goal Orientation	496	1.61	21.74*	REJECT

*.05.

Ho 2   There is no significant difference between the perceptions of elementary teachers and secondary teachers related to the effects of the appraisal system.

This hypothesis was developed to determine if the perception of elementary and secondary teachers was significantly different as to the effects of the appraisal system on teacher performance, attitudes, and behaviors. Table 14 shows there were significant differences in the perceptions of elementary and secondary teachers as to

the effects of the appraisal system on their sense of efficacy, reflection, performance, expectations, and goal orientation. Elementary teachers saw the system as significantly more helpful in each of these areas. Since perceptions of teachers at the elementary and secondary level differed on only five of the eleven concepts, the hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 14. Summary of means and pooled t-value for elementary vs secondary teachers' perceptions as to the effect of the appraisal system

CONCEPTS	ELE MEAN	SEC MEAN	POOLED t-value	CONCLUSION
Sense of Efficacy	1.04	.79	2.42*	REJECT
Commitment	1.00	.72	1.67	FAIL TO REJECT
Reflective	1.80	1.57	2.06*	REJECT
Growth Orientation	1.41	1.20	1.70	FAIL TO REJECT
Esprit	1.21	.87	1.60	FAIL TO REJECT
Isolation	.47	.33	1.31	FAIL TO REJECT
Collegiality	1.20	1.05	1.25	FAIL TO REJECT
Relationship	.86	.85	.04	FAIL TO REJECT
Teacher Performance	1.44	1.18	2.35*	REJECT
Expectations	1.54	1.10	2.82*	REJECT
Goal Orientation	1.80	1.39	2.72*	REJECT

Elementary Teachers (N=281)
Secondary Teachers (N=212)

*.05.

Ho 3   There is no significant difference between the perceptions of tenured and non-tenured teachers as to the effects of the appraisal system.

This hypothesis was developed to determine if the perception of tenured and non-tenured teachers as to the effects of the appraisal system on teacher performance, attitudes, and behaviors was significantly different. Table 15 shows that there were significant differences in the perceptions of tenured and non-tenured teachers related to the effects of the appraisal system on nine of the eleven concepts. The table also shows that non-tenured teachers were more positively influenced in eight of the nine areas of difference. For one concept (reflective), tenured teachers said the appraisal system was more help than did non-tenured teachers. Since the differences exceed the predetermined level, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 15. Summary of means and pooled t-value for tenured vs non-tenured teachers' perceptions as to the effect of the appraisal system

CONCEPTS	TND MEAN	N-TND MEAN	POOLED t-value	CONCLUSION
Sense of Efficacy	.87	1.18	2.25*	REJECT
Commitment	.78	1.30	2.40*	REJECT
Reflective	1.80	1.57	2.06*	FAIL TO REJECT
Growth Orientation	1.24	1.56	1.93	FAIL TO REJECT
Esprit	.95	1.30	1.66	FAIL TO REJECT
Isolation	.34	.76	2.87*	REJECT
Collegiality	1.07	1.41	2.19*	REJECT
Relationship	.72	1.49	3.00*	REJECT
Teacher Performance	1.28	1.60	2.24*	REJECT
Expectations	1.24	1.86	2.95*	REJECT
Goal Orientation	1.52	2.09	2.82*	REJECT
Tenured Teachers	(N=81)			
Non-tenured Teachers	(N=406)			

*.05.

CHAPTER V.

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the effects of a statewide pilot appraisal system on teacher performance, attitudes, and behaviors.

In this chapter, conclusions based on the findings are summarized and discussed and recommendations submitted for further research. The chapter has been organized into the following sections: (1) summary, (2) discussion, (3) limitations, and (4) recommendations for future research.

Summary

The participants in this study were from four school districts that piloted the Delaware Performance Appraisal System during the 1985-86 and 1986-87 school year. The attendance center levels were elementary and secondary schools.

Of the 1336 surveys mailed 505 were validly completed, producing a 37% return rate. Of the 726 elementary teachers surveyed 40% returned the surveys, 35% of the 610 secondary teachers returned the surveys.

The questionnaire was comprised of thirty-four statements. The respondents were asked to respond whether

the appraisal system "helped" or "hindered", using a nine point Likert scale, with a range of -4 to +4. These thirty-four items were utilized to measure eleven concepts. The concepts and survey items representing each were clustered into three areas: (1) teacher performance, (2) teacher attitudes, and (3) teacher behaviors.

The study yielded many interesting findings. Seven major findings are presented and discussed below.

1. <u>All but one of the items on the instrument had a mean score significantly different from zero in a positive direction, indicating that the appraisal system was a positive influence in terms of teacher performance, attitudes, and behaviors.</u> The one item not significant reflected the concept "teacher isolation". Teachers indicated that the appraisal system was not influential in helping them to feel less isolated in the classroom. Finding that 33 of 34 items reflecting improved performance, attitudes, and behaviors were significantly positive provides great support for those who advocate teacher evaluation in schools.

2. <u>Teachers reported that the appraisal system helped them to improve their teaching performance.</u> Over seventy percent of the teachers indicated that the appraisal system helped them to use teaching strategies more effectively and utilize new and different teaching

methods. Only two percent of the teachers indicated that the appraisal system was a hindrance while over fifty percent reported that appraisal system helped them to become better at teaching specific concepts and skills to students. These are important findings and indicate that teaching can be improved through teacher evaluation.

3. A majority of the teachers indicated that the appraisal system had an overall positive effect on their attitudes and there were some very dramatic effects on some important attitudes. The appraisal system was very influential in helping teachers to be more reflective, seventy percent or more of the teachers indicated that the appraisal system influenced them to: (1) think more about teaching, (2) reflect prior to selecting teaching strategies, and (3) reflect on strategies during and after teaching the lesson. Fifty-five percent of the teachers indicated the appraisal system helped them to be more successful in working with students. The appraisal system also improved teachers' attitudes toward their administrator. Sixty percent of the teachers reported the appraisal system helped them to feel that the administrator was interested in what they were doing. Fifty-five percent indicated that the system helped them to see the administrator as being a helping person, while fifty-one percent reported that the appraisal system helped them to increase trust in their administrator.

These findings are very encouraging and provide support
that the evaluation of teachers does make a difference in
how teachers see their school and can improve
relationships with others.

4. The appraisal system had a positive effect on
teacher behaviors. Sixty-one percent of the teachers
reported the appraisal system had a positive influence on
what they did in the classroom and school. The appraisal
system was most influential in helping teachers set goals
to improve their teaching, seventy-three percent indicated
it was a positive influence in this area. Sixty percent
or more of the teachers indicated that the appraisal
system helped them to: (1) participate in activities to
improve their teaching, (2) share ideas about teaching
with other teachers, (3) obtain ideas about teaching from
other teachers, (4) receive suggestions for improvement
from administrator, (5) strive to enhance student
learning, and (6) strive for excellence in teaching. Not
only did the appraisal system improve teaching
effectiveness and attitudes it helped them to do things
that enhance productivity and relationships.

5. Elementary and secondary teachers did not perceive
the appraisal system significantly different. There was
no significant difference in the perceptions of elementary
and secondary teachers, although elementary teachers
reported a somewhat more positive perception of

the effects of the appraisal system than did secondary teachers. This contradicts the commonly held notion that secondary teachers (and principals) are more negative than elementary teachers.

6. <u>Non-tenured teachers were significantly more positive in their perception of the effects of the evaluation system</u>. Non-tenured teachers indicated the appraisal system was significantly more helpful in improving teaching performance. The appraisal system was more influential in helping non-tenured teachers to: (1) utiltize teaching strategies more effectively, (2) teach specific skills and concepts, and (3) utilize new or different teaching methods. The appraisal system also positively influenced non-tenured teachers' attitudes more than it did tenured teachers. Non-tenured teachers were significantly more likely to indicate that the appraisal system had a positive effect on their attitudes particularly being more reflective. They were significantly more likely to say it helped them to: (1) think more about teaching strategies, (2) reflect prior to selecting teaching strategies, and (3) reflect during and after teaching the lesson. Non-tenured teachers were more likely to report that the appraisal system had a positive effect on behaviors related to productivity. The appraisal system had a more powerful influence on non-tenured teachers' goal orientation,

growth orientation, expectations, and other important behaviors. It appears then that evaluation systems are helpful to all teachers but they are perhaps less helpful to veteran teachers.

7. A very small percentage of the teachers perceived the appraisal system as a hindrance for improving their teaching performance, attitudes, and behaviors. Two percent of the teachers indicated that the appraisal system hindered them in improving their teaching performance, three percent reported that it hindered the improvement of their behaviors, and seven percent indicated it had a negative effect on their attitudes. It is encouraging that such a small percent saw the system in a negative light. It is also possible that these teachers were involved in remediation or their job security was threatened by the evaluation system.

Discussion

The study provides substantial evidence that teacher evaluation can be a positive force for improving teaching and the school environment; teachers indicated that the system had a positive influence on their performance. The evaluation system helped teachers to utilize teaching strategies, methods, and techniques to see that students

learn new concepts and skills. These exciting findings contradict earlier findings by Payne and Hulme (1987), who found that the evaluation system did not contribute to improved teacher performance.

The findings also revealed that the evaluation system had a positive effect on teacher attitudes, particularly on teacher reflection. This gives support to McLaughlin and Pfeifer's (1988) notion that teacher evaluation can stimulate teachers to think about their practices and can be a powerful force for self-improvement.

The appraisal system also had a positive impact on the relationship between teachers and administrators. Teachers indicated that the evaluation system helped them to see the administrator as a helping person interested in what they were doing. This appears to be very promising. Sweeney (1982) noted that for supervisors to be successful they must develop a climate of confidence and trust.

Teacher behaviors in and out of the classroom which can have an impact on student achievement were positively influenced by the appraisal system. The appraisal system, for example, influenced teachers to set high standards for student achievement. Brophy and Everston (1974) noted that teachers are more successful in producing student learning gains when they have high expectations and assume personal responsibility for making sure that their students learn.

The study provides evidence that these and other important behaviors were positively influenced by the system. An appraisal system can stimulate interaction between and among teachers. For example, "lending and borrowing materials" and "asking for advice" were increased and teachers "engaged in frequent and precise talk about teaching practices". These behaviors tend to enhance teacher knowledge, skills, and job satisfaction and promote collegiality.

It is not surprising that the appraisal system did not decrease teachers' sense of isolation in the classroom, supervisor's visits were probably too infrequent to influence that condition. This not only supports the findings of Bird and Little (1985), that isolation and interdependence among teachers are the prevailing patterns in most schools, it reinforces that evaluation as it is presently practiced may not rectify this condition.

While elementary teachers were generally more positive about the system than secondary teachers the results were not significantly different. This is somewhat heartening because many feel that secondary teachers are much more negative than elementary teachers. It is not surprising to find that non-tenured teachers saw the evaluation system as more helpful. One must remember that teachers who have just entered the profession

probably need more help and therefore are more likely to see an evaluation system in a more positive light.

Limitations

The following factors limited the scope of the investigation:

(1)   Teachers from only four pilot districts in one state were included in the study.

(2)   The content and quality of the effective teaching and evaluator training and other factors influencing the system were difficult to determine and therefore not controlled for in the study.

Recommendations for Further Research

Below are the suggestions and recommendations for further research.

(1)   This study was conducted in just one state and four districts. To provide data of greater utility to those who design appraisal systems further studies in other districts and states should be conducted.

(2)   Other items measuring the impact of an
      appraisal system on teacher performance,
      attitudes and behaviors should be developed to
      test the findings in this study and further
      explore the effects of an appraisal system.

(3)   Interviews to explore teacher perceptions in
      greater depth should be considered.

(4)   Supervisor perceptions were not included in the
      study because the data were received too late.
      Supervisor perceptions should be investigated
      in future studies.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acheson, K. & Gall, M. (1987). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers: Pre-service and in-service applications (Second Edition). New York: Longman.

Allen, T. (1986). Identifying behaviors of the master teacher. Ph.D. Dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames, IA.

Ashton, P., & Webb, R. (1982). Teachers' sense of efficacy: Toward an ecological model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New York.

Ashton, P., & Webb, R. (1986). Making a difference: Teacher sense of efficacy and student achievement. New York: Longman.

Ashton, P., Webb, R., & Doda, N. (1983). A study of teachers' sense of efficacy. (Final Report, Executive Summary). Gainsville: University of Florida.

Astuto, T. & Clark, D. (1985). Merit pay for teachers: An analysis of State Policy Options. College of Education, Kansas State University. Manhattan, KS.

Bacharch, S. Lipsky, D. & Shedd, J. (1984). Merit pay and its alternatives. OAP Monograph.

Bandura, A. (1981). Self-referent thought: A developmental analysis of self-efficacy. In J. Flavell & L. Ross (Eds.), Social cognative Development. Frontiers and possible future (pp. 200-239). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in agency. American Psychologist, 37, 122-147.

Bandura, A. & Schunk, D. H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through roximal self-motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 586-598.

Bell, T. (1983). The peer review model for managing a career ladder/master teacher/performance pay program for elementary and secondary schools. Washington, D. C.: Department of Education

Berk, R. A. (1987). Fifty reasons why student achievement gain does not mean teacher effectiveness. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1, 307-325.

Bird, Tom and Little, Judith Warren. (1985). "How Schools Organize the Teaching Occupation." The Elementary School Journal, EJ 337 995, 493-511.

Blumberg, A. (1974). Supervisors and teachers: A Private Cold War. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Bobbitt, J. F. (1912). The elimination of waste in education. Elementary School Teachers, 12, 260.

Bolam, C. (1985). Teacher evaluation and school improvement. Teachers College Record, 86, 38-45.

Bolton, D. (1973). Selection and evaluation of teachers. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Bolton, D. L. (1980). Evaluation of administrative personnel in school system. New York: Teacher College Press.

Boyce, A. C. (1915). Methods of measuring teachers' efficiency. In The Fourteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brady, L. (1985). The supportiveness of the principal in school-based curriculum development. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17, 95-97.

Brophy, J. E., Everston, C. M. (1974). The Texas teacher effectiveness project: Presentation of non-linear relations and summary discussion. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Buhr, D., Ashton, P., & Coker, L. (1983). Teachers' sense of efficacy: A self or norm-referenced construct. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Coleman, P. (1983). Towards more effective schools; improving school climate. Administrator's Notebook, 31, 4.

Cooper, H. & Good, T. (1983). Pygomalion grows up. Studies in the expectation communication process. White Plains, New York: Longman.

Cubberly, E. (1916). Public school administration. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A., & Pease, S. R. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of literature. Review of Educational Research, 53, 285-328.

Day, C. (1987). The Relevance and use of classroom research literature to the appraisal of teachers in classrooms: Issues of teacher learning and changes. Paper Presented to the British Educational Research Association, Manchester, England. (ERIC ED 295 996)

Denham, C. (1987). A perspective on the major purposes and basic procedures for teacher evaluation. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1, 29-32.

DiClemente, C. C. (1981). Self-efficacy and smoking cessation maintenance: A preliminary report. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 5, 175-187.

Duke, D. & Stiggins, R. (1987). Teacher evaluation: Five keys to growth. Washington: National Education Association.

Edmonds, R. R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37, 15-18.

Ellett, C. D. (1986). Emerging teacher performance assessment practices: Implications for the instruction supervision role of school principal. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional Leadership: Concepts and Controversies. Benton: Allyn and Bacon.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 569-582.

Glasman, N. S. & Biniaminov, I. (1981). Input-output analysis of schools. Review of Educational Research, 51, 509-539.

Haertel, E. (1986). The valid use of student performance measures for teacher evaluation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 8, 45-60.

Harris, B. (1986). Developmental teacher evaluation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hoole, C. (1907). Scholastic discipline. American Journal of Education, 17, 293-324.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1983). Power in staff development through research on training. Alexandria VA: ASCD.

Lawton, S. B., Hickox, E. S., Leithwood, K. A. & Musella, D. F. (1984). Performance appraisal of certified educational staff in Ontario Schools. Non-Technical Report. Ontario Ministry of Education, Toronto, Canada.

Lewis, J. (1985). Excellent organizations: How to develop and manage them using theory Z. New York: J. J. Wilkerson.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 325-40.

Little, J. W. (1986). Seductive images and organizational realities in professional development. In Ann Liberman (Ed.), Rethinking School Improvement: Research, Craft, and Concept. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

McGreal, T. (1983). Successful teacher evaluation. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexander, VA. (ERIC ED 236 776)

McLaughlin, M. W. and Pfeifer, R. S. (1988). Teacher Evaluation. Improvement, Accountability and Effective Learning. New York: Teacher College Press, Columbia University.

Medley, D., Coker, H. & Soar, R. (1984). Measurement-based evaluation of teacher performance. New York: Longman.

Norusis, M. J. (1983). User's guide SPSSX. New York: McGraw Hill.

Payne, D. & Hulme, G. (1987). The development, pilot implementation, and formative evaluation of a "Grass Roots" teacher evaluation system-or-the search for better lawnmower. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Evaluation Association, Boston, MA.

Popham, W. J. (1986). Teacher evaluation: Mission impossible. Principal, 65, 56-58.

Reavis, R. & Cooper S. (1945). The measurement of teaching ability. Journal of Experimental Education, 15, 2-6.

Redfern, G. B. (1980). Evaluating teachers and administrators: A performance objectives approach. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Redfield, D. (1987). A comparision of the perspectives of teachers, students, parents and principals concerning the influences of teaching in students and the use of student outcomes to evaluate teaching. (ERIC ED 290 765)

Riley, V. L. (1985). The politics of teacher evaluation. In J. Millman (Ed.), Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills CA: Sage Publications.

Robinson, G. E. (1984). Incentive pay for teachers: An analysis of approaches. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1985). Political myths about education reform: Lessons from research on teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 349-55.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (Forthcoming) Teachers' workplace: a study of social organizations. New York: Longman.

Rosenthal R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, B. & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effect on children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sapone, C. V. (1981). Appraisal and evaluation system: perception of administrator and teacher. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 592-596.

Schmidt, W. H. (1983). Content biases in achievement tests. Journal of Educational Measurement, 20, 165-178.

Sheppard, L. & Krietzer, A. (1987). The Texas teacher test. Educational Researcher, 16, 22-31.

Smith, S. C. & Scott, J. J. (1987). From isolation to collaboration: Improving the work environment of teaching. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management: University of Oregon.

Stiggins, R. J. (1986). Teacher evaluation: Accountability and growth systems--different purposes: NASSP Bulletin, 70, 51-58.

Stiggins, R. J. & Bridgeford, N. (1985). Performance assessment for teacher development. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7, 85-97.

Sweeney, J. (1982). Planning makes a difference: Improving the post-observation conference. NASSP Bulletin, 66, 28-30.

Sweeney, J. & Manatt, R. (1986). Teacher evaluation. In Ronald A. Berk (Ed.), Performance Assessment: Methods and Applications. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press:

Taylor, F. W. (1911). The principles of scientific management. New York: Harper and Row.

Thompson, J. D. (1967). Organizational in action. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Weber, J. R. (1987). Teacher evaluation on a strategy for improving instruction. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

Wingate, T. (1987). Merit pay for teachers. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Wise, A. & Darling-Hammond, L. (1984). Teacher evaluation and teacher professionalism. Educational Leadership, 42, 28-33.

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L. & McLaughlin, M. W. (1985). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation for the help and guidance offered by numerous of people - especially to the teachers who completed the questionnaires.

Sincere appreciation is extended to my doctoral committee, Dr. Fred Duffelmeyer, Dr. Jerry Herman, Dr. Patricia Keith, Dr. Richard Manatt, and Dr. James Sweeney, whose counsel, encouragement and support made this study a success.

A special word of thanks is due for Dr. James Sweeney for giving generously of his time and suggestions during the planning and writing of this study. His commitment to excellence and high expectations encouraged me to be committed to the challenge and made this dream a reality.

To my mother, family, and friends for their support and encouragement, I am deeply grateful.

Finally to the Almighty for granting me the opportunity and the ability to complete this journey.

APPENDIX A –

DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS (TEACHERS)

Definition of concepts and items representing each.

Sense of Efficacy - the extent to which teachers think that they have a positive effect on student achievement.

1. Be more successful with students (1)

2. Be more successful with below-average students (2)

3. Reach unmotivated students (3)

Commitment to Teaching as a Profession - the extent to which teachers are committed to teaching as a profession.

1. Want to stay in teaching (25)

2. Feel satisfied with my decision to remain in teaching as a profession (26)

Reflective - the extent to which teachers think about or analyze their instructional techniques and strategies.

1. Reflect on strategies after teaching the lesson (4)

2. Think more about teaching strategies (8)

3. Reflect on strategies during the lesson (10)

4. Reflect prior to selecting teaching strategies (9)

Growth Orientation - the extent to which teachers seek growth to improve instructional effectiveness.

1. Utilize professional development activities to improve my teaching (13)

2. Want to learn more about teaching (14)

3. Set some goals for myself to improve my teaching (15)

4. Participate in activities to improve my teaching (16)

Esprit - the extent to which teachers find their job stimulating and satisfying.

1. Feel pride in being a teacher (24)

2. Enjoy being in the classroom (27)

3. Feel enthused about teaching each day (28)

Sense of Isolation - the extent to which teachers feel that they have no one to turn to for help.

1. Feel isolated in the classroom (11)

2. Feel that someone else understands my classroom situation (12)

Collegiality - the extent to which teachers share or receive help from others.

1. Share ideas about teaching with other teachers (17)

2. Share my instructional materials with other teachers (18)

3. Receive suggestions for improvement from other teachers (22)

4. Obtain ideas about teaching from other teachers (19)

5. Obtain instructional materials from other teachers (20)

6. Receive suggestions for improvement from administrator (23)

Relationship with Supervisor - the extent to which there is a rapport and collaboration with supervisor.

1. See the administrator as a helping person (29)

2. See the administrator as interested in what I do (30)

3. Trust my administrator (31)

Teacher Performance - the extent to which teachers perceive that their performance is effective in the classroom.

1. Utilize teaching strategies more effectively (5)

2. Teach specific skills to students (6)

3. Utilize new or different teaching methods (21)

4. Teach specific concepts to students (7)

Expectations - the extent to which teachers expect students to do their best.

1. Set high standards for student achievement (32)

Goal Orientation - the extent to which teachers are committed to making a difference.

1. Strive for excellence in teaching (34)

2. Strive to enhance student learning (33)

APPENDIX   B -

INFORMATIONAL LETTER TO TEACHERS

STATE OF **DELAWARE**

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
THE TOWNSEND BUILDING
P. O. BOX 1402
DOVER, DELAWARE 19903

WILLIAM B. KEENE
STATE SUPERINTENDENT
SIDNEY B. COLLISON
JOHN J. RYAN
DEPUTY STATE SUPERINTENDENTS

April 3, 1989

JAMES L. SPARTZ
PRIMO V. TOCCAFONDI
ASSISTANT STATE SUPERINTENDENTS

Dear Teachers,

During the past two years through surveys and interviews, you have told me that the Delaware Performance Appraisal System has had an influence on you. I would like to know how and to what extent the Delaware Performance Appraisal System has made a difference.

Each of the statements in the attached survey asks you to indicate the extent to which the appraisal system has influenced you as a teacher. Please read the statement and circle the number which reflects the positive or negative influence of the appraisal system. Only one number should be circled for each statement. If the appraisal system has had neither a positive nor negative influence, please circle "0".

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robin R. Taylor
State Supervisor, Staff Evaluation

RRT:dal

APPENDIX   C -

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

DELAWARE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM SURVEY

Please circle your response.

In which district do you teach?   Christina   Smyrna   New Castle Vo-Technical   Seaford   Delmar

Are you tenured?   Yes   No

At which level do you teach?   Elementary   Secondary

To what extent has the appraisal system influenced you to do the following?   **Please circle your response**

		Hindered								Helped
1.	Be more successful with students	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
2.	Be more successful with below-average students	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
3.	Reach unmotivated students	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
4.	Reflect on strategies after teaching a lesson	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
5.	Utilize teaching strategies more effectively	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
6.	Teach specific skills to students	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
7.	Teach specific concepts to students	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
8.	Think more about teaching strategies	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
9.	Reflect prior to selecting teaching strategies	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
10.	Reflect on strategies during the lesson	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
11.	Feel isolated in the classroom	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
12.	Feel that someone else understands my classroom situation	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
13.	Utilize professional development activities to improve my teaching	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
14.	Want to learn more about teaching	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
15.	Set some goals for myself to improve my teaching	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4

		Hindered							Helped	
16.	Participate in activities to improve my teaching	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
17.	Share ideas about teaching with other teachers	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
18.	Share my instructional materials with other teachers	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
19.	Obtain ideas about teaching from other teachers	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
20.	Obtain instructional materials from other teachers	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
21.	Utilize new or different teaching methods	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
22.	Receive suggestions for improvement from other teachers	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
23.	Receive suggestions for improvement from an administrator	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
24.	Feel pride in being a teacher	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
25.	Want to stay in teaching	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
26.	Feel satisfied with my decision to remain in teaching as a profession	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
27.	Enjoy being in the classroom	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
28.	Feel enthused about teaching each day	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
29.	See the administrator as a helping person	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
30.	See the administrator as interested in what I do	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
31.	Trust my administrator	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
32.	Set high standards for student achievement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
33.	Strive to enhance student learning	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
34.	Strive for excellence in teaching	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4

91

APPENDIX D –

ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, TENURED, AND NON-TENURED TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Table 16. Distribution of means and standard deviations of
          teacher performance, attitudes, and behaviors as
          rated by elementary and secondary teachers

CONCEPTS	N	LEVEL	MEAN	S. D.
TEACHER PERFORMANCE				
1. Teacher Performance	1120	ELE	1.45	1.46
	860	SEC	1.20	1.31
TEACHER ATTITUDE				
1. Sense of Efficacy	848	ELE	1.04*	1.31
	648	SEC	.78*	1.20
2. Reflective	1139	ELE	1.80*	1.50
	859	SEC	1.56*	1.33
3. Sense of Isolation	559	ELE	.43*	1.52
	426	SEC	.31*	1.45
4. Commitment	529	ELE	1.00*	1.91
	418	SEC	.74*	1.73
5. Esprit	796	ELE	1.12*	1.90
	630	SEC	.87*	1.68
6. Relationship/Supervisor	796	ELE	.87*	2.24
	627	SEC	.87*	2.00
TEACHER BEHAVIOR				
1. Growth Orientation	1121	ELE	1.39*	1.55
	857	SEC	1.20*	1.52
2. Collegiality	1588	ELE	1.17*	1.53
	1049	SEC	1.02*	1.38
3. Expectations	267	ELE	1.54*	1.93
	210	SEC	1.01*	1.57
4. Goal Orientation	533	ELE	1.81*	1.78
	420	SEC	1.40*	1.57

9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
  0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

*.05.

Table 17. Distribution of means and standard deviations of teacher performance, attitudes, and behaviors as rated by tenured and non-tenured teachers

CONCEPTS	N	TENURED	MEAN	S. D.
TEACHER PERFORMANCE				
1. Teacher Performance	1661	YES	1.28*	1.38
	329	NO	1.59*	1.48
TEACHER ATTITUDE				
1. Sense of Efficacy	1253	YES	.87*	1.27
	249	NO	1.17*	1.26
2. Reflective	1673	YES	1.62*	1.42
	333	NO	2.08*	1.43
3. Sense of Isolation	826	YES	.63*	1.49
	162	NO	.74*	1.48
4. Commitment	793	YES	.78*	1.81
	157	NO	1.29*	1.89
5. Esprit	1194	YES	.96*	1.79
	235	NO	1.288	1.90
6. Relationship/Supervisor	1191	YES	.758	2.15
	242	NO	1.47*	2.01
TEACHER BEHAVIOR				
1. Growth Orientation	1656	YES	1.24*	1.53
	329	NO	1.55*	1.55
2. Collegiality	2064	YES	1.07*	1.46
	468	NO	1.38*	1.49
3. Expectations	399	YES	1.24*	1.74
	79	NO	1.87*	1.65
4. Goal Orientation	796	YES	1.53*	1.70
	158	NO	2.10*	1.63

9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
  0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

*.05.

Table 18. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on teacher
performance as rated by elementary and secondary
teachers

ITEMS	LEVEL	N	MEAN	S. D.
*Teacher Performance				
1. Utilize teaching strategies more effectively	ELE	285	1.77*	1.50
	SEC	216	1.49*	1.35
2. Teach specific skills to students	ELE	285	1.16*	1.35
	SEC	217	.98*	1.28
3. Teach specific concepts to students	ELE	284	1.19*	1.43
	SEC	217	.98*	1.28
4. Utilize new or different teaching methods	ELE	266	1.67*	1.54
	SEC	210	1.33*	1.32
Overall	ELE	1120	1.45*	1.46
	SEC	860	1.20*	1.31

9 point scale from -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped

*.05.

Table 19. Percentages of teachers rating the effects of
          the appraisal system on teacher performance as
          rated by elementary and secondary teachers

ITEMS	LEVEL	PERCENTAGES		
		HIND	NO INFLUN	HELP
*Teacher Performance				
1. Utilize teaching strategies more effectively	ELE	1%	22%	77%
	SEC	2%	28%	70%
2. Teach specific skills to students	ELE	1%	43%	56%
	SEC	2%	48%	50%
3. Teach specific concepts to students	ELE	2%	42%	56%
	SEC	2%	49%	49%
4. Utilize new or different teaching methods	ELE	3%	21%	76%
	SEC	2%	30%	68%
Overall	ELE	2%	32%	66%
	SEC	2%	39%	59%

```
 9 point scale from  -4 to + 4:
-4 to  -1 = Hindered
   0      = No hindrance or help
+4 to  +1 = Helped
```

Table 20. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on teacher
performance as rated by tenured and non-tenured
teachers

ITEMS	TENURED	N	MEAN	S. D.
*Teacher Performance				
1. Utilize teaching strategies more effectively	YES NO	421 85	1.59* 1.98*	1.42 1.49
2. Teach specific skills to students	YES NO	421 83	1.03* 1.37*	1.31 1.41
3. Teach specific concepts to students	YES NO	420 83	1.04* 1.37*	1.34 1.49
4. Utilize new or different teaching methods	YES NO	399 78	1.47* 1.67*	1.43 1.54
Overall	YES NO	1661 329	1.28* 1.59*	1.38 1.48

9 point scale from -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
  0   = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped

*.05.

Table 21.   Percentages of teachers rating the effects of
            the appraisal system on teacher performance as
            rated by tenured and non-tenured

| ITEMS | TENURED | PERCENTAGES | | |
		HIND	NO INFLUN	HELP
*Teacher Performance				
1. Utilize teaching strategies more effectively	YES	2%	26%	72%
	NO	1%	19%	80%
2. Teach specific skills to students	YES	2%	48%	50%
	NO	1%	37%	64%
3. Teach specific concepts to students	YES	1%	48%	51%
	NO	4%	33%	63%
4. Utilize new or different teaching methods	YES	2%	26%	72%
	NO	4%	22%	74%
Overall	YES	2%	37%	61%
	NO	3%	28%	69%

    9 point scale from -4 to + 4:
   -4 to -1 = Hindered
      0   = No hindrance or help
   +4 to +1 = Helped

Table 22. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on teacher
attitudes as rated by elementary and secondary
teachers

ITEMS	LEVEL	NO.	MEAN	S. D.
*Sense of Efficacy				
1. Be more successful with students	ELE	283	1.24*	1.38
	SEC	217	.97*	1.28
2. Be more successful with below-average students	ELE	282	1.00*	1.32
	SEC	215	.74*	1.17
3. Reach more unmotivated students	ELE	283	.89*	1.24
	SEC	216	.63*	1.16
*Reflective				
4. Reflect on strategies after teaching the lesson	ELE	286	1.81*	1.49
	SEC	215	1.57*	1.27
5. Think more about teaching strategies	ELE	286	1.92*	1.52
	SEC	216	1.78*	1.34
6. Reflect prior to selecting teaching strategies	ELE	285	1.78*	1.51
	SEC	213	1.56*	1.36
7. Reflect on strategies during the lesson	ELE	282	1.67*	1.48
	SEC	215	1.33*	1.35
*Sense of Isolation				
8. Feel isolated in the classroom	ELE	276	.09	1.30
	SEC	209	-.05	1.22
9. Feel someone understands my classroom situation	ELE	283	.77*	1.73
	SEC	217	.67*	1.70
*Commitment				
10. Want to stay in teaching	ELE	266	.99*	1.89
	SEC	208	.70*	1.75

*.05.

Table 22. Continued

	ITEMS	LEVEL	N	MEAN	S. D.
11.	Feel satisfied with decision to remain in teaching as a profession	ELE SEC	263 210	1.00* .78*	1.93 1.71
	*Esprit				
12.	Feel pride in being a teacher	ELE SEC	265 210	1.28* .91*	1.88 1.70
13.	Enjoy being in the classroom	ELE SEC	266 210	1.12* .98*	1.97 1.70
14.	Feel enthused about teaching each day	ELE SEC	265 210	.96* .73*	1.84 1.63
	*Relation/Supervisor				
15.	See the administrator as a helping person	ELE SEC	264 210	.91* .80*	2.26 1.95
16.	See the administrator as interested in what I do	ELE SEC	266 208	.93* 1.02*	2.27 1.97
17.	Trust my administrator	ELE SEC	266 209	.77* .78*	2.19 2.08
	Overall	ELE SEC	4667 3608	1.13* .93*	1.71 1.55

```
 9 point scale from  -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0     = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped
```

Table 23. Percentages of teachers rating the effects of
the appraisal system on teacher attitudes as
rated by elementary and secondary teachers

		PERCENTAGE		
ITEMS	LEVEL	HIND	NO INFLUN	HELP
Sense of Efficacy				
1. Be more successful with students	ELE SEC	2% 2%	38% 47%	60% 51%
2. Be more successful with below-average students	ELE SEC	2% 2%	45% 56%	53% 42%
3. Reach more unmotivated students	ELE SEC	2% 3%	49% 61%	49% 36%
*Reflective 4. Reflect on strategies after teaching the lesson	ELE SEC	4% 2%	19% 25%	77% 73%
5. Think more about teaching strategies	ELE SEC	3% 1%	17% 21%	80% 78%
6. Reflect prior to selecting teaching strategies	ELE SEC	3% 1%	22% 28%	75% 71%
7. Reflect on strategies during the lesson	ELE SEC	3% 2%	24% 36%	73% 62%
*Sense of Isolation 8. Feel isolated in the classroom	ELE SEC	10% 12%	75% 71%	15% 17%
9. Feel someone understands my classroom situation	ELE SEC	11% 12%	41% 44%	48% 44%
*Commitment 10. Want to stay in teaching	ELE SEC	8% 14%	40% 43%	52% 43%
11. Feel satisfied with decision to remain in teaching as a profession	ELE SEC	10% 11%	36% 44%	54% 45%

Table 23. Continued

ITEMS	LEVEL	PERCENTAGE		
		HIND	NO INFLU	HELP
*Esprit				
12. Feel pride in being a teacher	ELE	8%	33%	59%
	SEC	8%	45%	47%
13. Enjoy being in the classroom	ELE	8%	37%	55%
	SEC	8%	43%	49%
14. Feel enthused about teaching each day	ELE	9%	38%	53%
	SEC	9%	47%	44%
*Relation/Supervisor				
15. See the administrator as a helping person	ELE	17%	24%	59%
	SEC	13%	37%	50%
16. See the administrator as interested in what I do	ELE	16%	26%	58%
	SEC	11%	30%	59%
17. Trust my administrator	ELE	16%	31%	53%
	SEC	13%	39%	48%
Overall	ELE	8%	35%	57%
	SEC	8%	42%	50%

```
 9 point scale from  -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
 0      = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped
```

Table 24. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on teacher
attitudes as rated by tenured and non-tenured
teachers

ITEMS	TENURED	N	MEAN	S. D.
*Sense of Efficacy				
1. Be more successful with students	YES NO	419 83	1.06* 1.45*	1.35 1.30
2. Be more successful with below-average students	YES NO	416 83	.83* 1.17*	1.26 1.27
3. Reach more unmotivated students	YES NO	418 83	.73* .90*	1.20 1.22
*Reflective				
4. Reflect on strategies after teaching the lesson	YES NO	419 84	1.60* 2.23*	1.38 1.43
5. Think more about teaching strategies	YES NO	421 83	1.80* 2.19*	1.45 1.38
6. Reflect prior to selecting teaching strategies	YES NO	417 83	1.60* 2.08*	1.43 1.47
7. Reflect on strategies during the lesson	YES NO	416 83	1.47* 1.81*	1.43 1.45
*Sense of Isolation				
8. Feel isolated in the classroom	YES NO	407 79	- .02 .32*	1.25 1.27
9. Feel that someone un'stands my classroom situation	YES NO	419 83	.65* 1.15*	1.73 1.68
*Commitment				
10. Want to stay in teaching	YES NO	397 79	.76* 1.30*	1.80 1.87
11. Satisfied with decision to remainin teaching as a profession	YES NO	396 78	.81* 1.27*	1.81 1.91

*.05.

Table 24.   Continued

	ITEMS	TENURED	N	MEAN	S. D.
	*Esprit				
12.	Feel pride in being a teacher	YES NO	398 78	1.05* 1.42*	1.80 1.87
13.	Enjoy being in the classroom	YES NO	398 79	1.01* 1.29*	1.82 2.03
14.	Feel enthused about teaching each day	YES NO	398 78	.82* 1.12*	1.74 1.81
	*Relation/Supervisor				
15.	See the administrator as a helping person	YES NO	397 78	.74* 1.41*	2.15 2.06
16.	See the administrator as interested in what I do	YES NO	396 85	.87* 1.53*	2.14 2.06
17.	Trust my administrator	YES NO	398 79	.63* 1.48*	2.16 1.91
	Overall	YES NO	6933 1078	.92* 1.42*	1.64 1.65

9 point scale from -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 25. Percentages of teachers rating the effects of
the appraisal system on teacher attitudes as
rated by tenured and non-tenured teachers

ITEMS	TENURED	PERCENTAGES		
		HIND	NO INFLUN	HELP
*Sense of Efficacy				
1. Be more successful with students	YES	2%	44%	54%
	NO	0%	35%	65%
2. Be more successful with below-average students	YES	3%	51%	46%
	NO	1%	42%	57%
3. Reach more unmotivated students	YES	2%	56%	42%
	NO	1%	53%	46%
*Reflective				
4. Reflect on strategies after teaching the lesson	YES	3%	24%	73%
	NO	4%	13%	83%
5. Think more about teaching strategies	YES	2%	20%	78%
	NO	1%	12%	87%
6. Reflect prior to selecting teaching strategies	YES	2%	26%	72%
	NO	1%	17%	82%
7. Reflect on strategies during the lesson	YES	3%	29%	68%
	NO	4%	18%	78%
*Sense of Isolation				
8. Feel isolated in the classroom	YES	11%	73%	16%
	NO	8%	67%	25%
9. Feel someone understands my classroom situation	YES	12%	43%	45%
	NO	6%	37%	57%
*Commitment				
10. Want to stay in teaching	YES	11%	43%	46%
	NO	5%	38%	57%
11. Feel satisfied with decision to remain in teaching as a profession	YES	11%	41%	48%
	NO	6%	35%	59%

Table 25. Continued

		PERECENTAGES		
ITEMS	TENURED	HIND	NO	HELP
*Esprit				
12. Feel pride in being a teacher	YES	8%	40%	52%
	NO	6%	33%	61%
13. Enjoy being in the classroom	YES	9%	40%	51%
	NO	6%	38%	56%
14. Feel enthused about teaching each day	YES	9%	43%	48%
	NO	6%	38%	56%
*Relation/Supervisor				
15. See the administrator as a helping person	YES	17%	32%	51%
	NO	11%	15%	74%
16. See the administrator as interested in what I do	YES	15%	29%	56%
	NO	9%	17%	74%
17. Trust my administrator	YES	16%	37%	47%
	NO	7%	22%	71%
Overall	YES	8%	39%	53%
	NO	5%	31%	64%

9 point scale from -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 26. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on teacher
behaviors as rated by elementary and secondary
teachers

ITEMS	LEVEL	N	MEAN	S. D.
*Growth Orientation				
1. Utilize professional development activities to improve my teaching	ELE SEC	286 217	1.29* 1.00*	1.46 1.52
2. Want to learn more about teaching	ELE SEC	283 215	1.11* 1.07*	1.63 1.54
3. Set some goals for myself to improve my teaching	ELE SEC	286 216	1.78* 1.51*	1.53 1.59
4. Participate in activities to improve my teaching	ELE SEC	266 209	1.38* 1.20*	1.58 1.42
*Collegiality				
5. Share ideas about teaching with other teachers	ELE SEC	267 210	1.32* 1.29*	1.54 1.41
6. Share my instructional materials with other teachers	ELE SEC	266 209	1.21* 1.00*	1.51 1.32
7. Obtain ideas about t'ching from other teachers	ELE SEC	265 210	1.32* 1.23*	1.54 1.39
8. Obtain instru'nal mater'ls from other teachers	ELE SEC	263 210	1.03* .92*	1.46 1.37
9. Receive suggestions for improvement from other teachers	ELE SEC	265 210	.95* .78*	1.38 1.26
10. Receive suggestions for improvement from administrator	ELE SEC	262 210	1.32* 1.15*	1.75 1.58

*.05.

Table 26. Continued

ITEMS	LEVEL	N	MEAN	S. D.
*Expectations				
11. Set high standards for student achievement	ELE	267	1.54*	1.83
	SEC	210	1.01*	1.57
*Goal Orientation				
12. Strive to enhance student learning	ELE	266	1.74*	1.72
	SEC	210	1.33*	1.53
13. Strive for excellence in teaching	ELE	267	1.87*	1.83
	SEC	210	1.46*	1.60
Overall	ELE	3509	1.37*	1.60
	SEC	2536	1.15*	1.47

9 point scale from -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 27. Percentages of teachers the effects of the
           appraisal system on teacher behavior as
           rated by elementary and secondary
           teachers

ITEMS	LEVEL	PERCENTAGES		
		HIND	NO INFLUN	HELP
*Growth Orientation				
1. Utilize professional development activities to improve my teaching	ELE	3%	35%	62%
	SEC	5%	44%	41%
2. Want to learn more about teaching	ELE	5%	40%	55%
	SEC	3%	44%	53%
3. Set some goals for myself to improve my teaching	ELE	3%	22%	75%
	SEC	3%	25%	72%
4. Participate in activities to improve my teaching	ELE	3%	31%	66%
	SEC	2%	35%	62%
*Collegiality				
5. Share ideas about teaching with other teachers	ELE	3%	34%	63%
	SEC	2%	36%	62%
6. Share my instructional materials with other teachers	ELE	3%	37%	60%
	SEC	2%	44%	54%
7. Obtain ideas about t'ching from other teachers	ELE	3%	34%	63%
	SEC	2%	34%	64%
8. Obtain instru'nal mater'ls from other teachers	ELE	3%	40%	57%
	SEC	3%	47%	50%
9. Receive suggestions for improvement from other teachers	ELE	2%	45%	53%
	SEC	3%	53%	44%
10. Receive suggestions for improvement from administrator	ELE	6%	26%	68%
	SEC	7%	32%	61%

Table 27. Continued

| | | | PERCENTAGES | | |
ITEMS	LEVEL	HIND	NO INFLUN	HELP
*Expectations				
11. Set high standards for student achievement	ELE SEC	3% 3%	35% 45%	62% 52%
*Goal Orientation				
12. Strive to enhance student learning	ELE SEC	2% 2%	29% 37%	69% 61%
13. Strive for excellence in teaching	ELE SEC	3% 2%	25% 34%	72% 64%
Overall	ELE SEC	3% 3%	33% 39%	64 58

9 point scale from −4 to + 4:
−4 to −1 = Hindered
   0   = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 28. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on teacher
behaviors as rated by tenured and non-tenured
teachers

ITEMS	TENURED	N	MEAN	S. D.
*Growth Orientation				
1. Utilize professional development activities to improve my teaching	YES	422	1.13*	1.47
	NO	83	1.25*	1.61
2. Want to learn more about teaching	YES	417	.99*	1.58
	NO	83	1.53*	1.58
3. Set some goals for myself to improve my teaching	YES	420	1.59*	1.56
	NO	84	1.99*	1.54
4. Participate in activities to improve my teaching	YES	397	1.26*	1.51
	NO	79	1.42*	1.48
* Collegiality				
5. Share ideas about teaching with other teachers	YES	399	1.28*	1.48
	NO	79	1.35*	1.51
6. Share my instructional materials with other teachers	YES	399	1.09*	1.43
	NO	79	1.21*	1.44
7. Obtain ideas about t'ching from other teachers	YES	398	1.21*	1.47
	NO	78	1.59*	1.49
8. Obtain instru'nal mater'ls from other teachers	YES	396	.91*	1.41
	NO	78	1.24*	1.46
9. Receive suggestions for improvement from other teachers	YES	398	.83*	1.31
	NO	78	1.03*	1.43
10. Receive suggestions for improvement from administrator	YES	395	1.11*	1.66
	NO	76	1.88*	1.62

*.05.

Table 28. Continued

	ITEMS	TENURED	N	MEAN	S. D.
	*Expectations				
11.	Set high standards for student achievement	YES NO	399 79	1.24* 1.87*	1.74 1.65
	*Goal Orientation				
12.	Strive to enhance student learning	YES NO	397 79	1.46* 2.04*	1.65 1.59
13.	Strive for excellence in teaching	YES NO	399 79	1.59* 2.15*	1.75 1.66
	Overall	YES NO	4915 1034	1.21* 1.58*	1.54 1.54

```
 9 point scale from  -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0     = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped
```

Table 29. Percentages of teachers rating the effects of
the appraisal system on teacher behavior as
rated by tenured and non-tenured teachers

ITEMS	TENURED	PERCENTAGES		
		HIND	NO INFLUN	HELP
*Growth Orientation				
1. Utilize professional development activities to improve my teaching	YES	4%	40%	56%
	NO	4%	39%	67%
2. Want to learn more about teaching	YES	4%	44%	52%
	NO	2%	32%	64%
3. Set some goals for myself to improve my teaching	YES	3%	25%	72%
	NO	2%	19%	79%
4. Participate in activities to improve my teaching	YES	3%	34%	63%
	NO	2%	27%	71%
*Collegiality				
5. Share ideas about teaching with other teachers	YES	2%	35%	63%
	NO	1%	37%	62%
6. Share my instructional materials with other teachers	YES	3%	41%	56%
	NO	1%	39%	60%
7. Obtain ideas about teaching from other teachers	YES	3%	36%	61%
	NO	1%	27%	62%
8. Obtain instru'nal mater'ls from other teachers	YES	4%	44%	52%
	NO	1%	39%	60%
9. Receive suggestions for improvement from other teachers	YES	3%	49%	48%
	NO	1%	46%	53%
10. Receive suggestions for improvement from administrator	YES	7%	31%	62%
	NO	4%	14%	82%

Table 29. Continued

| ITEMS | TENURED | PERCENTAGES | | |
		HIND	NO INFLUN	HELP
*Expectations				
11. Set high standards for student achievement	YES	3%	42%	55%
	NO	1%	28%	71%
* Goal Orientation				
12. Strive to enhance student learning	YES	2%	35%	63%
	NO	1%	21%	78%
13. Strive for excellence in teaching	YES	3%	32%	65%
	NO	2%	18%	80%
Overall	YES	3%	38%	59
	NO	2%	30%	68

```
9 point scale from  -4 to + 4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0     = No hindrance or help
+4 to +1 = Helped
```

APPENDIX E -

DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS (ADMINISTRATORS)

DEFINITION OF CONCEPTS

Goal Orientation - the extent to which teachers are committed to makimg a difference.

1. Teachers striving for excellence in teaching (1)

2. Teachers striving to enhance student learning (13)

3. Teachers striving to improve the school (23)

Sense of Efficacy - the extent to which supervisors think that they have a positive effect on teacher performance.

1. Teachers see you as a helping person (2)

2. Your feeling that you have played a role in improving the quality of teaching in your school (14)

3. Your feeling that you have promoted a sense of professionalism within the staff (24)

Instructional Orientation - the extent to which teachers emphasize or focus on instructional matters.

1. Teachers discussing instructional matters with one another(4)

2. Teachers discussing instructional matters with you (3)

3. Teachers' level of concern about instructional matters (16)

Expectations - the extent to which the supervisors expect the best of teachers.

1. Your expectation for top quality performance in the classroom (5)

2. Your setting high standards for student achievement (28)

Esprit - the extent to which teachers find their job stimulating and satisfying.

1. A sense of pride within your teaching staff (6)

2. Morale of your teaching staff (17)

Commitment - the extent to which the supervisors are committed to a leadership position in schools.

1. Your desire to remain in a instructional leadership position (7)

Growth Orientation - the extent to which teachers seek to grow to improve their instructional effectiveness.

1. Teachers striving to improve their teaching techniques (8)

Esprit - the extent to which the supervisors find their job to be stimulating and satisfying.

1. Your feeling proud of being a building level administrator (9)

2. Your enjoyment in your role as a building level administrator (18)

3. Your enthusiasm about coming to work each day (25)

Relationship With Teachers - the extent to which there is a rapport and collaboration with teachers.

1. Collaborating with teachers on matters relating to students (10)

2. Collaborating with teachers on matters relating to instruction (11)

3. Your maintaining a positive working relationship with your teachers (20)

4. Your maintaining trust with your teachers (26)

5. Your obtaining ideas about teaching from other teachers (19)

Growth Orientation - the extent to which supervisors seek
to grow to improve their instructional leadership
effectiveness.

1. Your desire to learn more about teaching and
   supervision (21)

2. Your setting goals for yourself (15)

Teacher Performance - the extent to which supervisors
perceive that teacher performance enhance student
learning.

1. Teachers presenting lesson effectively (12)

2. Teachers utilizing effective techniques in the
   classroom (22)

3. Teachers planning for lesson (27)

APPENDIX F -

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

DELAWARE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM SURVEY

Please circle your response.

In which district are you an administrator?   Christina   Smyrna   New Castle Vo-Technical   Seaford   Delmar

Which type of school?   Elementary   Middle   Secondary   Special

Are you   Principal?   Assistant Principal?

Years experience as a building level administrator?   _____

To what extent has the appraisal system helped or hindered with the following?   **Please circle your response**

	Hindered								Helped
1. Teachers striving for excellence in teaching	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
2. Teachers seeing you as a helping person	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
3. Teachers discussing instructional matters with you	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
4. Teachers discussing instructional matters with one another	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
5. Your expectations for quality performance in the classroom	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
6. A sense of pride within your teaching staff	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
7. Your desire to remain in an instructional leadership position	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
8. Teachers striving to improve their teaching techniques	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
9. Your feeling proud of being a building level administrator	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
10. Collaborating with teachers on matters relating to students	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
11. Collaborating with teachers on matters relating to instruction	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
12. Teachers presenting a lesson effectively	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4

		Hindered							Helped	
13.	Teachers striving to enhance student learning	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
14.	Your feeling that you have played a role in improving the quality of teaching in your school	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
15.	Your setting some goals for yourself	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
16.	Teachers' level of concern about instructional matters	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
17.	Morale of your teaching staff	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
18.	Your enjoyment in your role as a building level administrator	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
19.	Your obtaining ideas about teaching from other teachers	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
20.	Your maintaining a positive working relationship with your teachers	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
21.	Your desire to learn more about teaching and supervision	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
22.	Teachers utilizing effective techniques in the classroom	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
23.	Teachers striving to improve the school	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
24.	Your feeling that you have promoted a sense of professionalism within the staff	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
25.	Your enthusiam for coming to work each day	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
26.	Your maintaining trust with your teachers	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
27.	Teachers planning for a lesson	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
28.	Your setting high standards for student achievement	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX G –

RATING OF INSTRUMENT BY ADMINISTRATORS

Table 30. Distribution of means and standard deviations of concept(s) measuring adminmistrator attitudes, behaviors and teacher performance, attitudes and behaviors

CONCEPTS	NUMBER	MEAN	S. D.
ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDE			
1. Sense of Efficacy	119	2.22	1.19
2. Commitment	39	2.00	1.87
3. Esprit	122	1.32	1.82
ADMINISTRATOR BEHAVIOR			
1. Expectations	67	2.48	1.30
2. Relationship/Teachers	191	2.07	1.45
3. Growth Orientation	74	2.18	1.43
TEACHER PERFORMANCE			
1. Teacher Performance	122	2.33	1.14
TEACHER ATTITUDE		.	
1. Esprit	82	1.63	1.41
TEACHER BEHAVIOR			
1. Goal Orientation	130	1.95	1.23
2. Instructional Orientation	123	2.16	1.23
3. Growth Orientation	39	2.24	1.23

9 point scale from −4 to +4:
−4 to −1 = Hindered
  0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 31. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on
administrator attitudes as rated by
administrators

ITEMS	N	MEAN	S.D.
SENSE OF EFFICACY			
1. Teachers see you as a helping person	39	2.26*	1.18
2. Your feeling that you have played a role in improving the quality of teaching in your school	38	2.28*	1.17
3. Your feeling that you have promoted a sense of professionalism within the staff	42	2.11*	1.22
COMMITMENT.			
4. Your desire to remain in a instructional leadership position	39	2.00*	1.87
ESPRIT			
5. Your feeling proud of being a building level administrator	39	1.76*	1.60
6. Your enjoyment in your role as a building level administrator	38	1.35*	2.00
7. Your enthusiasm about coming to work each day	45	.84*	1.87
Overall	280	1.80*	1.56

9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

*.05.

Table 32. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on
administrator behaviors as rated by
administrators

ITEMS	N	MEAN	S.D.
EXPECTATIONS			
1. Your expectation for top quality performance in the classroom	30	2.89*	1.12
2. Your setting high standards for student achievement	37	2.07*	1.47
RELATIONSHIP			
3. Collaborating with teachers on matters relating to students	40	1.89*	1.49
4. Collaborating with teachers on matters relating to instruction	38	2.24*	1.35
5. Your maintaining a positive working relationship with your teachers	37	2.13*	1.60
6. Your maintaining trust with your teachers	37	1.96*	1.49
7. Your obtaining ideas about teaching from other teachers	39	2.15*	1.32
GROWTH ORIENTATION			
8. Your desire to learn more about teaching and supervision	33	2.41*	1.45
9. Your setting goals for yourself	41	1.87*	1.43
Overall	332	2.18*	1.43

9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

*.05.

Table 33. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on
teacher performance as rated by
administrators

ITEMS	N	MEAN	S.D.
TEACHER PERFORMANCE			
1. Teachers presenting lesson effectively	45	2.51*	1.12
2. Teachers utilizing effective techniques in the classroom	37	2.35*	1.18
3. Teachers planning for lesson	40	2.33*	1.14
Overall	122	2.33*	1.14

9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

*.05.

Table 34. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on
teacher attitudes as rated by administrators

ITEMS	N	MEAN	S.D.
<u>ESPRIT</u>			
1. A sense of pride within your teaching staff	42	1.78*	1.31
2. Morale of your teaching staff	40	1.48*	1.50
Overall	82	1.63*	1.41

9 point scale from −4 to +4:
−4 to −1 = Hindered
   0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

*.05.

Table 35. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on
teacher behaviors as rated by administrators

ITEMS	N	MEAN	S.D.
<u>GOAL ORIENTATION</u>			
1. Teachers striving for excellence in teaching	45	2.20*	1.16
2. Teachers striving to enhance student learning	43	1.93*	1.24
3. Teachers striving to improve the school	42	1.72*	1.29

*.05.

Table 35. Continued

ITEMS	N	MEAN	S.D.
INSTRUCTIONAL ORIENTATION			
4. Teachers discussing instructional matters with one another	36	2.50*	1.17
5. Teachers discussing instructional matters with you	42	1.88*	1.27
6. Teachers' level of concern about instructional matters	45	2.09*	1.26
GROWTH ORIENTATION			
7. Teachers striving to improve their teaching techniques	39	2.24*	1.23
Overall	292	2.08*	1.23

9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
  0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 36. Percentages of administrators rating the
           effect of the appraisal system on administrator
           attitudes as rated by administrators

ITEMS	N	HIND	NO INFLUN	HELP
SENSE OF EFFICCY				
1. Teachers see you as a helping person	39	0%	9%	91%
2. Your feeling that you have played a role in improving the quality of teaching in your school	38	0%	7%	93%
3. Your feeling that you have promoted a sense of professionalism within the staff	42	0%	13%	87%
COMMITMENT				
4. Your desire to remain in a instructional leadership position	39	4%	20%	76%
ESPRIT				
5. Your feeling proud of being a building level administrator	39	2%	39%	59%
6. Your enjoyment in your role as a building level administrator	38	17%	39%	44%
7. Your enthusiasm about coming to work each day	45	18%	50%	32%
Overall	280	6%	25%	69%

9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 37. Percentages of administrators rating the
effect of the appraisal system on administrator
behaviors as rated by administrators

ITEMS	N	HIND	INFLUN	NO HELP
EXPECTATIONS				
1. Your expectation for top quality performance in the classroom	30	0%	7%	93%
2. Your setting high standards for student achievement	37	0%	26%	74%
RELATIONSHIP				
3. Collaborating with teachers on matters relating to students	40	2%	26%	72%
4. Collaborating with teachers on matters relating to instruction	38	0%	17%	83%
5. Your maintaining a positive working relationship with your teachers	37	2%	26%	72%
6. Your maintaining trust with your teachers	37	2%	26%	72%
7. Your obtaining ideas about teaching from other teachers	39	0%	17%	83%
GROWTH ORIENTATION				
8. Your desire to learn more about teaching and supervision	33	0%	20%	80%
9. Your setting goals for yourself	41	4%	26%	70%
Overall	332	1%	22%	77%

9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 38. Percentages of administrators ing the effect
of the appraisal system on teacher performance
as rated by administrators

ITEMS	N	HIND--	NO INFLUN--	HELP
TEACHER PERFORMANCE				
1. Teachers presenting lesson effectively	45	0%	4%	96%
2. Teachers utilizing effective techniques in the classroom	37	0%	4%	96%
3. Teachers planning for lesson	40	0%	9%	91%
Overall	122	0%	6%	94%

9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 39.   Percentages of administrators rating the effect
            of the appraisal system on teacher attitudes
            as rated by administrators

ITEMS	N	HIND	NO INFLUN	HELP
ESPRIT				
1. A sense of pride within your teaching staff	42	0%	21%	79%
2. Morale of your teaching staff	40	4%	37%	59%
Overall	82	2%	29%	69%

    9 point scale from   -4 to +4:
    -4 to -1 = Hindered
       0   = No Hindrance or Help
    +4 to +1 = Helped

Table 40.   Percentages of administrators as effect
            of the appraisal system on teacher behaviors
            as rated by administrators

ITEMS	N	HIND	NO INFLUN	HELP
GOAL ORIENTATION				
1. Teachers striving for excellence in teaching	45	0%	4%	96%
2. Teachers striving to enhance student learning	43	2%	13%	85%
3. Teachers striving to improve the school	42	0%	24%	76%

Table 40. Continued

ITEMS	N	NO HIND	INFLUN	HELP
INSTRUCTIONAL ORIENTATION				
4. Teachers discussing instructional matters with one another	36	0%	9%	91%
5. Teachers discussing instructional matters with you	42	2%	15%	83%
6. Teachers' level of concern about instructional matters	45	2%	11%	87%
GROWTH ORIENTATION				
7. Teachers striving to improve their teaching techniques	39	2%	2%	96%
Overall	292	1%	11%	88%

```
 9 point scale from  -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0     = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped
```

Table 41. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on
administrator attitudes as rated by elementary
and secondary administrators

	ITEMS	N	LEVEL	MEAN	S.D.
	SENSE OF EFFICACY				
1.	Teachers see you as a helping person	12 22	ELE SEC	2.00* 2.64*	1.34 1.05
2.	Your feeling that you have played a role in improvingthe quality of teaching in your school	12 22	ELE SEC	2.42* 2.50*	1.44 .91
3.	Your feeling that you have promoted a sense of professional-ism within the staff	12 22	ELE SEC	1.88* 2.22*	1.47 1.15
	COMMITMENT				
4.	Your desire to remain in a instruc-tional leadership position	12 22	ELE SEC	1.58* 2.55*	2.19 1.54
	ESPRIT				
5.	Your feeling proud of being a building level administrator	12 22	ELE SEC	1.83* 2.00*	1.59 1.60
6.	Your enjoyment in your role as a building level administrator	12 22	ELE SEC	1.33* 1.59*	2.46 1.82
7.	Your enthusiasm about coming to work each day	12 22	ELE SEC	.68* 1.05*	2.06 1.91
	Overall	84 154	ELE SEC	1.67* 2.08*	1.79 1.43

9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

*.05.

Table 42. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on
administrator behaviors as rated by elementary
and secondary administrators

ITEMS	N	LEVEL	MEAN	S.D.
EXPECTATIONS				
1. Your expectation for top quality performance in the classroom	12	ELE	2.92*	1.17
	22	SEC	3.04*	.90
2. Your setting high standards for student achievement	12	ELE	2.25*	1.87
	22	SEC	2.18*	1.37
RELATIONSHIP				
3. Collaborating with teachers on matters relating to students	12	ELE	1.25*	1.49
	22	SEC	2.09*	1.54
4. Collaborating with teachers on matters relating to instruction	12	ELE	1.92*	1.44
	22	SEC	2.36*	1.43
5. Your maintaining a positive working relationship with your teachers	12	ELE	1.92*	1.83
	22	SEC	2.36*	1.40
6. Your maintaining trust with your teachers	12	ELE	1.83*	1.75
	22	SEC	2.23*	1.41
7. Your obtaining ideas about teaching from other teachers	12	ELE	2.25*	1.49
	22	SEC	2.23*	1.15
GROWTH ORIENTATION				
8. Your desire to learn more about teaching and supervision	12	ELE	2.17*	1.64
	22	SEC	2.77*	1.34
9. Your setting goals for yourself	12	ELE	1.67*	2.15
	22	SEC	2.13*	1.32
Overall	108	ELE	2.02*	1.65
	198	SEC	2.38*	1.32

9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

*.05.

Table 43. Distribution of means and standard deviations
to the effect of the appraisal system on
teacher performance as rated by elementary
and secondary administrators

ITEMS	N	LEVEL	MEAN	S.D.
TEACHER PERFORMANCE				
1. Teachers presenting lesson effectively	12	ELE	2.83*	.94
	22	SEC	2.52*	1.08
2. Teachers utilizing effective techniques in the classroom	12	ELE	2.75*	1.29
	22	SEC	2.41*	1.05
3. Teachers planning for lesson	12	ELE	2.33*	1.37
	22	SEC	1.90*	.92
Overall	36	ELE	2.64*	1.20
	66	SEC	2.28*	1.02

9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

*.05.

Table 44.   Distribution of means and standard deviations
            the effect of the appraisal system on
            teacher attitudes as rated by elementary
            and secondary administrators

ITEMS	N	LEVEL	MEAN	S.D.
ESPRIT				
1. A sense of pride within your teaching staff	12	ELE	1.92*	1.73
	22	SEC	1.77*	1.11
2. Morale of your teaching staff	12	ELE	1.33*	1.92
	22	SEC	1.68*	1.36
Overall	12	ELE	1.63*	1.83
	22	SEC	1.73*	1.24

```
9 point scale from  -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0     = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped
```

*.05.

Table 45.   Distribution of means and standard deviations
            the effect of the appraisal system on
            teacher behaviors as rated by elementary
            and secondary administrators

ITEMS	N	LEVEL	MEAN	S.D.
GOAL ORIENTATION				
1. Teachers striving for excellence in teaching	12	ELE	2.50*	1.31
	22	SEC	2.23*	.87
2. Teachers striving to enhance student learning	12	ELE	2.08*	1.38
	22	SEC	2.00*	1.20
3. Teachers striving to improve the school	12	ELE	1.67*	1.56
	22	SEC	1.86*	1.17

*.05.

Table 45. Continued

	ITEMS	N	LEVEL	MEAN	S.D.
	INSTRUCTIONAL ORIENTATION				
4.	Teachers discussing instructional matters with one another	12 22	ELE SEC	2.41* 2.55*	1.31 1.14
5.	Teachers discussing instructional matters with you	12 22	ELE SEC	2.44* 1.73*	1.24 1.24
6.	Teachers' level of concern about instructional matters	12 22	ELE SEC	2.00* 2.36*	1.35 .95
	Growth ORIENTATION				
7.	Teachers striving to improve their teaching techniques	12 22	ELE SEC	2.75* 2.09*	1.22 1.23
	Overall	84 154	ELE SEC	2.26* 2.12*	1.34 1.11

```
 9 point scale from  -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
    0    = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped
```

Table 46. Percentages of administrators rating the effect of the appraisal system on administrator attitudes as rated by elementary and secondary administrators

ITEMS		NO HIND	INFLUN	HELP
SENSE OF EFFICACY				
1. Teachers see you as a helping	ELE	0%	17%	83%
person	SEC	0%	5%	95%
2. Your feeling that you have played a role in improvingthe quality of	ELE	0%	8%	92%
teaching in your school	SEC	0%	0%	100%
3. Your feeling that you have promoted a sense of professionalism	ELE	0%	25%	75%
within the staff	SEC	0%	9%	91%
COMMITMENT				
4. Your desire to remain in a instruc-	ELE	8%	33%	59%
tional leadership position	SEC	5%	18%	77%
ESPRIT				
5. Your feeling proud of being a	ELE	0%	33%	67%
building level administrator	SEC	0%	32%	68%
6. Your enjoyment in your role as a	ELE	8%	50%	42%
building level administrator	SEC	18%	23%	59%
7. Your enthusiasm about coming	ELE	17%	58%	25%
to work each day	SEC	14%	39%	47%
Overall	ELE	5%	32%	63%
	SEC	5%	18%	77%

9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 47. Percentages of administrators the rating effect
of the appraisal system on administrator
behaviors as rated by elementary and secondary
administrators

ITEMS		NO HIND-	INFLUN-	HELP
EXPECTATIONS				
1. Your expectation for top quality	ELE	0%	8%	92%
performance in the classroom	SEC	0%	0%	100%
2. Your setting high standards for	ELE	0%	33%	67%
student achievement	SEC	0%	23%	77%
RELATIONSHIP				
3. Collaborating with teachers on	ELE	8%	42%	50%
matters relating to students	SEC	0%	27%	73%
4. Collaborating with teachers on	ELE	0%	25%	75%
matters relating to instruction	SEC	0%	18%	82%
5. Your maintaining a positive				
working relationship with your	ELE	0%	42%	58%
teachers	SEC	0%	18%	82%
6. Your maintaining trust with your	ELE	0%	42%	58%
teachers	SEC	0%	18%	82%
7. Your obtaining ideas about	ELE	0%	17%	83%
teaching from other teachers	SEC	0%	14%	86%
GROWTH ORIENTATION				
8. Your desire to learn more about	ELE	0%	25%	75%
teaching and supervision	SEC	0%	14%	86%
9. Your setting goals for yourself	ELE	8%	33%	59%
	SEC	5%	18%	73%
Overall	ELE	2%	30%	68%
	SEC	1%	17%	82%

9 point scale from   -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
    0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped

Table 48. Percentages of administrators rating the
           effect of the appraisal system on teacher
           performance as rated by elementary and
           secondary administrators

ITEMS		NO HIND-	INFLUN-	HELP
TEACHER PERFORMANCE				
1. Teachers presenting lesson	ELE	0%	0%	100%
effectively	SEC	0%	0%	100%
2. Teachers utilizing effective	ELE	0%	0%	100%
techniques in the classroom	SEC	0%	5%	95%
3. Teachers planning for lesson	ELE	0%	17%	83%
	SEC	0%	5%	95%
Overall	ELE	0%	6%	94%
	SEC	0%	3%	97%

    9 point scale from -4 to +4:
  -4 to -1 = Hindered
     0   = No Hindrance or Help
  +4 to +1 = Helped

Table 49. Percentages of administrators rating the
           effect of the appraisal system on teacher
           attitudes as rated by elementary and secondary
           administrators

ITEMS		NO HIND-INFLUN-HELP		

ESPRIT

1. A sense of pride within your teaching staff	ELE	0%	33%	67%
	SEC	0%	18%	82%
2. Morale of your teaching staff	ELE	8%	58%	36%
	SEC	0%	27%	73%
Overall	ELE	4%	46%	50%
	SEC	0%	23%	77%

```
 9 point scale from  -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0     = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped
```

Table 50. Percentages of administrators rating the
           effect of the appraisal system on teacher
           behaviors as rated by elementary and
           secondary administrators

ITEMS		NO HIND-INFLUN-HELP		

GOAL ORIENTATION

1. Teachers striving for excellence in teaching	ELE	0%	0%	100%
	SEC	0%	0%	100%
2. Teachers striving to enhance student learning	ELE	0%	17%	83%
	SEC	5%	14%	81%

Table 50. Continued

ITEMS		NO HIND-	INFLUN	-HELP
3. Teachers striving to improve the school	ELE	0%	33%	67%
	SEC	0%	18%	62%
INSTRUCTIONAL ORIENTATION				
4. Teachers discussing instructional matters with one another	ELE	0%	17%	83%
	SEC	0%	9%	91%
5. Teachers discussing instructional matters with you	ELE	0%	11%	89%
	SEC	5%	18%	77%
6. Teachers' level of concern about instructional matters	ELE	0%	17%	83%
	SEC	0%	5%	95%
GROWTH ORIENTATION				
7. Teachers striving to improve their teaching techniques	ELE	0%	0%	100%
	SEC	5%	23%	72%
Overall	ELE	0%	14%	86%
	SEC	2%	12%	86%

   9 point scale from -4 to +4:
-4 to -1 = Hindered
   0   = No Hindrance or Help
+4 to +1 = Helped