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ABSTRACT
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Name of researcher: Michael L. Holtgren
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Date completed: April 1983

Problem

The role of the school principal is paramount in the operation of a school system, and affective behavior is an essential part of that role. It was the purpose of the study to determine if a discrepancy exists between the self-perceptions of principals as affective educators and their actual performance.

Method

Thirty-two school principals, their superintendents, and a sampling of their teachers were studied. The self-perceptions of the principals were identified concerning eight affective traits and
eight school-climate factors. The superintendent and teachers evaluated their principal's performance on these traits and factors.

The Charles F. Kettering Foundation "School Climate Inventory" and an affective trait questionnaire developed by the researcher were used to measure the principal's performance. Data was analyzed using mean scores, a Chi square analysis, and the Pearson product-moment formula to develop correlation coefficients.

Results

A school principal possessing strong positive self-perceptions on the stated affective traits does not necessarily perform as a professional leader in those areas. A similarity, but no significant relationship, existed between the perceptions of the superintendents and the perceptions of their principals regarding the principals' performances. No similarity or significant relationship existed between principals and their teachers regarding the principals' performances. No similarity, but a significant relationship, existed between the perceptions of the superintendents and the teachers regarding their principal's performance.

Conclusions

Differences exist between the way principals perceive their affective performance and the reality of that performance as evidenced by their superintendents, their teachers, and the building climate within their buildings. Superintendents rate the performances of their principals considerably higher than do the teachers.
Principals perceive themselves as strong in the affective domain, but their performance does not support those self-perceptions.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background--the Principal

A review of the development of the school principalship revealed that both the position and its responsibilities, as is commonly in existence in the schools of the 1980s, are in their infancy. For many years, the principal's duties were primarily clerical--keeping records of attendance, and grades, actually keeping the rooms clean, giving out supplies, and ringing the bell. The early principal had no direct relationship with a school board who administered the school. Beginning around 1900, the principal's duties included discipline, care of pupils, equipment and supply control, organization, general-management tasks, and supervision of the building and grounds. In addition most principals were also assigned full or part-time teaching responsibilities.

By 1930, the principal spent most of his or her time on administrative, supervisory, and clerical duties. More emphasis was placed on giving the principal and the teachers more autonomy from the school board and superintendent. There have been few changes in the job responsibilities of the school principal since 1930. John Benben (1966, p. 275) summarized the changing role of
the principal as beginning with basic clerical responsibilities and growing into a key position in educational administration.

In today's schools the principal is a key person in the administrative organization and is responsible for its total operation. Typically, many tangible responsibilities appear in the job description; such as fostering community relationships, recommending staff personnel, exercising pupil control, providing instructional leadership, maintaining facilities, administering finance and business management, and overseeing plant operation. Many intangible factors are also a part of the principal's role. Misner, Schneider, and Keith (1963) suggested that the attitude of the principal must permeate throughout the entire building, encouraging everyone to function as a child-centered person. A report (McCleary, 1979) by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) displayed findings of the behavioral traits of principals. The report described the school as a social system possessing its own belief patterns, authority structure, formal and informal communications systems, and special interest groups—the principal must deal with each of these elements. In so doing he or she must bring to the school his or her own unique background of training, experience, beliefs, and attitudes.

The National Consortium for Humanizing Education (NCHE) has conducted over ten years of work researching the efforts of educators and the results of those efforts (Aspy, 1977, pp. 39-46). Two of the findings addressed the topic of the principal's role in a school. First, the data from NCHE supported the hypothesis
that the principal is pivotal in a school's program. Teachers
whose principals demonstrated a high level of interpersonal func-
tioning enjoyed their teaching environment and tasks more than
did teachers whose principals functioned at low levels. The con-
clusion was that the principal's behavior appeared to be a pattern
for the school; it would seem that the principal modeled the kind
of behavior he or she expected in the classrooms. Secondly, there
was a positive and significant relationship between principals'
levels of interpersonal functioning and the tendency on the part
of the teachers to employ the same skills in the classrooms.

The position of school principal is primarily responsible
for the operation of the school and is the main influence on the
total educational process. This responsibility has a network which
includes a great many realms. One of these realms currently domi-
nating educational thought at all levels is perhaps most commonly
described in educational jargon as the "affective domain." Unlike
many past trends that have periodically dominated education, affec-
tive education contains a very rich tradition and a solid philosoph-
ical and theoretical base.

The popularity of the affective movement was well summa-
ized by Curwin and Fuhrmann (1975):

We are in the midst of an expanding wave of educa-
tional activity known as humanistic (affective) educa-
tion. More books and instructional materials pertaining
to this movement have appeared in the last two or
three years than in all preceding years put together.
Teacher training institutions around the nation have
developed courses or workshops that are humanistically
oriented. (p. xv)
Studies in the 1960s and 1970s by Christopher Jencks provided statistics indicating flaws in some very cardinal educational beliefs. Basically Jencks stated that school quality had little effect upon student academic scores. Students were more influenced by their home, their friends, and by television. According to Jencks (1973), "the primary basis for evaluating a school should be whether the students and teachers find it a satisfying place to be" (p. v).

Recently, support for affective education has come from educational psychiatrists. A few of their observations seem appropriate. Kelley (1969) stated:

> It has now become abundantly clear, from research, that how a person feels is more important than what he knows. How one feels controls behavior, what one knows does not. If one thinks too little of himself, he becomes immobile and unable to learn. In fact, the person who hates himself and others does not take in much subject matter. (p. 75)

Another psychiatrist, Philip W. Jackson (1969) saw schools as perpetuating the overemphasis on the cognitive domain when it should be placed on the affective. He stated that educators are too achievement oriented. They were very successful themselves in a cognitive, scholastic environment and therefore expect their students to share those same learning conditions (pp. 78-89). Don Hamachek (1969) saw poor self-concept as causing much of student failure. In terms of their perceptions of self, individuals have a definite commitment to perform as they do. Other things being equal, those who do not achieve, choose not to do so, while those who do achieve, choose to do so. He made a general recommendation
to teachers which is worth including—that first they must have a positive sense of self-worth. Teachers teach their self-concepts, not just what they know, as subject matter (pp. 90-93).

One of the main promoters of the current affective movement is William Glasser. In Reality Therapy, Glasser (1965) built a case for unacceptable behavior which exists because people deny the reality of the world around them. This is a result of personal needs not being fulfilled. To resolve this void, schools must make individuals responsible for their own actions—involving them with other students and surrounding them with a proper school environment. In Schools without Failure, Glasser (1969) recommended application of reality-therapy principles. He stated that schools must provide a place where individuals may achieve success. Emphasis is placed upon the school environment, student success, student self-worth, responsibility, and love.

In discussing the importance of affective education in the educational process, it is certainly appropriate to reflect upon the works of Krathwohl et al (1964). In the first two handbooks, taxonomies were developed describing and classifying the process by which education occurred; the first handbook described that in the cognitive domain and the second handbook the affective domain. They concluded with a theory of unity which stated that there is no fundamental separation of the affective area from the cognitive area: "No matter how we slice behavior, the ingredients of motivation-emotion-cognition are present in one order or another" (p. 45).
The affective domain does have a very real effect upon the educational process. The extent of the affectiveness of a person relates to his or her educational performance; whether it be the learning of a student, the teaching of a teacher, or the administration of an administrator. Perhaps the greatest determinant in the formula for education is the attitude of the individual. As critics loudly accuse, "Johnny can't read," a proper retort might be, "Johnny doesn't want to read; when he does, he will."

Statement of the Problem

The role of the school principal is paramount in the operation of a school system, and affective behavior is an essential part in that role. Assuming that most practicing principals would accept this statement as proper, application of such should be displayed in their professional performance. Yet it is quite common to observe situations in which principals' performances seem to be inconsistent with generally accepted indicators of affective behavior. Feedback indicating behavior which does not display affectiveness at times surfaces through evaluations; observations; and student, teacher, and parent testimonies; as well as accounts from the media. It is possible that there exists a discrepancy between the self-perceptions of principals as affective educators and their actual performance.

Purpose of the Study

The central purpose of this study was to determine if there is a discrepancy between the self-perceptions of a principal as an affective educator and the reality of his or her performance as viewed
by the teaching staff and superintendent. In addressing this central theme, several consequential secondary purposes arose. These involved the variables upon which his or her performance had a direct effect—self-perceptions, teachers' perceptions, superintendent's perceptions, and the climate of the building. Therefore, several subpurposes include:

1. To identify the self-perceptions of the principal within the affective domain
2. To identify the superintendent's perception of the principals' performances as affective leaders
3. To identify the teachers' perceptions of their principal's performance as an affective leader
4. To measure the building climate in respect to affectiveness within the principal's school.

Importance of the Study

A lengthy search including current dissertations, the ERIC collection, computer reference service searches, as well as general written works has to date not identified any work directly addressing this problem. Considerable data has been developed concerning self-perceptions and self-concept of educators, the perceptions of a principal by those around him or her, and assessment of his or her performance. These works may relate to certain isolated sections of the stated problem but are not able to resolve the global issue.

Two recent documents from the state of Michigan displayed the current position of the state regarding this subject. First,
on April 8, 1979, Governor William Milliken released a statement of educational purpose in which he commented:

Besides seeking to develop a child's intelligence, the schools must also nurture his or her character traits in positive ways. The goal of education must be not just to develop an intellectual being, but a being who also has a sense of values that are consistent with the highest values of our society.

The Michigan Department of Education (1971) developed goals in three areas of education for all public-school students in Michigan. The first area was entitled "Citizenship and Morality." In this section the state declared that it was the responsibility of the public schools to assure the development of youth as citizens who have self-respect for others and respect for the law (p. 3).

To comply with these educational intentions of the state of Michigan, coming both from the governor and the Department of Education, the performance of the principal must include leadership in the affective domain. It is the intention of this dissertation to provide a method to determine if, in fact, the principal is providing such leadership.

It is important for the performance of principals within the school system to be of high quality. The conclusions of this dissertation lead to several very pragmatic methods for achieving a high quality of the fulfillment of this performance. First, a process was presented which provided principals with a method to observe their own actual performance and to compare that with their self-perceptions of such performance. The test instrument utilized in this dissertation provided a method that principals may use to
identify for themselves areas in which self-behavior changes are essential. Secondly, the study provided an aid for the supervisor of principals in compiling performance evaluations. Areas of strengths and weaknesses were evident from this data. Thirdly, the information generated by this study provided indications of need areas among the principal staff. Such data provided a base for developing administrative inservice programs. Each or any of these three results should, in turn, provide evidence which may be used as a basis for improving administrative practice.

**Statement of Hypotheses**

The major hypothesis to be examined:

School principals possessing strong positive self-perceptions on stated affective behaviors will perform as professional leaders in those areas.

The supporting hypotheses to be examined:

1A. There is a difference between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their superintendent.

1B. There is a relationship between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their superintendent.

2A. There is a difference between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their teachers.
2B. There is a relationship between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their teachers.

3A. There is a difference between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building-climate conditions and the perceptions of their superintendent.

3B. There is a relationship between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building-climate conditions and the perceptions of their superintendent.

4A. There is a difference between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building-climate conditions and the perceptions of their teachers.

4B. There is a relationship between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building-climate conditions and the perceptions of their teachers.

5A. There is a difference between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers toward the performance of their principal on certain affective traits.

5B. There is a relationship between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers toward the performance of their principal on certain affective traits.

6A. There is a difference between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers concerning building-climate conditions.

6B. There is a relationship between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers concerning building-climate conditions.
Definition of Terms

Affective education. That segment of the educational process which concerns the learner's value and behavior system as he or she relates to self, to other persons, and to institutions is affective education. Several words are often used interchangeably in reference to this concept. The most common three seem to be affective, value, and humanistic education. Within the parameters of this paper the three terms were considered to be synonymous.

School climate. The actual environment that exists within a school building as it relates to student learning and personal growth as well as to the adults of the school community is here called the school climate.

Terms for Affective Traits

Several words used in this study need clear definition. In the area of affective behavior the following words need defining:

Caring. Caring is a feeling that others are concerned about you as a human being.

Empathy. Empathy is the ability to place oneself in another person's place and to appreciate how the other person feels.

Honest. Honesty is the ability to be truthful, straightforward, and genuine through thought, word, and deed.

Humble. Humbleness is the ability to be free from pride, arrogance, or assertiveness.

Joyful. Joyfulness is the ability to possess happiness and to be pleasant as characterized by outward signs of gratification.
Respect. Respect is the ability to appreciate the worth of another person or cause.

Self-concept. Self-concept is a person's view of him/herself or how a person feels about him/herself.

Trust. Trust is the belief that others are honest toward you and will not let you down.

Terms for School Climate

In the area of school climate the following general climate factors need defining:

Caring. Caring is a feeling that others are concerned about you as a human being.

Cohesiveness. Cohesiveness is when all members of the school community stick together and feel a part of the school.

Continuous academic and social growth. Opportunities for all to develop their skills, knowledge, or attitudes in regard to their assignment is defined as continuous academic and social growth.

High morale. High morale is when staff members possess a good feeling about what is happening (in their school building).

Opportunities for input. Opportunities for input is exhibited by an opportunity for all to contribute ideas knowing they will be considered.

Respect. Respect is to consider something worthy of esteem; including self, others, property, and regulations.

School renewal. School renewal is when persons are encouraged to be innovative, creative, and to grow professionally.
Trust. Trust is the belief that others are honest toward you and will not let you down.

Delimitation of Study

This study was limited geographically to Berrien and Cass counties in southwestern Michigan. Within those two counties all public schools having a K-12 student membership of approximately 1,500 to 2,500 during the 1981-82 school year were included.

Personnel included in the study were the principals, the superintendents, and classroom teachers.

The affective domain was limited to eight traits: trust, empathy, honesty, respect, positive self-concept, humility, caring, and joyfulness (happiness). Other behavioral areas that may be part of the affective domain were not considered.

The self-perceptions of the principals included only the stated eight traits.

Limitations of the Study

At the time of the data collection several conditions possibly existed in some of the involved school systems. Following are conditions that were not included as factors in analyzing data:

1. Teacher assignments ranged from kindergarten through high school. No distinction was made for possible difference due to level of assignment.

2. The schools involved were experiencing reductions in financial resources. No allowance was made for the effects of staff attitudes caused by this reduced funding.
3. Some of the schools involved were currently eliminating various staff members. Staff attitudes affected by threat or actual loss of position was not considered.

4. The data was collected in the latter portion of the school year, throughout April and the first of May. No effort was made to allow for attitude variance due to the time of the school year.

Organization of the Study

The organization of this document involves five chapters. Chapter I presents an introductory background concerning the position of school principal and a description of the affective domain. The problem is identified; the purpose and importance of the study listed; statements of hypotheses presented; and a definition of terms, delimitation, limitation, and organization of the study exhibited. Chapter II reviews related literature and research findings. Chapter III provides a description of the design of the study including the sample, survey instrument, and data collection. Chapter IV presents the results of the data. Chapter V reveals the summary and the conclusions of the study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature relevant to the study of the principal's performance and his or her self-perceptions. As has been stated earlier, no literature has been discovered addressing the problem. However, a large amount of material is available regarding specific components, including: self-perception, super­indents' and teachers' views of their principal's performance, the affective domain, and school climate. This review is organized into the following areas: perceptions and performance of the principal, school climate, and affective traits.

**Perceptions and Performance of the Principal**

Perceptions of the Principal

A 1979 dissertation authored by Burks reviewed self-evaluations of principals and compared them to evaluations of those same principals by their teachers, superintendents, and assistant superintendents. The conclusion of the study indicated there were no significant differences between the principals' self-evaluations and the principal evaluations made by teaching staffs, superinten­dents, and assistant superintendents.
Earl Matthews (1978) concluded that there was a significant relationship established between scores principals received relative to their perceived leadership behavior and measures of their effectiveness. Those principals who were effective were perceived by their teachers as individuals who could handle conflicting demands, had strong convictions, encouraged initiative, encouraged good judgment, and were friendly and approachable. There was a relationship between how a principal perceived his or her leadership behavior and personal effectiveness.

A statistical study conducted by the NASSP (Weldy, 1979, pp. 11, 35) rated as second in importance, behind teaching students basic skills, the development of a positive self-concept as the top educational purpose of the schools. The rating was the result of the opinions of principals; thus indicating that principals in general recognized the importance of their self-concept. Weldy also stated that it is the principal's leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, and the morale of the teachers.

The Likerts (1976) studied perceptions of management positions. They concluded that management perception is the key to behavior. The way in which people see things determines the way they act. If their self-perceptions are distorted, these distortions are reflected in their behavior. Perceptual distortions may become manifested toward other groups, resulting in hostile attitudes toward others or other groups. Confidence and trust are reduced or eliminated (p. 61).
Kaewdang (1977) also studied the principal's role perception and school effectiveness. Several of his conclusions were relevant to the present study. First, he found the principal's role perceptions of tasks was related to the actual school effectiveness. When a principal provided a positive model for students and workers, the school displayed higher effectiveness. Secondly, there was found to be very strong associations between the way the principals perceived their roles and school effectiveness. Thirdly, the principal's perception of tasks dealing with personnel, community, and physical plant showed a high relation to school effectiveness.

Finley (1976) conducted a study of the self-perceptions of principals and perceptions of those who worked for them in regard to those principals' leadership behavior. His conclusion indicated no significant difference between the principal and his or her subordinates on perceptions of that principal's leadership behavior.

A 1975 study by Alfred Aubry investigated the question of the principal's behavior as seen by self and those around him or her. Aubry developed two conclusions: (1) He supported the general hypothesis that there is no basic difference between a principal's description of personal behavior and the teachers' and central office administrator's descriptions of that principal's behavior. (2) The principal, the teachers, and the central administrators all perceive and describe the principal's behavior in a similar manner.

Robert Mosier (1957) investigated the relationship between the principal and the superintendent. He discovered a significant correlation between a principal that indicates a high level of
personal satisfaction and a principal who predicts a superintendent's high rating of his or her effectiveness. He also discovered that the interaction between the superintendent and the principal determines, in part, the quality of learning within a school. He then extended this working relationship to the next step--the teachers. The behavior of the principal toward the teachers was of key importance in determining the quality of the educational experiences in a school.

The Principal's Performance/Student Achievement

Helen Johnson (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978) studied the role of the principal as it related to student outcome. She pointed out that the principal is the chief school officer and is responsible for all student outcomes, both cognitive and affective. The results of her study indicated that the principal's performance does make a difference in the level of the production of student outcomes.

A study of the public-school system in New York City by Landes (1969, p. 13) displayed significant improvements in student reading skills when a principal believed in the competence of the staff.

Student Self-concept

Eberle and Hall (1979, p. 15) developed the belief that student behavior and achievement is governed by affective well-being. How an individual feels about self, in regard to peer associates and the setting in which he or she is located, determines to a large extent what that individual attempts to do.
Abraham Maslow (1968) conducted an extensive investigation of human potential and achievement. He detected an order of growth and development based upon the fulfillment of needs. According to his hierarchical order, growth cannot normally occur at one stage of development until needs at the previous level have been met. As a person progresses from the lower-level needs of "self-preservation" and "safety," he or she enters into the need areas of "social acceptance," "self-esteem," and "esteem from others." According to Maslow the needs of these stages must be met for a higher learning to occur.

Research conducted by Stenner and Katzenmeyer (1976, pp. 270-273) found student self-concept assessments to be correlated with both I.Q. and scholastic-achievement level. Stanley Coopersmith (1967) indicated that persons high in self-esteem are happier and more effective in meeting academic demands than are persons of low self-esteem. It was also interesting to note from his study that families with children of high self-esteem exert greater demands for academic performance of excellence. Arthur Combs (1981) in a "Kappan" article stated: "Exhaustive research has shown us that the self-concept is a vital factor in a person's success or failure in school, on the job, or in social interaction . . . student self-concepts control what they learn" (p. 447). Carl Rogers (1957) completed extensive works addressing the subject. A summary of these works indicated that the higher the levels of understanding, genuineness, and respect a teacher gives to the students, the more the students learn. A review of the conclusions of the NCHE program's ten-year study (Aspy & Roebuck, 1977, p. 40) indicated a positive and significant increase in
student achievement level of students with "affective" teachers as compared to the general level of teachers. William Purkey (1970) has extensively studied student achievement. In summarizing data, he stated, "Over all, the research evidence clearly shows a persistent and significant relationship between the self-concept and academic achievement" (p. 15).

Scheirer and Kraut (1979) were not in complete agreement with literature supporting the belief that an increase in self-concept increases academic achievement. They cited the massive intervention programs of compensatory education beginning in the 1960s which aimed at improving the self-concept in an attempt to improve academic achievement. In reviewing the results of many of the federal "War on Poverty" programs, such as Head Start, Follow Through, and Upward Bound, they concluded that most of those programs failed. The overall negative evidence for a causal connection between self-concept and academic achievement should create caution among educators who assume that enhancing a person's feelings about self leads to academic achievement.

Lorrie Shepard (1979) authored another article recommending caution in assuming that self-concept improvement increases achievement. She concluded that a child's ability to learn would more likely increase because of a noticeable improvement in actual learning rather than from receiving "unearned" praise or a pep talk about capabilities. It makes little sense to try to alter self-esteem directly, she believes, without changing the facts upon which that self-image may be based.
School Climate

Recently the topic of school climate has attracted the attention of scholars. Several works address school climate as it relates to the subject of this dissertation. DeOisres (1979) displayed a significant relationship between organizational school climate and the principal's leadership behavior. Stephen Dennis (1978) in a study conducted at New York University found that significant relationships do exist between teachers' perceptions of the school climate and their perceptions of the leadership behavior of the principal. Sandra Boyles (1979) revealed a significant correlation between teachers' perceptions of the organizational climate and each of sixteen personality factors.

An Occasional Paper (Fox, et al, 1973, pp. 3-5) produced by Phi Delta Kappa has been devoted to the study of improving school climate. The authors described proper school climate as critical to the operation of a school. A proper climate is needed to work toward proper goals; such as basic academics, social development, and curriculum improvement. More practically, it makes a school a good place to be, satisfying and meaningful for both youth and adults. The authors stated:

If schools continue to perpetuate an anti-humane climate in which apathy, failure, punishment, and inadequate success in achieving the curriculum are characteristic, they may guarantee their own demise, and ultimately that of the American social system. (p. 3)

Two goals of the humane school climate were stated: (1) to provide throughout the school a wholesome, stimulating, and productive learning environment conducive to academic achievement and personal growth.
of youth at different levels of development, and (2) to provide a pleasant and satisfying school situation within which young people can live and work. Fox, et al. also believed that a corollary provision would result--a stimulating and productive environment for the adults of the school community: the faculty, principal, other staff members, and parents.

Affective Traits

There exists a great number of behavior characteristics that are affective traits. This study isolated several of those--as identified by the following review of literature.

The classical Greek writings (Nash, 1975, p. 8) of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Sophocles all stressed that to become educated, a person needed to realize his or her potential or to become a self-actualized person.


David Aspy (1969) listed three traits: empathy, respect, and genuineness.

The Phi Delta Kappa Occasional Paper (Fox, et al., 1973) listed eight important factors: respect, trust, high morale, input, academic and social growth, cohesiveness, renewal, and caring.

The Bible\(^1\) identified a number of factors. In Phil 4:8

\(^1\)Bible references used throughout this dissertation come from the King James Version. Secondary biblical references when used appear in parentheses ( ) and are from the New International Version.
instruction was given to think on these things: truth, honesty, justice, purity, loveliness, and good report (admirableness). In Gal 5:22 the fruit of the Spirit was recognized as: love, joy, peace, longsuffering (patience), gentleness (kindness), goodness, faith, meekness, and temperance (self-control). Christ in the beatitudes in Matt 5:3-11 listed: the poor in spirit, they that mourn, the meek, the righteous, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers, and those persecuted.

In a 1962 study of teachers, Arthur Combs (1965) recognized the following affective competencies of superior teachers: adaptability, caring, compassion, enthusiasm, good sense of humor, humbleness, sincerity, honesty, acting with integrity, tolerance, understanding, and courage (pp. 2, 3).

Edgar Dale (1974) writing an educational fastback for Phi Delta Kappa, listed the learned qualities of able instructors--although rare--to be humaneness, appreciation, gratefulness, empathy, and self-discipline (p. 34). In another fastback, Merril Harmin (1977) discussed values education. Traits he emphasized were security (cared-for), feeling capable and appreciated, empathy, choosing, prizing, awareness of consequences, forthrightness (honesty), hope, and trust.

In a study of the basic values in education, Milton Rokeach (1973, p. 73) presented a ranking of values:

1. freedom
2. happiness
3. wisdom
4. self-respect
5. mature love
6. sense of accomplishment
Carl Rogers (1957) delineated three factors which he believed to be related to all human learning situations: empathy, congruence (genuineness), and positive regard.

Walcott Beatty (1976) stated that elements of school organization or of teacher behavior which are likely to have an impact on a person are personal worth, coping, expressing, and autonomy.

In their book about teaching human values in the classroom, the Hawleys (1975) suggested that the human values that moral philosophers and religious leaders have generally agreed upon are love, cooperation, trust, acceptance, joy, dignity, respect for differences, compromise, truth, understanding, and reverence (p. 13).

Eberle and Hall (1979) have authored a book describing how to plan and teach in the affective domain. They stated that "student behavior and achievement is governed by affective well-being"; that affective well-being consists of one's self-concept, interpersonal relations, aesthetic sensitivity, motivation, and achievement (p. 15).

In a more pragmatic approach to the question of values, the Quest educational program (Crisci, 1981, pp. 131-132) surveyed some 2,000 high-school students by asking the question, "What are some of the things that you struggle with most?" The students identified ten

7. friendship  
8. inner harmony  
9. family security  
10. world at peace  
11. equality  
12. exciting life  
13. comfortable life  
14. salvation  
15. social recognition  
16. national security  
17. world of beauty  
18. pleasure
areas of life that were of greatest concern to them: feelings (loneliness, jealousy, fear, love, hate), self-concept, mental health, friendships, family, finances, opposite sex, parenting, life planning, philosophy, and meaning of life.

Finally, in reviewing affective traits, recognition of the taxonomy of Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia (1964) provided a listing of the affective educational objectives. An outline of their taxonomy listed these objectives in order:

1.1 Awareness
1.2 Willingness to receive
1.3 Controlled attention
2.0 Responding
2.1 Acquiescence (obedience) in responding
2.2 Willingness to respond
2.3 Satisfaction in response
3.0 Valuing
3.1 Acceptance of a value
3.2 Preference for a value
3.3 Commitment
4.0 Organization (of values)
4.1 Conceptualization of a value
4.2 Organization of a value system
5.0 Characterization by a value (internalization)
5.1 Generalized set of values
5.2 Characterization (of life)
Summary

The literature reviewed addressed the topic of perceptions and the performance of the principal. First, several studies indicated that relationship patterns exist between the self-perceptions of the principal and his/her staff and upper administration. In general there was agreement between the self-perceptions of the principal as to his/her own behavior and the observations of the other groups. Secondly, very little data were found concerning the principal's performance and how it effects student achievement. However, the two studies reviewed indicated a relationship between the principal's performance and belief and actual student achievement. Thirdly, in reviewing literature in the area of student achievement, numerous studies indicated a relationship between a student's self-concept and personal academic achievement.

The second grouping of literature suggested a relationship exists between the climate of a school and the perceptions of the people that work there. Additionally, a description of school climate was developed.

The third and final review of literature provided an overview of some of the many works that compose the affective traits. Those traits that occurred most commonly included love, acceptance, trust, empathy, respect, caring, honesty, purity, joy, peacefulness, genuineness, humbleness, self-respect, and self-concept.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there is a discrepancy between the self-perceptions of a principal as an affective educator and the reality of his/her performance as viewed by others. To accomplish this task, this research was directed toward several topics: (Following each topic the instrument utilized to measure that topic is indicated.)

1. The self-perceptions of the school principals concerning certain affective traits (Instrument No. 1)
2. The perceptions of the superintendents about their principals' performances on the selected affective traits (Instrument No. 2)
3. The perceptions of the teachers about their principals' performances on the selected traits (Instrument No. 3)
4. The self-perceptions of the school principals concerning school climate within their buildings (Instrument No. 4)
5. The perceptions of the superintendents about the school climate within their principals' buildings (Instrument No. 5)
6. The perceptions of the teachers about the school climate within their buildings (Instrument No. 6)
7. The relationship between the self-perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their superintendents regarding the
performances of the principals on the selected traits (Instruments No. 1 and No. 2)

8. The relationship between the self-perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their teachers regarding the performance of the principal on the selected traits (Instruments No. 1 and No. 3)

9. The relationship between the perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their superintendents toward the climate within the principals' school buildings (Instruments No. 4 and No. 5)

10. The relationship between the perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their teachers toward the climate within their school buildings (Instruments No. 4 and No. 6).

Population

All public-school systems (having a K-12 population of approximately 1,500 to 2,500 students) in Berrien and Cass counties in Michigan have been included in the study. The demography of the eight school systems for 1981-1982 within the chosen area is described in Table 1.

The only selection criteria for the schools within the study were geographical location and population of the district. No social, financial, racial, academic, or other screening factors were considered. The eight systems gave the impression of being typical American schools of this size. However, these school systems may differ from very large or small schools, where the results of this study may not apply.
### TABLE 1
DEMographics of the Eight Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
<th>No. of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berrien Springs</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassopolis</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloma</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwardsburg</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Valley</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watervliet</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,063</strong></td>
<td><strong>810</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Berrien and Lewis Cass Intermediate School Districts' directories

**Instruments**

Six instruments were utilized for the study (see appendix A). Instruments 1, 2, and 3 were used to measure the eight selected affective traits that were generally the most dominant in the literature reviewed. Instrument 1 measured the self-perceptions of the building principals on each of the eight affective traits. Instrument 2 measured the superintendent's perceptions of the performance of his/her building principal on each of the traits. Instrument 3 measured the teachers' perceptions of the performance of their building principals.
on each of the eight traits. This Affective Trait Questionnaire utilized a Likert-type scale. The criteria for each response was:

1. Very weak
2. Weak
3. Acceptable
4. Strong
5. Very strong

The eight traits selected from the literature to be utilized for the study were: trust, empathy, honesty, respect, positive self-concept, humbleness, caring, and joyfulness (happiness).

Instruments 4, 5, and 6 utilized the "School Climate Inventory" (Fox, et al., 1973) developed through the Charles F. Kettering Foundation (CFK, Ltd.). These instruments measure the climate of a school based upon eight climate factors: respect, trust, high morale, opportunities for input, continuous academic and social growth, cohesiveness, school renewal, and caring.

A cover letter accompanied each questionnaire. It provided an explanation and description of the project and a definition of terms included in the instruments (see appendix D).

**Testing Procedures**

Appointments were made with each of the eight school superintendents. During interviews the researcher explained the nature of the study, showed forms, and sought permission to administer the respective questionnaires to the superintendents, principals, and teachers randomly selected from each school within the system. All
eight superintendents consented to the study and signed appropriate permission forms to be included with each questionnaire (see appendix B). Each superintendent permitted access to personnel directories from which the random sample was drawn. In most cases, to protect the confidentiality of personnel, this task was completed in the superintendent's office.

During each interview the superintendent scheduled a future meeting of his administrative staff when the proposal could be presented to all the principals. This staff meeting was used as a forum to explain the research proposal to the principals and to solicit their permission to participate in the study. At the conclusion of this meeting the superintendent and the principals were given their questionnaire which was to be completed within three days. The teachers' questionnaires were sent to the appropriate buildings with instructions to complete and return within three days. Following these three days the forms would be returned to the researcher via the courier of the Berrien County Intermediate School District. The entire data-collection process was conducted as planned and in a timely manner.

**Staff Selection**

To provide for acceptable power analysis, twenty percent of the teaching staff under the jurisdiction of each principal was utilized for the teacher component of the research. Only teachers placed full-time with a principal were considered for the study. Part-time or itinerant teachers were excluded as participants.
Teachers selected were chosen using the "Table of Random Numbers" by M. G. Kendall and B. B. Smith (Edwards, 1972, p. 420).

**Pilot Test**

A pilot test was conducted to preview the entire process of the research collection and to sample the test instruments. Since Niles Community School System was not within the population of the study, it was chosen to pilot the instrument. A process similar to that proposed for the actual study was completed for the pilot. A meeting was held with Dr. William Fairman explaining the project and seeking permission to use the Niles schools for the pilot project. Upon receiving his permission (see appendix C), the researcher met with three building principals who would participate in the study—a high-school principal, a junior-high principal, and an elementary principal. As the survey was administered to all participants, an additional form soliciting their suggestions regarding the project was distributed.

Of the forty-four participants taking part in the pilot study, sixteen returned their evaluations with suggestions. Most of the respondents found the number three response "uncertain" to be frustrating. That word was changed to "acceptable." Several other minor procedural changes also resulted from the suggestions.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

Returned data for the research was organized by school system and by personnel grouping—superintendent, principal, or teacher.
Each document was then audited for any clerical irregularities. Data were entered into the Andrews University computer for analysis.

Descriptive data

The first classification of data to be analyzed was descriptive in nature. Each of the eight affective traits and each of the eight school-climate factors were organized as separate variables. Each of these variables offered five possible responses. For each group studied—superintendents, principals, and teachers—the number of persons responding to each numerical choice was recorded. The percentage choosing each of the five possible responses within each of the three personnel groups were calculated. From the responses of the five possible options, a mathematical mean (mean = \bar{x}) was calculated for each of the three groups on each of the sixteen variables. Finally, the total number of responses on each variable within each group was calculated (number = N).

In order for this data to be applied to school districts outside the population of the sample, a chi square test was applied to each of the eight affective traits and the eight school-climate factors. To calculate the distribution of chi square, the number of participants responding to each of the five evaluation criteria for each of the three groups—principals, superintendents, and teachers—was utilized. In all sixteen sets response number 1 (very weak) and number 2 (weak) were combined. This collapsing was due to the small frequency of responses for these two choices. The other three responses (3, 4, and 5) all utilized the total number of actual choices within each one. The critical value of chi square at the .05 level
with a degree of freedom of 6 was determined to be 12.59 (Ferguson, 1976, p. 488).

The second classification of data investigated various relationships among the three personnel groupings on each of the sixteen variables. The Pearson product-moment formula was applied to develop a correlation coefficient. To determine the critical value of this correlation, tables were used from R. A. Fisher and F. Yates (Ferguson, 1976, p. 494). The level of significance was determined with a two-tailed test at the .01 and .05 levels. The degree of freedom (N-2) utilized the individual score of each principal on each factor and the individual score of each superintendent on each factor. However, because of the large number of teachers, the degree of freedom for them was calculated by grouping all of the teachers on each item.

Testing Hypotheses

Chapter I developed several hypotheses for the study. To be consistent with accepted methods of data collection and analysis (Sax, 1968, p. 418), the hypotheses were stated in the null form indicating no difference existed among variables (Ferguson, 1976, p. 160). The major hypothesis stated in the null declares: School principals possessing strong positive self-perceptions on stated affective behaviors will not perform as professional leaders in those areas. A "professional leader" was determined through the perceptions of the teachers and the superintendents and school-climate indicators. To test this null hypothesis data were analyzed by the following methods:
1. The principals possessing positive self-perceptions were determined to be those whose self-rated scores averaged a minimum of 4.0 which meant "strong" or higher.

2. The principals' performances were rated by their teachers and superintendents on each of the eight affective traits. These scores represented the performances of the principals as professional leaders. For these scores to determine that the principals were professional leaders, they had to be at least 4.0 which represented "strong" or to be within .10 of that score (when the score of the principals' group was 4.0 or greater).

3. Data describing the perceptions of school climate within the principals' buildings were presented. The principals' perceptions of their schools' climates were compared to how others evaluated these climates. For these perceptions to determine that the principals were professional leaders, there had to be a score of at least 4.0 which represented "strong" or to be within .10 of that score (when the score of the principals' group exceeded 4.0).

4. For rejection of the major null hypothesis, scores of the teacher and superintendent groups had to indicate agreement with the principals' group scores (as identified in criteria 1, 2, and 3 above) on a minimum of 50 percent of the affective traits and of the school-climate factors.

There were twelve supporting hypotheses presented in chapter I. Stated in the null form, these are:
1A. There is no difference between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their superintendent.

1B. There is no relationship between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their superintendent.

2A. There is no difference between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their teachers.

2B. There is no relationship between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their teachers.

3A. There is no difference between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building climate conditions and the perceptions of their superintendent.

3B. There is no relationship between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building climate conditions and the perceptions of their superintendent.

4A. There is no difference between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building climate conditions and the perceptions of their teachers.

4B. There is no relationship between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building climate conditions and the perceptions of their teachers.

5A. There is no difference between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers toward the performance of their principal on certain affective traits.
5B. There is no relationship between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers toward the performance of their principal on certain affective traits.

6A. There is no difference between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers concerning building-climate conditions.

6B. There is no relationship between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers concerning building-climate conditions.

The A form of the six hypotheses involves differences between perceptions of the three personnel groups on each of the eight traits and eight climate factors. These were examined using mean scores. For no difference to exist there must have been a .10 or greater span between the mean scores of the groups on more than 50 percent of the traits or factors. This constituted acceptance of the null hypotheses.

The B form of the six hypotheses involves relationships between perceptions of various personnel groups on each of the eight traits and eight factors. Rejection of a hypothesis occurred when more than 50 percent of the traits or factors possessed significance at the .05 level in relationships between groups.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

In this chapter the data are presented according to the procedures in chapter III. A description of the returned data is first displayed. Second, findings are presented as they relate to each of the ten topics which were utilized to determine if there was a discrepancy between the self-perceptions of a principal as an affective educator and the reality of his/her performance. Those ten topics stated:

1. The self-perceptions of the school principals concerning certain affective traits
2. The perceptions of the superintendents about their principals' performances on the selected affective traits
3. The perceptions of the teachers about their principals' performances on the selected traits
4. The self-perceptions of the school principals concerning school climate within their buildings
5. The perceptions of the superintendents about the school climate within their principals' buildings
6. The perceptions of the teachers about the school climate within their buildings
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7. The relationship between the self-perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their superintendents regarding the performances of the principals on those selected traits
8. The relationship between the self-perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their teachers regarding the performances of the principals on those selected traits
9. The relationship between the perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their superintendents toward the climate within their school buildings
10. The relationship between the perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their teachers toward the climate within their school buildings.

Third, the results of the chi-square analysis are presented.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was administered to personnel in eight public-school systems. Each of the eight school superintendents completed and returned his questionnaire. All thirty-two of the school principals completed and returned their questionnaires (see table 2). The methodology imposed that a minimum of 20 percent of the teachers should respond, a total of 148 teachers. A total of 253 teacher questionnaires were distributed, 246 (97.2 percent) were completed and 7 were returned with no response. All of the completed teacher questionnaires were included in the data, generating a composite teacher inclusion of approximately 36 percent of all teachers within the eight-school systems (see table 3).
### TABLE 2
RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE
SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Surveyed</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Number Surveyed</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berrien Springs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassopolis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwardsburg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watervliet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One hundred percent of the superintendents and principals completed and returned their questionnaires.

Data Displayed
Descriptive Data

The first three topics examined, as mentioned in chapter III, deal with perceptions about the performance of the school principal.

**Topic 1.** The self-perceptions of the school principals concerning selected affective traits.

**Topic 2.** The perceptions of the superintendents about their principals' performances on the selected affective traits.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School System</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Building Total</th>
<th>Min. Response Needed--20%</th>
<th>Number Surveyed</th>
<th>Number Responding</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berrien Springs</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>404</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassopolis</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>702</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>703</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coloma</td>
<td>Edwardsburg</td>
<td>River Valley</td>
<td>Watervliet</td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>678</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Full-time resident teachers

NOTE: 248 = 97% of the teachers returned the questionnaire.
Topic 3. The perceptions of the teachers about their principals' performances on the selected traits.

The principal's performance was observed by him/herself as well as his/her superintendent and teachers on each of the eight selected affective traits. The eight traits included: trust, empathy, honesty, respect, positive self-concept, humbleness, caring, joyfulness (happiness). Several sources of data are displayed to describe the perceptions of each of the three groups. First, the mean score derived from the total observations from each grouping is given. Second, the responses, 1 (very weak), 2 (weak), 3 (acceptable), 4 (strong), and 5 (very strong), of the persons in each of the three groups are recorded by number and percentage. Third, the chi square was determined and its significance at the .05 level is indicated.

In response to the trust factor, 84.4 percent of the principals perceived their performance as being strong or very strong. Their superintendents viewed this factor in a similar perspective rating 81.3 percent of their principals as strong or very strong. In the viewpoint of the teachers, however, it was somewhat lower; placing 63.2 percent of the principals in the strong or very strong category, while indicating 23.7 percent to be acceptable, and 13.1 percent as weak or very weak. This pattern is reflected also in the mean (X) score of all responses. Whereas the self-rating of the principals regarding trust and the evaluations of the superintendents' views in respect to their principals' performances in trust are identical at a score of 4.09, the teachers' views of their principals' performances on the trust factor are again lower at a mean score of 3.73 (table 4).
Table 4

Perceptions of the Principal's Performance: Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1 (Very Weak)</th>
<th>2 (Weak)</th>
<th>3 (Acceptable)</th>
<th>4 (Strong)</th>
<th>5 (Very Strong)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>5 15.6</td>
<td>19 59.4</td>
<td>8 25.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1 3.1</td>
<td>4 12.5</td>
<td>14 43.8</td>
<td>12 37.5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>12 4.9</td>
<td>58 23.7</td>
<td>88 35.9</td>
<td>67 27.3</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Chi square value = 12.686, which is significant at .05 (12.59)
In responding to the empathy factor, 65.6 percent of the principals perceived their performance as being strong or very strong. The superintendents' views of their principals' performances on this trait are similar to the principals'; however, they are lower, rating 59.4 percent as strong or very strong. Again the teachers perceived their principals lower on the empathy factor, indicating the performance of 51.2 percent to be strong or very strong. The rating of acceptable (3) was fairly consistent among the three groups as principals chose this response at 31.3 percent, superintendents at 37.5 percent, and teachers at 32.0 percent. The mean scores were lower than most of the other affective trait categories at 3.75 for the principals, 3.69 for superintendents, and 3.50 for the teachers (table 5).

In responding to the honesty factor, 93.7 percent of the principals perceived their performances as being very honest. The superintendents viewed their performances on this trait as 87.5 percent being very honest. The teachers perceived the honesty factor in the performances of their principals as somewhat lower, rating 69.9 percent as being very honest. The mean scores indicated a similarity between principals and superintendents, but indicated much lower scores from the teachers as to the honesty of the principals. The honesty trait had the largest discrepancy between the ratings of the teachers and of the principals of all eight factors (table 6).
TABLE 5
PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL'S PERFORMANCE: EMPATHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1 Very Weak</th>
<th>2 Weak</th>
<th>3 Acceptable</th>
<th>4 Strong</th>
<th>5 Very Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1  3.1</td>
<td>10 31.3</td>
<td>17 53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 3.1</td>
<td>12 37.5</td>
<td>15 46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>8 3.3</td>
<td>33 13.5</td>
<td>78 32.0</td>
<td>80 32.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Chi square value = 12.421 which is NOT significant at .05 (12.59).
### TABLE 6

PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL'S PERFORMANCE: HONESTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Chi square value = 13.830, which IS significant at .05 (12.59).
In responding to the respect factor, the principals scored themselves higher than the other respondents, viewing their performance as 78.1 percent being strong or very strong in this area. Superintendents observed 65.6 percent of their principals as strong or very strong, and the teachers rated 64.9 percent as such. There existed a similarity between the superintendents' and teachers' opinions within the strong and very strong grouping totals. The mean scores again indicated lower perceptions of the respect trait from teachers than from the principals or superintendents (table 7).

The positive self-concept factor had a different pattern of responses from most of the other factors. The mean score of 3.81 indicated principals see themselves as the lowest of the three groups. The mean of the superintendents was 4.0 and of the teachers 3.84, both higher than the principals' own scores. The principals also viewed themselves lower in the strong and very strong columns at 58.8 percent. The superintendents rated 76 percent of their principals as such and the teachers viewed 69.5 percent of their principals as strong and very strong (table 8).

The trait of humbleness received the overall lowest rating of all the factors. This lowest rating was consistent among each of the three personnel groups. The mean scores displayed the principals rating their own performance at the lowest level with a 3.32, while the teachers rated them slightly higher at 3.36, and the superintendents at 3.41. A large grouping of scores occurred in the acceptable (3) and strong (4) categories. Within these two fall 83.6 percent
TABLE 7

PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL'S PERFORMANCE: RESPECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1: Very Weak</th>
<th>2: Weak</th>
<th>3: Acceptable</th>
<th>4: Strong</th>
<th>5: Very Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Chi square value = 7.938, which is NOT significant at .05 (12.59).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Chi square value = 4.391, which is NOT significant at .05 (12.59).
of the principals' scores, and 67.6 percent of the teachers' scores. It is interesting to note that in this area of humbleness the teachers indicated their lowest overall response within the strong and very strong categories. Finally, it is noted that this is the only one of the eight factors in which none of the superintendents rated their principals' performances as very strong (table 9).

Within the factor of caring, a discrepancy was seen between the ratings of the teachers and those of the other two groupings. Conversely, a similarity was indicated between the principals' group and the superintendents' group scores. This was shown in the mean scores where the superintendents' and principals' scores were identical at 4.19 while the teachers' mean score was considerably lower at 3.77. There were no ratings from principals or superintendents in the very weak or weak categories, whereas 11 percent of the teachers rated their principals' performances as such. Within the upper two categories of strong and very strong fell 90.6 percent of the principals' self-ratings, but only 78.1 percent of the superintendents' and 61.4 percent of the teachers' ratings fell in these categories (table 10).

The factor joyfulness had a heavy clustering of scores in the acceptable and strong categories. In this range 75 percent of the principals observed their performances; and 78.1 percent of the superintendents and 70.6 percent of the teachers saw the performances of their principals in these categories. The mean of the scores showed that the perceptions of the superintendents (3.69) and of the teachers (3.61) were close, while the principals viewed themselves as somewhat more joyful with a mean score of 3.84 (table 11).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Chi square value = 17.219, which IS significant at .05 (12.59).
### TABLE 10
PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL'S PERFORMANCE: CARING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1 Very Weak</th>
<th>2 Weak</th>
<th>3 Acceptable</th>
<th>4 Strong</th>
<th>5 Very Strong</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>39.4⁺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.9⁺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.6⁺</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Chi square value = 19.525, which is significant at .05 (12.59).
### TABLE 11

PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL’S PERFORMANCE: JOYFULNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Chi square value = 8.032, which is NOT significant at .05 (12.59).
Table 12 displays the mean responses of the principals, the superintendents, and the teachers on each of the eight factors. Several general observances may be drawn from the data displayed in this table. First, there is general geometric parallelness of the three lines. This indicates that the mean score of each group fluctuates somewhat consistently. There was a tendency when one of the responding groups scored high or low on a given factor that the other two groups also scored high or low on that trait. However,

Table 12

Summary of the mean responses of the principals, superintendents, and teachers toward the eight affective traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Traits</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive self-concept</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbleness</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyfulness</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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the amount of variation between the means on each of the eight factors did not seem to possess a consistency. With the exception of two factors, positive self-concept and humbleness, the mean scores of the teachers rated the principals' performances lower than the principals rated themselves and lower than the superintendents rated the principals. Finally, table 12 shows that in general the scores of the principals and the superintendents were much closer to each other than were the scores of the teachers.

Table 13 places a ranking on the mean scores of the principals, the superintendents, and the teachers in respect to each of the eight factors. This ranking displays the highest to the lowest mean scores of each factor for each group.

**TABLE 13**

**RANKED MEANS OF THE AFFECTIVE TRAITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Self-concept</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbleness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyfulness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rankings of mean scores indicate a similarity of order of the perceptions of each of the three groups toward the performance of the principal. It is interesting to note that total agreement existed only at the first (1) and last (8) ranked trait factors. This indicates that each group—the principals, the superintendents, and the teachers—perceived the performance of the principal in the area of honesty to be the highest and the performance in the area of humbleness to be the lowest.

The second battery of data related to topics 4, 5, and 6 and reported the observations of the principals, the superintendents, and the teachers concerning their view of the climate within their school buildings. School climate was observed by using the eight specific climate factors. Tables 14 through 21 are presented displaying the results of responses toward each of the climate factors.

In evaluating the building climate within their school as to respect, the teachers' views were much lower than the principals' and the superintendents'. Nearly one-fifth of the teachers (19.9 percent) viewed respect as very weak or weak, as compared to 3.1 percent of the principals and 12.5 percent of the superintendents. The largest grouping of the teachers (39.4 percent) believed that respect in their building was acceptable, with only 40.7 percent finding it strong or very strong. On the other hand, 68.7 percent of the principals believed respect in their building was strong or very strong. The superintendents scored even higher, indicating respect within their principals' buildings as strong or very strong, in 71.9 percent of the evaluations (table 14).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1 Very Weak</th>
<th>2 Weak</th>
<th>3 Acceptable</th>
<th>4 Strong</th>
<th>5 Very Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Chi square value = 25.597, which IS significant at .05 (12.59).
A considerable discrepancy in the factor of trust was evident among the teachers, the principals, and superintendents. Of the teachers 20.7 percent believed trust within the building was very weak or weak. The administrators tended to see trust at a higher level with very few responding at the lower two categories. The majority indicated trust was strong or very strong (table 15).

The area of high morale was evaluated low by all three groups. A large portion of the teachers (40.6 percent) indicated the morale factor was very weak or weak within their building. Principals also viewed morale lower, as 15.6 percent judged their building very weak or weak. On the very strong side of the scale, scores were few. In fact, no principal indicated his/her building to be very strong, and only 15.6 percent of the superintendents and 7.8 percent of the teachers chose the very strong category. On the high morale factor administrators tended to select more often the acceptable and strong responses, with principals at 84.4 percent and superintendents at 71.9 percent (table 16).

The opportunities for input was one of two factors in which the mean of the principals' evaluations was higher than the others. Again the teachers' perceptions were quite low, as 23.2 percent felt that opportunity for input within their building was very weak or weak. All three groups indicated very consistently that this factor was acceptable at 34.4 percent, 34.4 percent, and 33.5 percent (table 17).

In viewing the responses in each of the five categories among the groups of respondents, a more consistent pattern existed in the
### TABLE 15
PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CLIMATE: TRUST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superintendents</strong></td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Chi square value = 29.158, which IS significant at .05 (12.59).
TABLE 16
PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CLIMATE: HIGH MORALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1 Very Weak</th>
<th>2 Weak</th>
<th>3 Acceptable</th>
<th>4 Strong</th>
<th>5 Very Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Chi square value = 23.641, which IS significant at .05 (12.59).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1 Very Weak</th>
<th>2 Weak</th>
<th>3 Acceptable</th>
<th>4 Strong</th>
<th>5 Very Strong</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Chi square value = 13.869, which is significant at .05 (12.59).
area of continuous academic and social growth. The teachers tended to evaluate slightly lower than the other two groups but there was more agreement among them (table 18).

The area of cohesiveness received the lowest mean rating of all eight climate factors by the teachers and the superintendents. The teachers rated building cohesiveness as 37.8 percent very weak or weak. The administrators seldom viewed this area in the lower categories, but rather chose the more moderate ranks. The principals perceived the building cohesiveness as being acceptable or strong at 78.1 percent as did the superintendents (table 19).

The superintendents' group viewed school renewal more positively than did the other two groups. The mean score of the superintendents (3.78) was considerably higher than those of the others as was their impression that school renewal was strong or very strong (62.5 percent). Again the teachers displayed a much lower opinion of this factor with a mean rating of 3.20 and with 27.5 percent believing school renewal was very weak or weak (table 20).

Overall the climate factor of caring was judged to be the highest, although there still remained a substantial difference in the ratings of each group. The teachers were considerably lower with a mean rating of 3.33; the principals' mean was 3.78; and the superintendents', 3.84 (table 21).

Table 22 displays the mean responses of the principals, the superintendents, and the teachers on each of the eight school climate factors. Several observations can be made from this data. First, it can be noted that on every one of the eight climate factors the
### TABLE 18

**PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CLIMATE: CONTINUOUS ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL GROWTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1 Very Weak</th>
<th>2 Weak</th>
<th>3 Acceptable</th>
<th>4 Strong</th>
<th>5 Very Strong</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 12.5</td>
<td>10 31.3</td>
<td>14 43.7</td>
<td>4 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 9.4</td>
<td>11 34.4</td>
<td>14 43.7</td>
<td>4 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>18 7.3</td>
<td>28 11.4</td>
<td>96 39.0</td>
<td>77 31.3</td>
<td>27 11.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Chi square value = 4.870, which is NOT significant at .05 (12.59).
TABLE 19

PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CLIMATE: COHESIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1 Very Weak</th>
<th>2 Weak</th>
<th>3 Acceptable</th>
<th>4 Strong</th>
<th>5 Very Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 12.5</td>
<td>11 34.4</td>
<td>14 43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 12.5</td>
<td>13 40.6</td>
<td>12 37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>28 11.4</td>
<td>65 26.4</td>
<td>83 33.8</td>
<td>53 21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Chi square value = 18.287, which is significant at .05 (12.59).
TABLE 20

PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CLIMATE: SCHOOL RENEWAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N 32, 32, 244

Chi square value = 12.122, which is significant at .05 (12.59).
### TABLE 21
PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL CLIMATE: CARING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1 (Very Weak)</th>
<th>2 (Weak)</th>
<th>3 (Acceptable)</th>
<th>4 (Strong)</th>
<th>5 (Very Strong)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Chi square value = 22.451, which is significant at .05 (12.59).
TABLE 22
SUMMARY OF THE MEAN RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS, SUPERINTENDENTS, AND TEACHERS TOWARD THE EIGHT SCHOOL CLIMATE FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Climate Factors</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Morale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Input</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Academic and Social Growth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Renewal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers' mean scores were considerably lower than the two administrative groups. Second, with the exception of two climate factors—opportunities for input and cohesiveness—superintendents judged the school climate higher than did the principals. Again, as with the...
affective trait factors, there is a general geometric parallelness of the three lines. The fluctuation of the scores on each climate variable is somewhat consistent among the three personnel groups. There was a tendency that when one of the three personnel groups scored lower or higher than the other two groups would respond in a similar manner.

Table 23 places a ranking on the mean scores of the principals, the superintendents, and the teachers in respect to each of the eight climate factors. This ranking displays the highest to the lowest mean scores of each climate factor for each group.

**TABLE 23**

RANKED MEANS OF THE CLIMATE FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Morale</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Input</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Academic and Social Growth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Renewal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, as with the ranking of the affective trait factors, the rankings of mean scores of the climate factors indicate a similarity of the order of the perceptions of each of the three groups toward the performance of the principal. This similarity is not as obvious among the climate factors because of the rank ties that are evident. Agreement does exist (with a tie among the superintendents) for the factor caring. This was rated by the means of each personnel group to be the highest. One the bottom end of the ranking is cohesiveness, being the most consistent.

The chi square results indicate that of the sixteen studies of the affective traits and the climate factors, eleven were significant and five were not (table 24). This level of significance implies that the results of the research may be applied to external school situations with expected frequencies.

Correlation Data

The third battery of data addressed topics 7 through 10.

Topic 7. The relationship between the self-perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their superintendents regarding the performances of the principals on those selected traits.

Topic 8. The relationship between the self-perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their teachers regarding the performance of the principal on those selected traits.

Topic 9. The relationship between the perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their superintendents toward the climate within their school buildings.
TABLE 24
CHI SQUARE OF THE AFFECTIVE TRAITS AND OF THE SCHOOL CLIMATE FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Traits</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>School Climate Factors</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>12.686*</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>25.597*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>12.421</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>29.158*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>13.830*</td>
<td>High Morale</td>
<td>23.641*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>7.938</td>
<td>Opportunities for input</td>
<td>13.869*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive self-concept</td>
<td>4.391</td>
<td>Continuous academic &amp; social growth</td>
<td>4.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbleness</td>
<td>17.219*</td>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>18.287*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>19.525*</td>
<td>School renewal</td>
<td>14.122*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyfulness (happiness)</td>
<td>8.032</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>22.451*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level (12.59)

Topic 10. The relationship between the perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their teachers toward the climate within their school buildings.

These topics dealt with various relationships among the principal, the superintendent, and the teachers. These relationships were displayed using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Table 25 presents the correlations between the self-perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their superintendents and
teachers on the eight affective traits (topics 7 and 8). Column one shows the correlations between the principals and their superintendents, whereas column two is between the principals and their teachers, and column three between the superintendents and their teachers.

### TABLE 25

**CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS ON EACH AFFECTIVE TRAIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Correlation Between</th>
<th>Principals/Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals/Teachers</th>
<th>Superintendents/Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.2469</td>
<td>.4088*</td>
<td>.5993**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>-.2739</td>
<td>-.1110</td>
<td>.4624**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>-.2590</td>
<td>.1649</td>
<td>.5200**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.0014</td>
<td>.3271</td>
<td>.5507**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Self-concept</td>
<td>.0979</td>
<td>.3589*</td>
<td>.1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbleness</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.3303</td>
<td>.3601*</td>
<td>.5510**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.3403</td>
<td>.4262*</td>
<td>.4123*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyfulness</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.2647</td>
<td>.2099</td>
<td>.3857*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

♦Significant at .05 level of significance  
♦♦Significant at .01 level of significance

Correlations presented in table 25 are discussed in respect to the following description of those scores:
0 = no correlation
below $\pm .20$ = meaningless
$\pm .20 - .39$ = low
$\pm .40 - .59$ = moderate
above $\pm .60$ = high

The data displayed in the first column, that being the correlations between the perceptions of the principals and of his/her superintendent, indicate that six of the eight traits were described as having a low level of relationship. Two of the traits, respect and positive self-concept, are meaningless. None of the eight traits in this grouping were determined as significant at .05 or .01.

The second column showing the correlations between the perceptions of the principals and of his/her teachers shows a low to moderate relationship between the two groups. Two of the traits, empathy and honesty, remain meaningless. Four of the traits show a low level and two traits, trust and caring, have a moderate level of correlation. Three traits, positive self-concept, humbleness, and caring, exhibit significance at the .05 level.

The third column displays the correlations between the superintendents and teachers reflecting their perceptions of the principal's performance on the eight affective traits. Here relationships are much greater. Six of the traits possess a moderate relationship. Seven of the eight traits are significant at the .05 level and five remain significant at .01.
Observing the data in a horizontal manner in table 26, the correlations of each of the three groupings as they related to each of the affective traits is displayed. The traits of trust, empathy, honesty, respect, humbleness, and joyfulness all display that the superintendent/teacher group possesses a higher level of correlation than either of the other two groups. The lowest correlations appear for the most part between the principal/superintendent group where

**TABLE 26**

**CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS, AND TEACHERS ON EACH SCHOOL CLIMATE FACTOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Principals/ Superintendents</th>
<th>Principals/ Teachers</th>
<th>Superintendents/ Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>.1256</td>
<td>.2991</td>
<td>.4848**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>.3740*</td>
<td>.2669</td>
<td>.2763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Morale</td>
<td>.3337</td>
<td>.5354**</td>
<td>.4334*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Input</td>
<td>-.0438</td>
<td>.0056</td>
<td>.2916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Academic and Social Growth</td>
<td>-.0741</td>
<td>.2895</td>
<td>.1647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>.0912</td>
<td>.3060</td>
<td>.4577**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Renewal</td>
<td>-.0592</td>
<td>.3933*</td>
<td>.4452*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>.1144</td>
<td>.3890*</td>
<td>.4159*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level of significance
**Significant at .01 level of significance
they were the lowest on the traits of trust, respect, positive self-concept, humbleness, and caring. An obvious difference is evident between the three groups on the respect trait where the principal/superintendent relationship is meaningless, the principal/teacher relationship low, and the superintendent/teacher relationship a high moderate level.

Table 26 presents the correlations between the self-perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their superintendents and teachers on the eight school-climate factors. Column one displays the correlations between the principals and the superintendents, whereas column two is between the principals and the teachers, and column three is between the superintendents and the teachers. Correlations presented in table 26 are discussed in respect to the following description of those scores.

0 = no correlation
below ± .20 = meaningless
± .20 - .39 = low
± .40 - .59 = moderate
above ± .60 = high

Column one, showing the correlations between the principals and the superintendents on each of the eight school-climate factors denotes a general lack of relationships. Six of the eight factors are in the meaningless range, and two, trust and high morale, are low. Only the factor of trust has a level of significance at the .05 level. The second column which shows correlations between principals and teachers has only one factor (opportunities for input) which is meaningless. Six of the factors rate as low in correlation.
and one factor, high morale, is rated as moderate and is significant at the .01 level. The third column showing correlations between superintendents and teachers displays the overall highest correlations on five of the eight factors. Five of the factors are significant at the .05 level. Only one topic, continuous academic and social growth, has a correlation which is considered meaningless.

The correlations of each of the three groups as they relate to each other is shown for each climate factor on horizontal lines. In five factors the correlations between superintendents and teachers are higher than correlations between the other two groups. Three of the factors, respect, school renewal, and caring have a large difference between each of the groups. In each of these three factors the relationships between the principals/superintendents are classified as meaningless, the relationships between principals/teachers are low, and those between superintendents/teachers are moderate. The relationships between the principals and the superintendents are the lowest, where six of the eight factors rated overall lower than either of the other two groups.

Summary

Eight public-school systems in Berrien and Cass counties in Michigan made up the population of the study. Within these systems there were thirty-two principals. The questionnaire to gather data was sent to each of the eight school superintendents, the thirty-two building principals, and a sampling of the teachers. Questionnaires were returned from all of the superintendents, all of the principals, and from 97 percent of the teachers surveyed.
Descriptive data were examined as it related to: the self-perceptions of the school principals, the perceptions of the school superintendents about their principals' performances, and the perceptions of the teachers about their principals' performances. These perceptions were viewed as they related to the eight traits of: trust, empathy, honesty, respect, positive self-concept, humbleness, caring, and joyfulness (happiness) and to the eight school-climate factors of: respect, trust, high morale, opportunities for input, continuous academic and social growth, cohesiveness, school renewal, and caring. Each of the three groups of respondents gave its perceptions of the principal's performance according to a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Response 1 represented a rating of very weak, 2--weak, 3--acceptable, 4--strong, and 5--very strong. From these responses, data were organized and presented in several different ways. First, the total number of persons choosing each of the five possible responses was determined. Second, the percentage of persons choosing each response was indicated. Third, the mean scores for each of the three groups--principals, superintendents, and teachers were calculated. Results generally indicated that the self-perceptions of the principals were higher than the perceptions of both the superintendents and the teachers regarding the performances of the principals. In most cases the scores of the principals and the scores of the superintendents were similar. However, the scores of the teachers were generally lower than the other two groups.

A chi square analysis of this data was conducted and indicated that the results of this research may be applied to external school situations with expected frequencies.
The final section of chapter IV viewed the various relationships among the principals, the superintendents, and the teachers on each of the eight affective traits and the eight school-climate factors. This was accomplished by using the Pearson produce-moment correlation coefficient. In general there was no significance between the scores of the principals and the superintendents—only one of the sixteen variables possessed significance at the .05 level. However, a significant relationship at the .05 level existed between the scores of the principals and the scores of the teachers on seven of the sixteen variables. More relationships were evident between the superintendents and the teachers where twelve of the sixteen variables indicated a significant relationship at the .05 level.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Chapter I

A historic view of the school principal was presented. The position of principal began with responsibilities of a janitorial and clerical nature and evolved to the current status where the principal serves as the key person in the educational administration of a school building.

The importance of the affective domain of education was presented with the conclusion that this domain has a major effect upon the entire educational process.

Based upon the importance of the role of the principal and affective education within a school, the purpose of this study was to determine if there was a discrepancy between the self-perceptions of a principal as an affective educator and his/her actual performance. To investigate this concern a major hypothesis and twelve supporting hypotheses were used. The major hypothesis stated: School principals possessing strong positive self-perceptions on stated affective behaviors will perform as professional leaders in those areas. The supporting hypotheses stated:
1A. There is a difference between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their superintendent.

1B. There is a relationship between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their superintendent.

2A. There is a difference between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their teachers.

2B. There is a relationship between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their teachers.

3A. There is a difference between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building climate conditions and the perceptions of their superintendent.

3B. There is a relationship between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building climate conditions and the perceptions of their superintendent.

4A. There is a difference between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building climate conditions and the perceptions of their teachers.

4B. There is a relationship between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building climate conditions and the perceptions of their teachers.
5A. There is a difference between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers toward the performance of their principal on certain affective traits.

5B. There is a relationship between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers toward the performance of their principal on certain affective traits.

6A. There is a difference between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers concerning building climate conditions.

6B. There is a relationship between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers concerning building climate conditions.

Chapter II

The second chapter reviewed literature pertaining to three main areas relating to the study: the perceptions and performance of the principal, the school climate, and affective education.

Literature indicated that relationships existed between the self-perceptions of the principal and the perceptions of his/her staff and administration. In general, there was agreement between the self-perceptions of the principal as to his/her own behavior and the observations of other groups concerning that behavior. Two studies revealed a relationship between the principal's performance and student achievement. Numerous studies indicated a relationship between a student's self-concept and academic achievement.
The second area of literature addressed the topic of school climate. The summary of that literature indicated a relationship existed between the climate of a school and the perceptions of the people that work there.

The third section of literature reviewed presented studies relating to affective traits. The traits that appeared most commonly throughout the literature were recognized. These included: love, acceptance, trust, empathy, respect, caring, honesty, purity, joy, peacefulness, genuineness, humbleness, self-respect, and self-concept.

Chapter III

Chapter III explained the methodology used within the study. To investigate the hypotheses ten topics were developed. These topics addressed the perceptions and relationships among the three groups of educators within the study: principals, superintendents, and teachers. This investigation isolated eight specific affective traits and eight school-climate factors.

The population of the research was described to be all K-12 public-school systems within Berrien and Cass counties in Michigan having a student enrollment of approximately 1,500 to 2,500. Schools qualifying for the study were: Berrien Springs, Brandywine, Buchanan, Cassopolis, Coloma, Edwardsburg, River Valley, and Watervliet.

Six instruments were used to gather data from participants of the study--principals, superintendents, and teachers. Three instruments measured perceptions of the three groups toward the eight selected affective traits: trust, empathy, honesty, respect, positive
self-concept, humbleness, caring, and joyfulness. The other three instruments measured the school climate based upon the eight climate factors: respect, trust, high morale, opportunities for input, continuous academic and social growth, cohesiveness, school renewal, and caring. The instruments utilized a Likert-type scale with scores ranging from very weak to very strong.

Questionnaires were administered to each superintendent, the thirty-two building principals, and a sampling of the teachers within the school systems. Data from a minimum of 20 percent of the teaching staff within each school building were required.

A pilot test was conducted on the Niles Community School System to preview the entire process and to test the survey instruments. Several minor changes were implemented due to the pilot test.

The methods used to collect and analyze the data were described. First, the number and percentage choosing each of the five responses within each of the personnel groups were calculated for each affective trait and climate factor. From this data the mean score was developed for each trait and factor. The second analysis viewed relationships among each of the personnel groups—principals, superintendents, and teachers—on each of the sixteen variables. A correlation coefficient was developed for each using the Pearson-product moment formula. The third analysis involved a chi square test of the data.

The major hypothesis and the twelve supporting hypotheses were stated in the null form. The methods used to apply the data to the hypotheses were stated.
Eight public-school systems in Berrien and Cass counties in Michigan made up the population of the study. Within these systems were thirty-two principals. The questionnaire to gather data was sent to each of the eight school superintendents, the thirty-two building principals, and a sampling of the teachers. Questionnaires were returned from all of the superintendents, all of the principals and from 97 percent of the teachers surveyed.

Descriptive data were examined as they related to: the self-perceptions of the school principals, the perceptions of the school superintendents about their principals' performances, and the perceptions of the teachers about their principals' performances. These perceptions were viewed as they related to the eight traits of: trust, empathy, honesty, respect, positive self-concept, humbleness, caring, and joyfulness (happiness) and to the eight school-climate factors of: respect, trust, high morale, opportunities for input, continuous academic and social growth, cohesiveness, school renewal, and caring. Each of the three groups of respondents gave its perceptions of the principal's performance according to a scale ranging from 1 to 5. Response 1 represented a rating of very weak, 2--weak, 3--acceptable, 4--strong, and 5--very strong. From these responses, data were organized and presented in several different ways. First, the total number of persons choosing each of the five possible responses was determined. Second, the percentage of persons choosing each response was indicated. Third, the mean scores for each of the three groups--principals, superintendents, and teachers--were calculated. Results generally indicated
that the self-perceptions of the principals were higher than the perceptions of both the superintendents and the teachers regarding the performances of the principals. In most cases the scores of the principals and the scores of the superintendents were similar. However, the scores of the teachers were generally lower than the other two groups.

A chi square analysis of this data was conducted and indicated that the results of this research may be applied to external school situations with expected frequencies.

The final section of chapter IV viewed the various relationships among the principals, the superintendents, and the teachers on each of the eight affective traits and the eight school-climate factors. This was accomplished by using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. In general there was no significance between the scores of the principals and the superintendents—only one of the sixteen variables possessed significance at the .05 level. However, a significant relationship at the .05 level existed between the scores of the principals and the scores of the teachers on seven of the sixteen variables. More relationships were evident between the superintendents and the teachers where twelve of the sixteen variables indicated a significant relationship at the .05 level.

Conclusions Concerning the Ten Topics

Ten topics were developed in chapter III to aid in interpreting and applying the data. These topics were presented with the data and conclusive statements for each topic. The ten topics were:
1. The self-perceptions of the school principals concerning certain affective traits

2. The perceptions of the superintendents about their principals' performances on the selected affective traits

3. The perceptions of the teachers about their principals' performances on the selected traits

4. The self perceptions of the school principals concerning school climate within their buildings

5. The perceptions of the superintendents about the school climate within their principals' buildings

6. The perceptions of the teachers about the school climate within their buildings

7. The relationship between the self-perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their superintendents regarding the performances of the principals on those selected traits

8. The relationship between the self-perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their teachers regarding the performance of the principal on those selected traits

9. The relationship between the perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their superintendents toward the climate within their school buildings

10. The relationship between the perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their teachers toward the climate within their school buildings.

The conclusions relating to the ten topics are:
Topic 1

The self-perceptions of the school principals concerning certain affective traits.

Overall the principals perceived their own performances on the selected affective traits higher than their superintendents and teachers viewed their performances. On seven of the eight traits, 65 percent or more of the principals believed their performances were in the strong or very strong categories. Interestingly, the only category not to be included in this group was humbleness, where only 38.8 percent of the principals rated themselves high. On all eight traits, an average of 72.7 percent of the principals perceived their performances as strong or very strong. On the low end of the scale only 3.54 percent of the principals perceived their performances as weak or very weak on the overall average of all eight traits.

The mean scores of the principals group again displayed a higher perception of their performance than did the other two groups. On mean scores the principals perceived their own performances equally or higher than did the teacher and superintendent groups on all but two of the traits—positive self-concept and humbleness. Additionally, the average mean of the principals on all eight traits was considerably higher than that of the teacher group (principals $\bar{X} = 3.94$, teachers $\bar{X} = 3.69$) and slightly higher than that of the superintendent group (principals $\bar{X} = 3.94$, superintendents $\bar{X} = 3.92$).

This overall mean score of 3.94 is slightly less than a perfect strong score of 4.0. The descriptive data presented indicates...
that the principal perceives his/her overall performance as slightly less than strong.

Topic 2

The perceptions of the superintendents about their principals' performances on the selected affective traits.

Superintendents observed the performances of their principals to be strong or very strong on all eight traits 71.1 percent of the time. Data indicated that they rated their principals less than 60 percent strong or very strong on only two traits--empathy (59.4 percent) and humbleness (56.3 percent). The overall mean of the superintendents on all eight traits was 3.92, slightly lower than a perfect strong rating of 4.0.

The descriptive data presented indicated that the superintendents perceived the overall performances of their principals as strong.

Topic 3

The perceptions of the teachers about their principals' performances on the selected traits.

Teachers observed the performance of their principals to be strong or very strong on all eight traits 59.6 percent of the time. This is somewhat less than the perceptions of the superintendents on the same criteria, as they rated the principals to be strong or very strong 71.1 percent of the time. On the other hand, the teachers rated their administrators as very weak or weak in 12.8 percent of the cases. This compared to a rating of 5.1 percent on the same categories by the superintendents.
The average of the means on the eight traits for the teacher group was 3.69; again somewhat less than the same rating from the superintendents (3.92).

The descriptive data indicated that teachers perceived the performances of their principals consistently less than did the superintendents and the principals. Mean scores indicated a teacher perception of that performance between acceptable (3.0) and strong (4.0) at a mean score of 3.69.

**Topic 4**

The self-perceptions of the school principals concerning school climate within their buildings.

Principals perceived the climate of their building to be strong or very strong 59.8 percent of the time on the eight climate factors. On the bottom end of the scale they evaluated the climate of their building to be very weak or weak only 7.8 percent of the time. The mean overall average of 3.6 fell between acceptable (3.0) and strong (4.0) on the scale.

**Topic 5**

The perceptions of the superintendents about the school climate within their principals' buildings.

Superintendents observed that the climate of their principals' buildings was strong or very strong on all eight school-climate traits in 59.8 percent of the cases. On the bottom end of the scale they evaluated these climates as being very weak or weak in only 8.98
percent of the cases. The mean overall average of 3.7 fell between acceptable (3.0) and strong (4.0) on the scale.

**Topic 6**

The perceptions of the teachers about the school climate within their buildings.

Teachers observed the climate of their school buildings as being strong or very strong 39 percent of the time overall on the eight climate factors. On the lower end of the scale they rated the climate very weak or weak in 26.1 percent of the cases. The mean overall average of 3.16 fell slightly above the acceptable rating of 3.0. Teachers rated their buildings consistently below the ratings of both the administrative groups.

**Topic 7**

The relationship between the self-perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their superintendents regarding the performances of the principals on those selected traits.

The correlations between the principals and their superintendents indicated a general lack of relationship between the perceptions of the two groups. Six of the eight traits were low with the other two meaningless as they related to each other. None of the eight traits possessed a significance at the .05 level.

**Topic 8**

The relationship between the self-perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their teachers regarding the performance of the principal on those selected traits.
A significant relationship was evidenced between the perceptions of the teachers and principals on four of the eight affective traits. In describing these eight relationships, two were meaningless, four were low, and two were moderate.

Topic 9

The relationship between the perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their superintendents toward the climate within the school building.

The correlations between the principals and their superintendents indicated a general lack of relationship between the perceptions of the two groups. Six of the eight climate factors were meaningless with two classified as low. Only one of the eight factors possessed a significance at the .05 level.

Topic 10

The relationship between the perceptions of the principals and the perceptions of their teachers toward the climate within their school buildings.

A significant relationship was evidenced between the perceptions of the teachers and principals on three of the eight climate factors. In describing these eight relationships; one was meaningless, six were low, and one was moderate.

The Statement of Hypotheses

The "Statement of Hypotheses" originally exhibited in chapter III included one major null hypothesis and twelve supporting null
hypotheses to be examined. This section presents those null hypothe-
oses as they related to the data collected.

The major null hypothesis states: School principals possess-
ing strong positive self-perceptions on stated affective behaviors
will not perform as professional leaders in those areas.

Chapter III created a standard for principals who possess
strong positive self-perception. A minimum rating of strong (4.0)
on the questionnaire indicated this achievement. The study displayed
the mean (\(\bar{x}\)) scores of all the principals as they viewed their self-
performance. Four of the traits (trust, honesty, respect, and caring)
received a mean score of 4.0 (strong) or higher as the principals
viewed themselves. Therefore, on these four affective traits the
principals met the stated requirements for having strong positive
self-perceptions.

To determine the status of the major null hypothesis these
four traits were compared to the principals' professional leadership
in those four areas. This professional leadership was judged by the
perceptions of the superintendent, the teachers, and the actual school
climate. Table 27 illustrates the mean scores of each group on the
four traits in which principals judged their performance strong posi-
tive.

According to the criteria established in chapter III, the
superintendents' group concurred with the self-perceptions of the
principals on these four traits. However, the view from the teachers
on all four traits indicated the performance of their principals was
less than strong (4.0), the minimum level for acceptance.
TABLE 27
MEAN SCORES ON TRUST, HONESTY,
RESPECT, CARING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The climate of the school building was the final variable used to view the principal's performance. Data indicated that none of the eight climate factors were considered as strong by any of the participants--the principals, the superintendents, or the teachers. Thus the hypothesis as stated cannot be addressed as presented by the results of the school-climate data. However, data supporting the lower impressions of the teachers concerning the performance of their principal were very evident. On all eight climate factors the impressions of the teachers concerning their principal's performance were much lower than the principal's self-perceptions.

Based upon criteria stated for rejection of the major null hypothesis, which mandated that there must be agreement between groups within a minimum of 50 percent of the affective traits and climate factors, the hypothesis is accepted. This indicates that a school principal possessing strong positive self-perceptions on
stated affective traits does not necessarily perform as a professional leader in those areas.

The twelve supporting hypotheses

Chapter III stated hypotheses 1A through 6A involved differences among the perceptions of the three personnel groups on each of the eight traits and eight climate factors. These were examined using mean scores. For no difference to exist there had to be a .10 or greater span between the mean scores of the groups on more than 50 percent of the affective traits or climate factors. This constituted acceptance of the null hypothesis.

Supporting null hypothesis 1A states: There is no difference between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their superintendent. Table 28 illustrates the mean scores of each group for each affective trait.

The mean scores as indicated in table 28 exhibited some similarity between the perceptions of the principals and those of the superintendents. The two traits of trust and caring had mean scores that were equal. Five of the eight traits had mean scores within .10 of each other. The average of all mean scores displayed a closeness between the principals and the superintendents, with scores of 3.94 and 3.92, respectively.

As 62.5 percent of the traits exhibited mean scores within .10 of the principals' group score and the superintendents' group score, null hypothesis 1A is accepted. This indicates that there is no difference between the self-perceptions of principals and the perceptions of their superintendent on the selected affective traits.
### TABLE 28

**SUMMARY OF MEAN SCORES FOR AFFECTIVE TRAITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Self-concept</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbleness</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyfulness</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.94</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting null hypothesis 2A states: *There is no difference between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their teachers.* The mean scores as indicated in table 28 showed a lack of similarity between the scores of the principals and their teachers. Two of the traits had similar means—positive self-concept and humbleness—where they were within .04 of each other. However, five of the eight traits greatly differed, having over .50 separation. The average of all mean scores indicated a substantial difference between the principals and the teachers with scores of 3.94 and 3.69, respectively.
As 25 percent of the traits exhibited mean scores within .10 of the principals' group score and the teachers' group score, null hypothesis number 2A is rejected. This indicates that there is a difference between the self-perceptions of principals and the perceptions of their teachers on the selected affective traits.

Supporting null hypothesis 3A states: There is no difference between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building climate conditions and the perceptions of their superintendent. Table 29 illustrates the mean scores of each group for each school-climate factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Morale</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Input</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Academic and Social Growth</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Renewal</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Mean</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29 displays some similarities between the means of the principals and the superintendents. The average mean between the two groups differed by .10. Five of the eight school-climate factors had mean scores within .10 of the principals' group score and the superintendants' group score. This amounted to 62.5 percent of the factors, which by the criteria established in chapter III constituted acceptance of the null hypothesis. This indicates that there is no difference between the self-perceptions of principals and the perceptions of their superintendents on the selected school-climate factors.

Supporting null hypothesis 4A states: There is no difference between the self perceptions of principals concerning building climate conditions and the perceptions of their teachers. None of the stated school-climate factors were within the .10 acceptable span between the means of the principal and teacher groups. Therefore, null hypothesis 4A is rejected, indicating that there is a difference between the self-perceptions of principals and the perceptions of their teachers about the school's climate.

Supporting null hypothesis 5A states: There is no difference between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers toward the performance of their principal on certain affective traits. Table 28 shows that on all eight affective traits the superintendents' mean scores were higher than those of the teachers. The average mean score of the superintendents was considerably above the teachers with scores of 3.92 and 3.69, respectively.

Two of the traits, which is 25 percent, exhibited mean scores within the .10 acceptable span between the means of the superintendent
and teacher groups. Therefore, null hypothesis 5A is rejected, indicating that there is a difference between the perceptions of superintendents and the perceptions of the teachers concerning the performance of their principal on certain affective traits.

Supporting null hypothesis 6A states: There is no difference between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers concerning building climate conditions. Table 29 showed that none of the eight school-climate factors were within the .10 acceptable span between the means of the superintendents' group scores and those of the teachers' group scores. Therefore, null hypothesis 6A was rejected, indicating that there is a difference between the perceptions of superintendents and of teachers about the climate of their school.

In chapter III criteria was presented to determine the status of null hypotheses 1B through 6B. Rejection of a hypothesis occurred when more than 50 percent of the traits or factors possessed significance at the .05 level among relationships between various groups.

Supporting null hypothesis 1B states: There is no relationship between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their superintendents. Table 25 illustrates that none of the correlations between the principals and the superintendents were significant on any of the eight affective traits. Therefore, null hypothesis 1B is accepted, indicating no relationship between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their superintendents.
Supporting null hypothesis 2B states: **There is no relationship between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their teachers.** As table 25 illustrates, four of the eight traits had a correlation with a significance at the .05 level between the perceptions of principals and teachers. Therefore, null hypothesis 2B is accepted, indicating no relationship between the self-perceptions of principals on certain affective traits and the perceptions of their teachers.

Supporting null hypothesis 3B states: **There is no relationship between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building climate conditions and the perceptions of their superintendents.** Table 26 indicates that of the eight correlations between principals and superintendents only one proved significant at the .05 level. Based upon these relationships, null hypothesis 3B is accepted, indicating no relationship between the self-perceptions of principals and those of superintendents on building-climate conditions.

Supporting null hypothesis 4B states: **There is no relationship between the self-perceptions of principals concerning building climate conditions and the perceptions of their teachers.** Table 26 shows that three of the eight school climate factors had significant correlations between the perceptions of the principals and those of the teachers. Based upon these relationships, null hypothesis 4B is accepted, indicating no relationship between the self-perceptions of the principals and those of the teachers on building-climate conditions.
Supporting null hypothesis 5B states: There is no relationship between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers toward the performance of their principal on certain affective traits. Table 25 shows that on seven of the eight affective traits a significant correlation at the .05 level existed between the perceptions of the superintendents and the teachers about the performance of their principal. Based upon these relationships, null hypothesis 5B is rejected, indicating that a relationship does exist between the perceptions of the superintendent and the teachers concerning the performance of their principal on certain affective traits.

Supporting null hypothesis 6B states: There is no relationship between the perceptions of the superintendent and those of the teachers concerning building climate conditions. Table 26 indicates that on five of the eight school-climate factors a significant correlation at the .05 level existed between the perceptions of the superintendents and the teachers. Based upon these relationships, null hypothesis 6B is rejected, indicating that a relationship does exist between the perceptions of the superintendent and the teachers concerning school-building climate conditions.

Implications

Perhaps the most dominant implication was displayed in the relationship among the three personnel groups. The mean scores showed a close likeness between the impressions of the principals and the superintendents and a usually consistent, lower set of scores from the teachers. This is exhibited in table 12 on the
affective traits and more dramatically in Table 22 which shows opinions of the school climate. An average of all eight means of the affective traits shows the grand mean of all principals at 3.94, all superintendents at 3.92, and all teachers at 3.69. On the school-climate factors the principals' grand mean was at 3.6, the superintendents' at 3.7, and the teachers' at 3.16. This implies that teachers perceived the performance of their principal and the climate of their building considerably lower than did their principal and superintendent.

The impressions of all three groups generally perceived the climate of their schools as only acceptable. None of the mean responses of any of the employee groups placed any of the climate categories in the strong (4.0) or very strong (5.0) classification. In fact, mean scores from teachers on two factors, high morale and cohesiveness of staff, fell below acceptable.

Many implications can be gleaned from the mean responses to the affective traits. Generalization of the self-views of principals implies that they believed themselves to be trustworthy, very honest, respectful, and caring. They saw themselves as lower in empathy and self-concept, and rated themselves lowest in humbleness. In general their supervisor, the superintendent, shared these perceptions. The teachers and the principal had considerable disagreement on several of the traits: trust, honesty, respect, and caring. It can be concluded that these four affective traits within which the major relationships of a principal and teacher exist need attention in the operation of a school system.
Table 30 summarizes the conclusions that were developed through the twelve supporting hypotheses. Each comparison among the various groups indicates if there was or was not a similarity of perceptions or a relationship among perceptions of the topics studied.

**TABLE 30**
COMPARISONS OF THE SIMILARITIES AND RELATIONSHIPS AMONG THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE VARIOUS GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Similarity Existed (x)</th>
<th>Relationship Existed (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals/Superintendents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Traits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Factors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Traits</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Factors</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent/Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Traits</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Factors</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actual mean ratings of the superintendents' impressions of their principals' performances were much higher than those of the teachers and were similar to those of the principals. This implies that principals and superintendents viewed the performance of the principal much the same. However, the teachers viewed the performance of their principal to be considerably lower than did
the other two groups. Yet the data indicate a significant relationship existed between the perceptions of superintendents and teachers; whereas, there was no significant relationship between the perceptions of the principals and the superintendents. The implication of this data suggests that biases unique to superintendents and to teachers affected their perceptions of the performance of their principal.

Recommendations

Based upon the data presented in this study, the following recommendations are presented for consideration:

1. Within the required education courses for teachers and administrators there should be instruction which addresses various affective traits, including: trust, empathy, honesty, respect, self-concept, humbleness, caring, and joyfulness. Most colleges and universities that provide educational training require course work in teaching methods, educational theory, educational philosophy, and student teaching. It is recommended that the structure of these courses include objectives which would provide an academic background and awareness in methods of self-development and the teaching of these affective traits.

2. In-service efforts of schools should emphasize affective awareness and training techniques. To accomplish this, several options are available to a school district. The instruments and methods of this research study would identify affective areas of weakness and strength within a school. The Phi Delta Kappa Occasional Paper
addressing school climate (Fox, et al., 1973) offers a more detailed inventory to assess school climate and offers a plan for improving areas of deficiency. In-service programs intended to develop affectiveness in school staffs are available from educational specialists such as Dr. Patrick DeMartco, of the education department at Michigan State University, and Dr. David Groves, of the MSU staff and director of the FOCUS program. Total packages of affective in-service educational programs are available for purchase from nationally recognized authorities such as Dr. William Glasser.

3. Results of this study indicate that school principals do not perform as professional leaders in the affective areas of trust, empathy, honesty, respect, humbleness, and caring. In view of this it is recommended that principals be made aware of this study and that they evaluate their own performance in respect to these traits and pursue behavior modification if necessary.

4. Since this study indicates weaknesses in the affective performance of principals, screening and hiring processes for that position should include utilizing an appropriate affective trait testing instrument. Future employees should achieve a satisfactory score indicating his/her personality possesses skills in this domain.

5. Efforts of school systems to analyze and improve their building climate should be given high priority by Boards of Education. The literature reviewed displayed the importance of a positive school climate, whereas the typical responses from all three school groups studied indicated the existing school climate typically to be only
acceptable. Such efforts should be systematic and an ongoing part of the operation of the school system.

6. Evaluations of the principal's performance should include specific feedback concerning his/her affective performance. The principal should be made aware of weak and strong areas within the academic domain and plans for improvement should be implemented.

7. The administration should follow and model principles of the Bible. Most of the affective traits that have been discussed are also among the teachings of Jesus. Many of our public schools have turned from the teachings and power of Jesus to secular methods of teaching and management. A return to prayer and a Bible-based educational process would influence the relationships of this study.

8. A final recommendation is for this study to be implemented in parochial schools to determine whether the results would vary significantly.

Several existing phenomena may have affected the data collected. These are identified here and should be considered in future study of the subject:

1. The study was conducted in the later segment of the school year (April and May). Attitudes of participants may be lower than at an earlier date in the school year. An analysis of the results of a similar study conducted in the beginning months of the school year should be considered.

2. Several of the school districts were in the midst of teacher negotiations. It was observed that because of this there were some negative feelings between teachers and administrators.
3. All of the systems studied were experiencing staff reductions (teacher or principal) when the study was conducted. A number of the participants had been notified of being released from their job or of their being reassigned at the time they completed their questionnaires.

4. In the questionnaire participants were given definitions for each school climate factor. However, definitions for the affective traits were not given because it was assumed that participants possessed a working knowledge of these terms. Future studies should consider the inclusion of definitions of terms for both sets of traits and factors.

5. Perceptions of teachers and principals may differ when sex or level of assignment (elementary, middle school, high school) is considered. Future studies might include an analysis of these classifications.

6. Perhaps many of the principals within the study were hired by the current superintendent. This may have created a relationship in which principals were selected through personality or selection biases. Future studies should consider this relationship between superintendents and their principals.
QUESTIONNAIRE--SUPERINTENDENT

DIRECTIONS: Use one of these five options in responding to both PART I and PART II below:

1 Very weak  2 Weak  3 Acceptable  4 Strong  5 Very strong

---

**PART I**

How do you perceive the performance of your building principal of School on each of the following affective traits? Circle the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective trait</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive self-concept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbleness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyfulness (happiness)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**PART II**

To what degree is each item a strength or weakness within the climate of School? Circle the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate factor</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High morale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for input</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous academic &amp; social growth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School renewal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## QUESTIONNAIRE--PRINCIPAL

**DIRECTIONS:** Use one of these five options in responding to both PART I and PART II below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART I

How do you perceive your performance as principal on each of the following affective traits? Circle the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective trait:</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive self-concept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbleness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyfulness (happiness)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART II

To what degree is each item a strength or weakness within the climate of your school? Circle the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate factor:</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High morale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for input</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous academic &amp; social growth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School renewal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONNAIRE--TEACHER

DIRECTIONS: Use one of these five options in responding to both PART I and PART II below:

\[
1 \text{ Very Weak} \quad 2 \text{ Weak} \quad 3 \text{ Acceptable} \quad 4 \text{ Strong} \quad 5 \text{ Very strong}
\]

PART I

How do you perceive the performance of your school principal on each of the following affective traits? Circle the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective trait</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive self-concept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humbleness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyfulness (happiness)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART II

To what degree is each item a strength or weakness within the climate of your school? Circle the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate factor</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High morale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for input</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous academic &amp; social growth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School renewal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

LETTERS GRANTING PERMISSION
To: Staff members, Berrien Springs Public Schools  
From: Dr. Jon N. Schuster  
Date: April, 1982  
Re: Permission to distribute questionnaire  

I have given permission for Mike Holtgren to distribute his dissertation questionnaire to members of our staff. The data will be used by him in a confidential manner as he completes his research. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire.

[Signature]
To: Staff members, Brandywine Public Schools
From: William J. Horlo
Date: April, 1982
Re: Permission to distribute questionnaire

I have given permission for Mike Holtgren to distribute his dissertation questionnaire to members of our staff. The data will be used by him in a confidential manner as he completes his research. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire.
To: Staff members, Buchanan Community Schools
From: Dr. M. J. Neveaux
Date: April, 1982
Re: Permission to distribute questionnaire

I have given permission for Mike Holtgren to distribute his dissertation questionnaire to members of our staff. The data will be used by him in a confidential manner as he completes his research. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire.
To: Staff members, Cassopolis Public Schools
From: Gilbert Dunn
Date: April, 1952
Re: Permission to distribute questionnaire

I have given permission for Mike Holtgren to distribute his dissertation questionnaire to members of our staff. The data will be used by him in a confidential manner as he completes his research. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire.

[Signature]
To: Staff members, Edwardsburg Public Schools  
From: Wayne Clark  
Date: April, 1982  
Re: Permission to distribute questionnaire

I have given permission for Mike Holtaren to distribute his dissertation questionnaire to members of our staff. The data will be used by him in a confidential manner as he completes his research. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire.

[Signature]

Wayne Q. Clark
To: Staff members, Coloma Public Schools
From: William Barrett
Date: April, 1982
Re: Permission to distribute questionnaire

I have given permission for Mike Holtgren to distribute his dissertation questionnaire to members of our staff. The data will be used by him in a confidential manner as he completes his research. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire.

[Signature]
William Barrett
To: Staff members, Watervliet Public Schools
From: Samuel Gravitt
Date: April, 1982
Re: Permission to distribute questionnaire

I have given permission for Mike Holtgren to distribute his dissertation questionnaire to members of our staff. The data will be used by him in a confidential manner as he completes his research. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire.

[Signature]
4/6/82
To: Staff members, River Valley School District
From: Charles Williams
Date: April, 1992
Re: Permission to distribute questionnaire

I have given permission for Mike Holtgren to distribute his dissertation questionnaire to members of our staff. The data will be used by him in a confidential manner as he completes his research. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire.
APPENDIX C.

PERMISSION FOR PILOT STUDY
To: Staff members, Miles Community Schools  
From: Dr. William Fairman  
Date: March, 1982  
Re: Permission to distribute questionnaire

I have given permission for Mike Holzgrove to distribute his dissertation questionnaire to members of our staff. The data will be used by him in a confidential manner as he completes his research. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire.

[Signature]

Dr. William Fairman
April 1982

Dear

I am gathering data for my dissertation through Andrews University. My study looks at the performance of building principals as it relates to several affective traits. Schools in Berrien and Cass Counties in Michigan are included in the study. Within these schools I am asking the superintendent, building principals, and a sample of the teachers to respond to the attached questionnaire. I am asking for your assistance by completing that questionnaire.

Of course, all responses and analyses will be confidential. There will be no identification of specific responses nor persons.

Please complete the attached questionnaire, place it in the attached envelope, seal, and hand it in to your school office by ____________, when I will pick them up.

I thank you very much for helping me in this task.

Mike Holtgren
2510 Bond Street
Niles, Michigan 49120

Dr. Bernard Lall
Professor of Educational Administration
Andrews University

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED ON QUESTIONNAIRE

I believe that most of us share a rather common interpretation of the terms used in PART I of the questionnaire. Listed below is a very brief explanation of the items listed in Part II.

General Climate Factors:

Respect--to consider worthy of esteem; including self, others, property, regulations, etc.

Trust--the belief that persons are honest toward you and will not let you down.

High Morale--people feel good about what is happening (in school building).

Opportunities for Input--an opportunity for all to contribute ideas and to know they have been considered.

Continuous Academic and Social Growth--all members are provided an opportunity to develop their skills, knowledge, or attitudes in regard to their assignment.

Cohesiveness--all members of the school community stick together and feel a part of the school.

School Renewal--persons are encouraged to be innovative, creative, and to grow professionally.

Caring--persons feel that others are concerned about them as a human being.
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