

## Effective components in evaluation of the performance of the managers of elementary schools

Mohammad Bakhshoodeh<sup>1</sup>, Mehrnoosh Pazargadi<sup>2</sup>, Parivash Jaffari<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>. Ph. D Student. Department of Educational Administration, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup>. Associated Professor, Department of Educational Administration, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup>. Department of Educational Administration, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad, University, Tehran, Iran  
[Mehrnooshpazargadi@yahoo.com](mailto:Mehrnooshpazargadi@yahoo.com)

**Abstract:** The aim of this study is to determine the effective components in evaluation of the performance of elementary school managers. This study was Research and Development in term of aim and was descriptive survey in terms of data collection. The statistical population of this study was the managers of elementary school of Kerman province and the sampling was of clustering type. As the statistical population was 3191 people, the sample volume was determined as 344 people based on Morgan table. Data collection method was determined by field study and the instrument was researcher-built questionnaire, the interview and documents of the evaluation of manager's performance. To determine the validity of the questionnaire, content validity and construct validity (explorative factor analysis) was used and to determine its reliability, Cronbach's alpha was applied. The calculated value for KMO test was 0.97 and showed that sampling of this research is adequate. Based on the results of factor analysis, the first factor is interpersonal relations determining about 0.18 of the variance. The flexibility more than 0.16 and customer about 0.8 determine the variance of important factors matrix. Among the required factors, the knowledge and skill and belief principle each determine less than 0.2 of the variance. Totally, 12 recognized factors determined a considerable percent of the variance (71%). Based on the results of factor analysis, we can say that the interpersonal relations, flexibility, customer based relations and continuous improvement are four important factors among the factors determining about 48.5% of the variance.

[Mohammad Bakhshoodeh, Mehrnoosh Pazargadi, Parivash Jaffari. **Effective components in evaluation of the performance of the managers of elementary schools.** *Life Sci J* 2013;10(1):384-392]. (ISSN: 1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 62

**Keywords:** Performance; managers; elementary schools; Iran

### 1. Introduction

#### Statement of the problem

In technology era and current advanced world, the existence of organizations, institutions, efficient companies with high productivity are avoidable for competition and sustainability. The presence of such organizations and offices required having strong, empowered, flexible and mastering the newest management skill and this is not fulfilled except via a strong, just, fair with definite criteria (Ali Abadi, 2007). As good evaluation process can be effective in recognizing strengths and weaknesses of the managers (National comprehensive center for teacher quality, 2010). Determining the effective factors in evaluation of the performance guaranteeing the performance evaluation of the manager and staffs. Based on the findings of Goldring et al. the schools use unusual and unstable tools for evaluation of the managers performance (Condon, 2009). The main problem is that whether a strong evaluation system in government institutions generally and in education units for the education of future human resources specifically exist? Does the evaluation system

developed the schools and improved the performance of teachers and students?

Another important point is that whether the required components are identified to evaluate for standard-based issues to evaluate the performance of managers of education units? If such components are identified, are there some barriers to use them needing to remove these barriers? Or there are problems in both case (the lack of identification of comprehensive components and execution problems).

In the investigation of the existing literature at global level regarding the evaluation of the performance, there are two various views. Some of the experts not only questioned the performance evaluation benefits, they considered it harmful. For example, Cluger (2010) cited in Coens and Jenkins (2000) stated that the evaluation of the performance can be harmful (p. 1) he questioned the profit of performance evaluation system and said: "most of the staffs are hateful of the evaluation of the performance" and showed their protest to the evaluation system (p. 1). But some of the theorist considered the performance very useful. For example, National

comprehensive center for teacher quality, 2010 stated that based on the findings of Wallace foundation (2009) the evaluation process of good performance can be applied as an effective method to determine the weaknesses and strengths of the managers and encourage them to emphasize on the affairs creating the best learning and teaching (p. 1). In providing this view, Condon (2009) believed that evaluation of the performance of the manager of the school is challenging. The presence of two various views and contradictory, about the advantages and disadvantages of the performance evaluation, its evaluation and aim is challenging. Some people considered evaluation as a tool to give feedback and knowledge of a person of the weaknesses and strengths and the attempt to increase his abilities. For some people besides considering evaluation as a tool to develop personal abilities considered it a tool to take administrative decision of improvement, assigning scores, dismiss, etc. for example, Barger (2008) believed that performance evaluation via the relation of the performance of staffs with the organization besides development of the organization and staffs helped the managers in decision making and giving feed back to the subset. Conger (2003) distinguished between the instrument being provided for management development and the tool that is used for organization decisions as increasing the wage and promotion. And believed that management growth tool should provide some information about the weaknesses and power of the manager while organization decision making instrument should have more accuracy and reliability.

As effective components are not investigated in the evaluation of managers, the determination of these components and indices is done via a research work.

#### Research background

The review of the literature about the evaluation of performance showed three various views in this regard. Some of the experts considered the presence of a system to evaluate the performance necessary. Barger (2008, Trout 2002, National comprehensive center for teacher quality, 2010, Condon, 2009) and some group not only knew it useful, it is considered harmful in some cases (Cluger, 2010, William, 2001, Manatt and Benway, 1998 Almost and Mann, 2005). Here there is a third type of experts that besides separating between traditional evaluation (top to bottom) with new evaluation an emphasis on the correct method of its evaluation in some conditions considered it not only valuable causing the growth of the organization,

staffs and society (Ozgen et al., 2008 , National comprehensive center for teacher quality, 2010)

Regarding the necessity of evaluation, Barger (2008) believed that evaluation helps the staffs to know that their performance is determined based on acceptable criteria by the organization or not. On the other hand, evaluation process helps the institution that the activity of the staffs is based on the policies and to fulfill the organization mission?

In proving the necessity of evaluating the performance of school manager, Condon (2008)) believed that evaluation of the performance of the manager of the school is challenging. It is required that the evaluation of the performance of the managers is turned into a factor to be sure of his commitment to the results to improve the management activities. By citing the findings of Godring et al. (2009) added that based on their researches in performance evaluation system of the management of the schools, uncommon and instable instruments are used to evaluate the performance of the manager.

National comprehensive center for teacher quality ( 2010) based on the findings of Wallace (2009) believed that "good performance evaluation process can be used as an effective method to define the weaknesses and strengths of the managers and encourage them to emphasize on the affairs creating the most important learning and teaching (p. 1).

On the other hand, Kluger (2010) in protest to the performance evaluation system said:" most of the staffs and supervisors hate the evaluation of performance. In addition, the advantage of performance evaluation is under the question for the organizations (p. 1). He cited Coens and Jenkins (2000) added that human resources managers with the hope that there are some advantages including the improvement of performance via the opportunity of relation between the manager and staffs and data collection for decision making can evaluate the performance of staffs and the profit of this act is under question. They stated that "performance evaluation can be harmful" (p. 1) questioning the performance evaluation system (Kluger, 2010). Harvey cited Brown regarding the dissatisfaction of the evaluation of performance "In more than 90% of the companies I visited, it doesn't seem any one is satisfied of performance evaluation system"(p. 1). William (2001) believed that based on the conclusion of human resources management community more than 90% of evaluation systems are unsuccessful and based on private report of "Laver" it can be said that there is an evident reality that most of performance

evaluation systems neither create motivation nor guidance.

Conger (2003) in rejecting the traditional evaluation system based on the result of a research in 1999 in New York human resources conference said: " 90% of the human resources managers said that if we give them opportunity, the current performance evaluation system applying in their companies is modified reviewed or eliminated (Herfous, 2000, p. 2). Cited in Bernardin, Hagan, Villanova (1998) said: " It seems that dissatisfaction of the performance evaluation system is high and performance evaluation word is censored in organization literature and performance management is replaced by it. (Conger, 2003, p. 3).

Against two contradictory views in two spectrums, the view that knows the performance evaluation necessary for the benefit of the organization and the view that knows the performance evaluation harmful and there is a middle view. This view besides distinguishing between traditional evaluation (top-down) and new evaluation and emphasis on correct method of its evaluation, in case of the fulfillment if the following conditions, not only considered it useful but also necessary for the organization:

- The system should be based on job analysis
- The aim of the system should be vivid
- The system should be based on job behavior and defined standards.
- The evaluation is executed continuously
- Evaluators in using evaluation and consulting methods should be trained.
- Positive feedback regarding the discussion about evaluation should be predicted.
- A vivid relation should be between good performance and reward system (Barger, 2008, p. 22)

The management of the services of Iran Khodro (2006) believed that " Today, some issues as appearance of flat structures, non-centralized reporting structures, the change in the form and nature of performance management system and increase of the job of staffs and the managers that can have better feedback of the accessible performance and resources (p. 91).

We can conclude that evaluation system trend changed from traditional form, the evaluation of inferiors , customers, superiors and self-evaluation and now multiple performance evaluation system that is called feedback 360 degree, in most of the organizations, offices and world companies, it is used. In this study, the researcher attempts to identify effective components in evaluation of performance of

the school managers by considering the results of researchers' research.

## 2. Method

Statistical populations of this study were the managers of education units of elementary section of Kerman province and clustering sampling method was used. The statistical population (the number of the managers of elementary schools of Kerman province) based on the latest data published of education organization of the province as 3191. The sample size based on Morgan table was 344 people. 8 cities and regions were selected randomly among 32 cities and regions of the province (Menojan, Jiroft, Kerman, Sirjan, Shahr Babak, Anar, Kashkuyeh and Venugh). This study is of survey method and data collections were done by field study and the instrument was researcher-built questionnaire, interview and the investigation of documents of managers' performance evaluation. To determine the validity of the questionnaire, content validity method was used via receiving the comments of theorists regarding the evaluation of performance and construct validity method (factor analysis) was used and to determine the reliability, Cronbach's alpha was used.

To fulfill the research aim (The identification of performance evaluation components of elementary school managers based on the results of the researches and experts) by review of literature of the evaluation of the performance of the school managers at global and national level and the documents regarding the criteria, regulations, instructions, forms and evaluation of school managers performance as staffs evaluation plan no. 40/110/100 dated 1373/2/14, evaluation instruction no. 83292/70/68 dated 1387/10/22 and instruction no. 200/11942, the deputy of management and development and human resources of president titled " evaluation method of staffs performance", the researcher found that in sum 13 components (team work, accepting, change, continuous improvement, flexibility, interpersonal relations, customer, strategic thought, financial affairs and support, ethical issues, knowledge and skills, control and supervision, education leadership and planning and organizing) have important role in improving the performance of manager and can be considered as performance evaluation criteria. At first to make the questionnaire, between 8 to 10 items (in sum 118) are used.

The questionnaire to determine the content validity was given to 30 experts consisting of 11 PhD and Phd candidates in education management field, 11 MA of education management and 8 BA of education management with the experience of some year's manager of the school, education authority and

the chief of education office. (11 questionnaires were sent via E-mail and the typed form of the questionnaire was sent by face to face presence).

In the questionnaire, based on Likert scale, the respondent was asked to define his approval with each of the items with selecting very little, little, average, much and very much.

After receiving the questionnaires for the analysis of the results, for very little, little, average, much and very much, the value of 1 to 5 was considered. The items dedicating above 85% (achieving at least 130 scores of total 150 scores) and the items under 130 were eliminated. Thus, the number of items based on the receiving scores and the comments of experts were reduced from 118 items to 78 items and two components of "accepting and change" and "flexibility" based on the overlapping of the items and the proposal of one of the experts was returned to one component titled "Flexibility and accepting the change" and the number of variables were reduced from 13 components to 12 components.

The reliability of questionnaire was investigated by Cronbach's alpha and SPSS software. By this formula, correlation test was taken by this formula between the score of one by one of the items with total score. Because we expected that people who give definite score in definite item act such in other items.

Reliability coefficient of total questionnaire was 0.979 and the coefficient of each component was achieved as:

"Team work, 0.740, flexibility and accepting change 0.719, continuous improvement 0.758, interpersonal relations 0.722, customer based 0.825, strategic thinking, 0.839, financial affairs and support, 0.841, ethical issues 0.738, knowledge and skills, 0.759, control and supervision, 0.851, education leadership 0.771, planning and organizing, 0.842.

After determining the validity and reliability of the questionnaire, to identify the effective components in evaluation of the performance of the managers of the schools, the next stage of research was distributing the questionnaire among the managers of elementary schools of Kerman province. As the statistical population (The number of the managers of elementary schools of Kerman province) based on the latest statistics published of Education organization of province were 3191. The sample volume based on Morgan table was 344 people. To do this, to distribute the questionnaires among 344 people of the managers of elementary schools, after the coordination with education organization of the province and allowance to distribute the questionnaire, 8 cities and regions were selected

randomly among 32 cities and regions of the province (Menojan, Jiroft, Kerman, Sirjan, Babak, Anar and Kashkuyeh Venugh).

At first, the authorities of each office (security guard, education deputy or education chief and elementary education authority) to assign half hour of the time of the meeting of the managers in the initial hours, the required coordination was required and after the appointment from the authorities, the questionnaires were distributed among the managers and were collected after completing them. In the questionnaire, the researcher besides clarifying the aim of the study asked the respondents (the managers of school) that besides determining the education, age, gender, experience and the years of working as a manager, define their approval regarding the effect of each variable in their performance based on Likert grading scale. This issue is emphasized that the accuracy of managers in completing the questionnaire can result into real results. After the collection of questionnaire, 64 questionnaires that were completed incomplete or inaccurately were deleted and the data of 280 questionnaires were entered in SPSS software.

After explorative factor analysis, it was defined that KMO size that is called sampling adequacy and comparing observed correlation values by partial correlation values is 0.97 for KMO test and it shows that the sampling of this study is adequate and this value is suitable for factor analysis. Bartlett's sphericity is equal to chi-square 8.14758 with degree of freedom at alpha  $\alpha=0.1$  that is significant.

### 3. Findings

Table 1 shows the condition of sample group based on gender, Table 2 shows the condition of sample group based on education and table 3 shows the condition of sample group based on major.

**Table 1: The condition of sample group based on gender**

Gender	Frequency	%
Man	162	58%
Woman	118	42%
Total	280	100%

**Table 2: The condition of sample group based on education**

Education	Frequency	%
Diploma	5	1.8%
Associate	44	15.7%
BA	216	77.1%
MA and higher	15	5.3%
Total	280	100%

**Table 3: The condition of the sample group based on the field**

Education	Frequency	%
Elementary education	163	52.2%
Management	18	6.4%
Other	53	19%
Unknown	46	16.5%
Total	280	100%

### Explorative factor analysis to identify the main factors

Determining the adequacy of factor analysis: Explorative factors analysis is used namely to identify important factors in a special field. A matrix of the variables is established. The index that is used for the importance and significance of the matrix is the index determining the relation between the variables and is recognized as partial correlation coefficient. The size of KMO that is called "Sampling adequacy" is an index comparing the observed correlation values with partial correlation

values. Serni and Kisar (1977) cited in Human (2001) believe that when KMO is bigger than 0.6, factor analysis is done with satisfaction and the more this value; the more is the adequacy of sampling.

**Table 4: The results of Bartlett's sphericity test and KMO test**

No	Method	Statistics	Values
1	Bartlett's sphericity	Chi-square	1475.8
		Degree	200
		Significance level	0.001
2	KMO significance test		0.97

As is shown in Table 4, the calculated value for KMO test is 0.97 that is good in terms of Keisar and shows that sampling of this study is adequate and is suitable for factor analysis in the study. Bartlett's sphericity test is equal to chi-square 14757.8 with degree of freedom at alpha  $\alpha=0.1$ .

Table 5 shows factor loads of the questions on 12 components.

**Table 5: Factor loads of the questions on 12 components**

Factor		Factor load					
Interpersonal relations	1	0.67					
	2	0.71					
	3	0.66					
	4	0.68					
	5	0.67					
	6	0.66					
Flexibility	1		0.47				
	2		0.45				
	3		0.39				
	4		0.53				
	5		0.59				
	6		0.66				
	7		0.62				
Customer	1			0.52			
	2			0.57			
	3			0.53			
	4			0.57			
	5			0.46			
	6			0.64			
	7			0.51			
Continuous improvement	1				0.46		
	2				0.51		
	3				0.53		
	4				0.70		
	5				0.68		
Strategic thinking	1					0.50	
	2					0.58	
	3					0.40	
	4					0.44	
	5					0.48	

	6					0.42	
Education leadership	1						0.41
	2						0.45
	3						0.39
	4						0.39
	5						0.46

The continue of Table 5 of factor loads of questions on 12 factors

Factor		Factor load					
Planning	1	0.30					
	2	0.37					
	3	0.32					
	4	0.34					
	5	0.36					
	6	0.33					
	7	0.34					
Control and supervision	1		0.36				
	2		0.37				
	3		0.43				
	4		0.34				
	5		0.30				
	6		0.33				
	7		0.39				
Supporting affair	1			0.37			
	2			0.36			
	3			0.31			
	4			0.35			
	5			0.34			
	6			0.33			
	7			0.32			
Team work	1				0.65		
	2				0.42		
	3				0.65		
	4				0.44		
	5				0.69		
	6				0.37		
	7				0.47		
	1					0.8	
	2					0.33	
	3					0.43	
	4					0.49	
Knowledge and skill	5					0.44	
	6					0.45	
	7					0.51	
Religious principles	1						0.41
	2						0.52
	3						0.45
	4						0.45
	5						0.64

Table 6 Shows the Eigen value, determined variance percent and variance density percent.

**Table 6: The Eigen value, determined variance percent and variance density percent**

Factor	The number of items	Eigen value	The determined variance percent	The percent of determined density variance
Interpersonal relations	6	40.7	18%	18%
Flexibility	7	2.88	16%	34%
Customer	7	1.61	8%	42%
Continuous improvement	5	1.6	6.5%	48.5%
Strategic thinking	6	1.44	5%	52.5%
Education leadership	5	1.23	4.8%	57%
Organizing planning	5	1.16	3%	60%
Control	7	1.10	2.55	62.5%
Financial affairs	7	1.06	2%	64.5%
Team work	7	1.03	2.8%	68%
Knowledge and skill	7	1.04	1.8%	70%
Religious beliefs	5	1.03	1.6%	71%

Based on the results of Table 6, the first factor is interpersonal relations with Eigen value 40.7 determining about 18%. Flexibility with Eigen value 2.88 determines more than 16% and customer –based with Eigen value 1.61 about 8% of the variance of important factors matrix. Among the required factors, knowledge and skill with Eigen value 1.04 and religious beliefs with Eigen value 1.03 determine each less than 2% of variance. Totally, 12 identified factors showed considerable percent of variance (71%). Based on the factor analysis results, we can say that interpersonal relations, flexibility, customer-based and continuous improvement are four important factors among the investigated factors determining about 48.5% of the variance.

#### 4. Discussion and conclusion

Based on the results of the study, the first factor are interpersonal relations with Eigen value 40.7 determining about 18% of variance. Flexibility and change acceptance with Eigen value 2.88 determine more than 16% and customer based with Eigen value 1.61 determine about 8% of the variance of important factors matrix. Totally, 16 identified factors determine considerable percent of the variance (71%). Based on the results of factor analysis, we can say that interpersonal relations, flexibility, customer-based and continuous improvement are four important factors determining about 48.5% of the variance.

As “interpersonal relations” determine a great part of variance, it shows that this component is one of the most effective component in performance and this issue is in line with the study of Wise and Jacobo (2010) as the required condition for learning organization as continuous relation of the members of the organization and believe that the staffs of each school should collaborate about new ideas and work

issues to make the ideas internalized and use them in their policies based on the culture of the school.

The results of the study of Bryk and Schneider showed that there is a relation between the reliance of teachers to the managers and teacher's attitude and finally the performance of students (Clarke, 2006).

Another component with important role in determining the variance is “flexibility and accepting the change”. The result of this study is in line with the results of Breault and Breault (2010) study regarding the professional growth of the schools showing that flexibility is necessary in the responsibilities of beneficiaries. The result of this study is in line with the study of Bullock and Thomas that in a study on 160 schools during 3 years, found that 90% of the managers were agree with the flexibility and responsibility of the manager of the school.

The results of the study showed that efficient managers encouraged the teachers to risk taking and using new education methods (Finnigan, 2010 cited in Leithwood et al.). Based on the results of a study, a great number of the staffs of schools found that creating school culture supporting of the change and innovation is necessary to improve the performance of school (Penlington et al., 2008).

“Customer based” is the third effective component in determining the performance in this study. This result is in line with the results of a case study about two schools during three years that showed “customer's satisfaction can be effective as a part of planning process of school development” (Davies and Ellison). In response to the question of Rice (2003) regarding the fact that what strategies use the managers of the institutions and they responded that they use the strategies focused on fulfilling the expectations of the customers and giving better service to them. The managers believed

that such work not only requires the improvement of working methods but also requires main changes in the organization culture.

Garbot (1996) in his study found that the quality requires the commitment of the highest authority to the lowest position in organization rank and if searching culture is used for continuous improvement, it has great influence on the standards, performance and determining the needs.

Based on the results of this study, the fourth effective component in evaluation of the performance of school managers is considering "continuous improvement" in each school and this result is in line with the results of world researches.

For example, based on the findings of Rice and Taylor (2003), it was defined that the universities and colleges with various missions can discover the importance and benefits of continuous improvement process. In another study, the dean of university in response to the question about management innovations said that the universities and colleges follow the activities facilitating the continuous improvement strategies for more efficiency.

Based on the results of factor analysis, besides four mentioned factors, there are other factors as "team work", "education leadership", "strategic leadership", "planning and organizing", religious beliefs", "control and supervision", "financial affairs and support and "knowledge and skill" determining a great part of variance. These results are in line with the results of researchers at world level. Because regarding the necessity of partnership management and emphasis on "team work", the results of Harris study (2004) showed that high participation is related highly with high satisfaction. Conversely, low participation considerably is related to low satisfaction. Fitzgerald et al. (2003) believed that based on the findings of Middlewood, the managed approach is to evaluate the performance requiring the total participation of all the teachers. Joyce (2010) referred to the results of Haplin and Rinalds by which the distributed form of leadership in growth and change of school is of high efficiency.

On the other hand, the investigation of documents of evaluation of managers of schools showed that most of the indices in these documents including planning, control and supervision, education leadership, supporting affairs, religious beliefs and strategic leadership had high validity and effectiveness. Because the results of this study emphasized on the effectiveness of the indices.

#### **Corresponding Author:**

Mehrnoosh Pazargadi  
Department of Educational Administration  
Science and Research Branch, Islamic

Azad University  
Tehran  
Iran  
E-mail: [Mehrnooshpazargadi@yahoo.com](mailto:Mehrnooshpazargadi@yahoo.com)

#### **References**

- 1- Parkinson, North, Kut, Rostom J. M. K. The management skills, Translated by Mehdi Iran nejad Parizi. Tehran. Azadeh. 1997.
- 2- Delavar, Ali. The theoretical and practical basics in humanity and social sciences. Tehran Roshd. 2006.
- 3- Sarmad. Zohre. Bazargan. Abas. Hejazi. Elahe. Research methods in behaviorist sciences. Tehran. Agah publications. 1998.
- 4- Shahabi, Behnam. Achieving competition advantage with learning organization. Scientific-education journal of Tadbir. Year 18. No. 184. Shahrivar 2007. P.26-31
- 5- Ali Babayi Zakliki, Mohammad. The leaders and creating excellent organization space. Scientific-education journal of Tadbir. Year 18. No.186. Ahan 2007. P.29-32.
- 6- Feqhi Farahmand, Naser. Reliable management of organization. Tabriz. Foruzesh.2003.
- 7- The management of the services of the managers of Iran Khodro company (2006). The evaluation of 360 degree of theory to practice (a successful experience in achieving world class). Tehran. Farazandish.
- 8- Mola Hosseini. Ali. Mostafavi. Shahrzad. The evaluation of robustness of organization by fuzzy logics. Scientific-education journal of Tadbir. No. 186. Ahan 2007. P.18-23.
- 9- Naderi, Nahid, Rajayipour, Saeed, Jamshidian, Abdolrasul, The concepts and strategies of empowerment of the staffs. Scientific-education journal of Tadbir. Year 18. No. 186. Ahan 2007. P. 65-67.
- 10- Nasr, Ahmad Reza and Maesumi, Mohammad. The comparison of the performance of the managers of BA of management and education planning with other fields. Education journal. Year 21, no. 2, summer 2005. P.99-127.
- 11- Niaz Azari, Kiomars. The theories of organization and management with emphasis on education organizations. Tehran. Farashenakhti Andisheh.2006.
- 12- Aderhold, M.N. (2001), "The implementation of 360 degree feedback for high school Deca Officers. The Graduate school university of Winsconsin-stout.
- 13- Atwater.L.E and Bretl J.F. 2003." Antecedents and Consequences of reactions to development 360 degree feedback. Arizona State University

- West. Journal of Vocational Behavior 66 pp 532-548.
- 14- Barger, J.F.2008. Performance Evaluation. Verona fire Department. Leading Community Risk Reduction.
- 15- Brocken, D.W. Dalton, M.A,Jako, R.A,Mccaulley, C.D &Pollman, V.A (1997), "Should 360degree feedback be used only for developmental purposes? Center for Creative Leadership Greensboro, North Carolina.
- 16- Bradley, T,P (2004), Analysis of Leadership Perceptions using Multirater Feedback". Dissertation prepared for Doctor of Philosophy. University of North Texas.
- 17- Carson, D.E. 2006."Saying it like it isn't: The pros and cons of 360degree feedback". Business Horizons 49, 395-402 Science direct.
- 18- Coates, D,E. 2006.The ultimate use of 360 degree feedback, Measuring individual performance improvement". Performance Support System, Inc.
- 19- Condon, C., Clifford, M.2009."Measuring Principal Performance". How Rigorous Are Publicly Available Principal Performance Assessment Instruments? [www.Learningpt.org](http://www.Learningpt.org)
- 20- Conger, J.A. 2003" 360 degree Assessment: Time for reinvention" Center for Effective Organization. University of Southern California.
- 21- Kluger, A.N.2010. Strength-based performance Appraisal and Goal Setting" Human resource management review. Journal Homepage, [www.Elsevier.com/locate/hamres](http://www.Elsevier.com/locate/hamres)
- 22- Kortov, K. 2006. Preparation for 360 degree feedback in leadership development programs and executive coaching" European School of Management Technology.
- 23- Latman, G. P, Almost, J & Mann, S. 2005." New developments in Performance Management". Organizational Dynamics, Vol.34. No. 1, pp. 77-87.
- 24- Manatt, R.P & Benway, M.1998." Teacher and administrative performance evaluation". Benefits of 360 degree Feedback. Teacher and Administrator Performance Evaluation.
- 25- Ozgen, Sibel. Alabart, J.R & Medir, Magda. Implementation of 360 degree Feedback Assessment Process for Development of Senior Engineering Students. Campus Sescelades, SPAIN [joanramon.alabart@urv.cat](mailto:joanramon.alabart@urv.cat).
- 26- Portin, B.S,Feldman, S & Knapp, M.S. 2006."Purposes, uses and practices of Leadership Assessment in education. Center for study of Teaching and Policy. Leadership Assessment. University of Washington.
- 27- Stran, S.E &Kuhnert, K.W. 2009. "Personality and leadership development levels as predictors of leader performance" The leadership quarterly, 421-433.
- 28- William, J.F. 2001. "Leadership evaluation and assessment" Leadership in the Library and information science professions The Haworth Press. 153-175.WWW.Walk the talk. Eric L. Harvey "turning performance Appraisals Upside down, Human resource professional.

11/26/2012