

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 436 513

SP 038 904

AUTHOR LoVette, Otis; Holland, Glenda; McCall, Mike  
TITLE Teachers' Perceptions of the Use of "Empowering-Type Activities" by Their Building Principals.  
PUB DATE 1999-11-00  
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Point Clear, AL, November 17-19, 1999).  
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Behavior; Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Effectiveness; Age Differences; Elementary Secondary Education; Graduate Students; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Leaders; Leadership Styles; \*Principals; Sex Differences; \*Teacher Attitudes; \*Teacher Empowerment

## ABSTRACT

This study examined whether teachers perceived their school principals as using empowering-type activities. The study focused on differences according to such factors as age, gender, and school grade and size. Researchers examined the survey responses from graduate students in the Educational Leadership Program at Northeast Louisiana University in 1999. Participating students were full-time teachers taking evening courses at the university. Students completed a survey entitled Principal Profile, which asked them to rate their principals' performance and focused on empowering-type activities. Data analysis indicated that principals utilized empowering type activities to some degree. There were no significant differences between such groupings as older versus newer and male versus female administrators or teachers. The Principal Profile is appended. (SM)

**TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE USE OF  
"EMPOWERING-TYPE ACTIVITIES"  
BY THEIR BUILDING PRINCIPALS**

**Dr. Otis LoVette, Professor  
Educational Leadership**

**Dr. Glenda Holland, Department Chair  
Educational Leadership**

**Mike McCall, Graduate Assistant**

**University of Louisiana at Monroe**

**Mid-South Educational Research Association  
Annual Meeting  
Point Clear, Alabama  
November 17-19, 1999**

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND  
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS  
BEEN GRANTED BY

O. LoVette

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

# Teachers' Perceptions of the Use of "Empowering-type Activities"

by Their Building Principals

## Introduction

As improvement of student academic performance in U. S. schools continues to be of intense concern, various types of restructuring and reform are being instituted in our schools to bring about the desired improvement. Along with these changes often comes "heavy handed," even punitive, accountability measures. It seems that often these efforts to restructure and reform are ill-conceived, political, and have little grounding in what research has revealed.

Ever since 1989, when six national goals were established for American education, there has been a National agenda to improve student academic performance. In 1991 President Bush and Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander took these goals and developed the America 2000 plan. They sought to bring local communities into the process of making the accomplishment of these goals a community concern. In 1994 President Clinton continued in the same venue by signing the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. After the adoption of these Goals our government and much of our citizenry had aspirations of being number one in the world in mathematics and science achievement by the year 2000 (one of the 8 goals). Along with this goal were several others that were equally unrealistic. Perhaps these governmental initiatives of the past decade were the beginning of the unrealistic expectations that have been laid on the backs of schools and educators.

Are there ways of improving what is going on within our schools, which is now a National imperative, without the drastic changes being imposed? Most educators would readily admit that the practices we use are not always the best that we know. Often this is because of time or money constraints, but it also might be because of the natural resistance to change, politics, and the desire to "ride it out" ("And this to shall soon

pass.”). It is obvious that the reform efforts and imposed accountability has “come down from the top.” As educators, and those who study human behavior and motivation, we should know that this type of approach is rarely successful in eliciting ownership and support from those who must carry out the mandates. With the use of imposed or “coercive” power come responses which are more inclined toward hostility and aggression rather than embracing and supporting.

Power is often defined: getting someone to do something they “don’t want” to do. Wouldn’t it be better to use empowerment, which might be defined as getting someone to do something they “want” to do? There is abundant evidence to show that teachers and others respond well to the use of activities/approaches that will provide ownership and the accompanying responsibility. It appears that this type of approach is rarely used with the present reform efforts. When teachers have to accept their own lack of power, especially with the many mandates that go along with many accountability measures, and also autocratic school leaders, their potential for improved performance and job satisfaction is diminished. Lightfoot (1986) said empowerment builds teacher commitment and involvement. Frase & Sorenson (1992) said that what was lost (when teachers were not empowered) was the creativity, commitment, and energy that teachers could be contributing to the school organization. Short & Greer (1997) discussed in-depth the many benefits of empowering teachers in their work on empowered schools.

Changes in our society, especially during the past ten years, require that school leaders have different competencies, or at least modification of competencies, if they are to be effective (Kaiser, 1995). Research indicates that schools are rarely effective that have poor leadership, yet Thurston, Clift, and Schacht (1993) indicated that there had only been a few isolated refinements of leadership training programs and little fundamental reform in how administrators were prepared to do their very important jobs. Bartell (1994) indicated that the school principal has a powerful impact upon the success or failure of a school.

Kochan & Spencer (1999) found in their research that principals indicated that their jobs had become increasingly complex and many would be retiring within the next ten years. Principals also indicated that those who would fill their positions would need a myriad of competencies. One could speculate that this finding may be indicative that many of those “older” principals may not have the competencies or the leadership styles which would allow them to empower staff in an effort to be responsive to the changes involved in the various reforms. Short and Greer (1997) indicated that the principal’s leadership style and management skills effect both the culture and climate of the school.

There has been considerable discussion in the literature about the role of leaders in effective schools. Johnson & Johnson (1984) indicated that effective schools research has promoted changes in the “perceived” role of the school principal. In the past the principal was often a teacher with little or no knowledge of school administration; today the opposite seems true. In fact, principals may have limited knowledge of the technology of teaching; yet, many expect today’s principal to be the “instructional leader” in the school. There are some who question seriously whether or not the principal should be the “instructional leader” of the school.

It seemed important to the researchers to inquire about the implementation of change and acceptance of various reform efforts at the “individual school” level? What are our principals doing to facilitate reform? Even though there seems to be a lack of consensus in the literature regarding the roles of today’s and tomorrow’s principals, it seems well accepted that they are and will be expected to do new and different things. Glickman (1990) said future administrators would have to use what time they had more efficiently and equitably and this implied the utilization of non-traditional approaches to staff supervision and other areas of responsibility.

If the empowerment of staff is seen as a way to obtain greater performance by teachers, as they may be afforded ownership with the resulting responsibility, have principals been trained to provide empowerment for teachers? It would seem that many

of “today’s training programs” recognize the need for training about the value of empowerment and consequently provide such preparation. It also seems evident, if one would consider the reports of students who are presently teachers, that administrators from past training programs did not receive such training and/or do not chose to share power. Student comments would also lead one to believe that many of those who had training relative to the advantages of empowerment choose not to use such approaches.

### Problem

There have been numerous studies and surveys relating to the importance of teacher empowerment in schools. Effective leadership behavior in schools has also been addressed by a wealth of research. This research sought to determine if the principals who were leading our schools were perceived as using “empowering-type” activities. The research also investigated other questions relative to teachers’ perceptions of their school principals.

### Research Questions

The researchers sought to answer the following questions.

1. Are perceptual ratings given to items related to empowering-type activities significantly lower than those given to other items related to administrative activity?
2. Are younger principals perceived as providing more empowering-type activities than older principals?
3. Are female principals perceived as providing more empowering-type activities than male principals?
4. Are principals of elementary schools perceived as providing more empowering-type activities than junior high/middle school or high school principals?
5. Are those principals in smaller schools perceived as providing more empowering-type activities than those in larger schools?
6. Does the age of the teacher influence their perception of the principal’s use of empowering-type activities?

7. Does the gender of the teacher responding influence their perception of the principal's use of empowering-type activities?

#### Participants and Design

The research was conducted utilizing the survey responses of graduate students in the Educational Leadership Program at Northeast Louisiana University (now the University of Louisiana at Monroe) during the spring, summer, and fall sessions of 1999. Students surveyed were full-time teachers who were taking evening courses. Students in the Program are typically from a 15 parish area in north Louisiana. Students were asked to complete a survey entitled Principal Profile (Appendix ) which asked them to rate items relative to their principal's performance. Student's names or other identifying data were not required. The "Profile" had 134 items, the first 103 of which were to be rated using a 5 point scale with 5 being "outstanding," 4 being "clearly above average," 3 being "average," 2 being "clearly below average," and 1 being "unacceptable." The last 31 items were not used in this study. Those 25 items (within the 103) that were identified by the researchers as "empowering-type activities" were statistically investigated. A mean response was determined for the other 78 items on the Profile but they had no additional statistical treatment.

#### Statistical Treatment

A mean was established for the 78 items on the Profile which were not selected as items related to empowering-type activities. This mean was tested, using a t-test for Equality of Means, to determine if it was significantly different from the mean of the 25 items relating to empowering-type activities. The mean for the 25 selected items was then used on a comparative basis with each of the 25 individual items. The range of means for the 25 selected items was from 1.28 to 5.00 with a mean of 3.37. Using a 95% confidence interval of the differences a t-test for Equality of Means and Levene's Test for Equality of Variances were calculated for each set of data identified in the research questions.

### Demographic Data

Data was gathered so that the 25 items utilized from the Profile could be examined relative to the sex of the principal, the age of the principal, the sex of the rater, the age of the rater, the grade level, and the school enrollment. Table 1 shows the gender of the subjects and whether they were principals or assistant principals. It should be noted that the latter two categories were combined for the statistical analysis.

Table 1.

#### Subject Gender and Title

<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>No Response</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Assistant Principal</u>	<u>No Response</u>	<u>Total</u>
31	24	1	66	63	2	1	66

Table 2 shows the ages of the subjects.

Table 2.

#### Subject Age

<u>Under 30</u>	<u>31-40</u>	<u>41-50</u>	<u>51-60</u>	<u>Over 60</u>	<u>No Response</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	5	23	31	4	2	66

Table 3 shows the gender of the participants who completed the Profile.

Table 3.

#### Participant Gender

<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>No Response</u>	<u>Total</u>
12	51	3	66



Table 4 shows the ages of the participants who completed the Profile.

Table 4.

Participant Age

<u>Under 30</u>	<u>31-40</u>	<u>41-50</u>	<u>51-60</u>	<u>Over 60</u>	<u>No Response</u>	<u>Total</u>
10	22	25	2		7	66

Table 5 shows the number of school organizational types of the subjects/participants.

Table 5.

School Organization

<u>Elementary</u>	<u>Jr. High/ Middle School</u>	<u>High School</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
34	11	15	6	66

Table 6 shows the school enrollments of the subjects/participants.

Table 6.

School Enrollment

<u>Under 250</u>	<u>251-500</u>	<u>501-750</u>	<u>751-1000</u>	<u>1001-1500</u>	<u>Over 1500</u>	<u>No Response</u>	<u>Total</u>
17	18	19	4	5	2	1	66

## Findings

The findings are reported relative to each research question posed.

1. Are the perceptual ratings given to the items related to empowering-type activities significantly lower than those given to other items related to administrative activity?

There was no significant difference in the mean of empowering-type activities (3.37) and the mean of the other 78 items (3.39) on the Principal Profile survey.

2. Are younger principals perceived as providing more empowering-type activities than older principals?

Respondents' mean in each age group was compared with that of each of the other age groups. No significant differences between groups or from the mean were found. It was noted that the lowest mean (3.07) was found in the largest group, those 31 principals who were in the 51-60 age group.

3. Are female principals perceived as providing more empowering-type activities than male principals?

Respondents' mean for each of the two gender groups was compared. No significant difference between the two groups was found

4. Are principals of elementary schools perceived as providing more empowering-type activities than junior high/middle school or high schools?

The mean for each group was as follows: elementary (3.38), junior high/middle school (3.33), and high school (3.34). No significant differences were noted.

5. Are principals in smaller schools perceived as providing more empowering-type activities than those in larger schools?

Principals in smaller schools were not perceived as providing more empowering-type activities than those in larger schools. No significant difference existed between the group mean and the mean of any of the individual enrollment sizes.

6. Does the age of the teacher responding influence their perception of the principal's use of empowering-type activities?

Statistically, the age of the teacher responding had no significant influence on their perception of their principal.

7. Does the gender of the teacher responding influence their perception of principal's use of empowering-type activities?

The gender of the teacher responding was not statistically significant relative to their rating of their principal.

## Conclusions and Discussion

Even though it would be difficult to say that a mean score of 3.37 on the empowering-type activities was indicative that principals “were” utilizing such activities, the data and its statistical treatment did not support the premise that principals “were not” utilizing empowering-type activities. Even though teachers informally contend that administrators do not utilize empowering activities/approaches, the analysis of the data in this study did not support such a contention. Perhaps teachers would just like to have more input and more opportunity to share in making decisions on items, especially when they are stakeholders.

The data also would not support hypotheses relative to differences that may have been perceived to exist between such groupings as older versus newer and male versus female administrators; this is difficult to explain. Even though it would appear that younger administrators and perhaps female administrators would provide more empowering type activities, such was not supported.

It should be noted that it is not unusual for respondents to such instruments to “halo” their responses. Respondents often fear that the information they provide might identify them and be used against them in some way. It was also noted in this survey that those who gave high ratings to their administrators in the empowerment area also gave high ratings in the other areas and conversely those who gave low ratings gave low ratings throughout.

## Recommendations for Further Study

Further research is planned using all 134 items on the Principal Profile. Each area will be examined to see if there are perceived weaknesses or strengths relative to the mean (positive items) for the entire Profile. Administrators have expressed interest in such an instrument that might be used as part of an assessment technique to be used for principals to help determine areas perceived by their faculties as needing attention and areas of strength.

It is planned to administer the instrument to an identified faculty and their principal so that reliability can be tested and the principal's perceptions can be compared with the faculty's perceptions. The instrument will also be further refined to include numbering for each item and some items will be improved and re-written.

#### References

- Bartell, C. (1994, April). Preparing future administrators: Stakeholders perceptions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Frase, L.E., & Sorenson, L. (1992). Teacher motivation and satisfaction: Impact on participatory management. NASSP Bulletin, 76 (540), 37-44.
- Glickman, C.D. (1990). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Johnson, D.W., & Johnson, R.T. (1984). The principal's role. Curriculum Report, 9 (10), 4.
- Kaiser, J.S. (1995). The 21st century principal. WI: Stylex.
- Kochan, F.K., & Spencer, W.A. (1999). Preparing leaders for tomorrow's schools: The practitioners' perspective. Research in the Schools, 6 (1), 9-16.
- Lightfoot, S.L. (1986). On the goodness of schools: Themes of empowerment. Peabody Journal of Education, 63 (3), 9-28.
- Short, P.M., & Greer, J.T. (1997). Leadership in empowered schools. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Thurston, P., Clift, R., & Schacht, M. (1993). Preparing leaders for change-oriented schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 75, 259-265.

APPENDIX

**Principal Profile**

## PRINCIPAL PROFILE

This instrument is to be used to obtain a comprehensive assessment of teacher and/or principal perception of various aspects of the building principal's/assistant principal's performance and personal qualities. It is hoped that the information obtained can be used as direction for professional growth for specific individuals and improvement in preparation programs. Please provide the following demographic data but do not provide your name. Individual teachers responding are not to be identified in any way.

The person being assessed is: Principal \_\_\_ Asst. Prin. \_\_\_ They are: Male \_\_\_ Female \_\_\_  
Their approximate age is: Under 30 \_\_\_ 31-40 \_\_\_ 41-50 \_\_\_ 51-60 \_\_\_ Over 60 \_\_\_  
I am: Male \_\_\_ Female \_\_\_ And: Under 30 \_\_\_ 31-40 \_\_\_ 41-50 \_\_\_ 51-60 \_\_\_ Over 60 \_\_\_

Grade Level:	Approximate schools enrollment:
___ Elementary	___ Under 250      ___ 751- 1000
___ Junior High/Middle School	___ 251- 500      ___ 1001- 1500
___ High School	___ 501- 750      ___ Above 1500
___ Other _____	

Please rate using the following scale: 5=outstanding, 4=clearly above average, 3=average, 2=clearly below average, 1=unacceptable

### Management

- \_\_\_ Accessible to staff and others
- \_\_\_ Keeping us informed
- \_\_\_ Visibility in the school setting
- \_\_\_ Uses a minimum of instructional time for non-instructional tasks thus maximizing time on task
- \_\_\_ Working effectively with the central (superintendent's) office
- \_\_\_ Emphasizing staff productivity (on-task behavior by staff)
- \_\_\_ Taking positions which are most beneficial to the school (on issues)
- \_\_\_ Communicating clearly the vision or mission of the school
- \_\_\_ Monitoring classroom performance by teachers
- \_\_\_ Monitoring student performance and conduct
- \_\_\_ Managing support staff (non-teachers)
- \_\_\_ Managing school facilities
- \_\_\_ Managing school finance
- \_\_\_ Managing equipment and supplies
- \_\_\_ Providing needed resources for staff
- \_\_\_ Providing time for faculty to work collaboratively on curriculum, etc.
- \_\_\_ Administering discipline effectively
- \_\_\_ Letting others know what is expected of them
- \_\_\_ Providing instructional leadership
- \_\_\_ Supporting excellence in the performance of staff
- \_\_\_ Providing for beneficial staff-development activities
- \_\_\_ Demonstrating high expectations for self and others
- \_\_\_ Providing leadership in curriculum development
- \_\_\_ Providing a pleasant, safe, and orderly climate for learning

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## **Relationships**

- Shows consideration for staff ("staff" includes teachers and support personnel)
- Provides praise and recognition for staff
- Senses the temper or tone of faculty members on given issues
- Works to create interdependence among staff members
- Works to improve school climate (relationships)
- Stands up for teachers
- Involves parents in productive efforts with the school
- Rewards positive patterns of behavior
- Fosters collaboration and group efforts
- Develops loyalty in staff
- Supports staff consensus on issues
- Works to enhance group efforts
- Asks for faculty input
- Makes teachers feel like they are working toward common goals
- Maintains communication which is candid and productive
- Maintains productive relationships with students
- Maintains productive relationships with parents
- Effectively redirects negative patterns of behavior
- Celebrates/recognizes other's accomplishments
- Shares decision-making with teachers and other school staff members
- Empowers faculty to make decisions not bound by principal's possible censure

## **Delegation**

- Delegates responsibility to others
- Trusts teachers to make mature judgements
- Gives teachers a sense of professional autonomy
- Creates opportunities for teachers to maximize their potential
- Stimulates teachers to use their intellect and creativeness
- Involves faculty in the development of school rules and regulations
- Enables others to act on their own
- Uses a committee approach to decision-making
- Shares power with faculty
- Gets things done, but doesn't do everything alone
- Delegates authority and provides backing for those given the authority
- Acknowledges the skills and intellect of faculty
- Causes me to want to volunteer for extra responsibility

## **Personal Qualities**

- Works with staff in collegial, non-threatening ways
- Understands people
- Demonstrates knowledge of school administration

- Makes decisions and follows through
- Works well with individuals and groups
- Demonstrates personal warmth and caring
- Is inspiring to others
- Acts as a positive catalyst to get things done
- Sets a good example for teachers and others
- Stays well-informed about school issues
- Is patient
- Tolerates stress well without taking it out on others
- Is friendly
- Uses time effectively
- Has good organizational skills
- Exercises good judgement
- Spends the time it takes to get the job done
- Uses a democratic approach
- Is persuasive
- Takes a risk when it could benefit students or school
- Is open and candid with others
- Is flexible (able to "roll with the punches")
- Is honest
- Has good planning skills
- Is effective
- Is fair
- Has good problem solving abilities
- Is reliable
- Accepts responsibility for her/his actions
- Is dependable
- Provides a good model for teachers
- Is consistent
- Has good communication skills
- Is predictable
- Is dynamic
- Is decisive (in a good way)
- Is resourceful
- Is charismatic
- Is intelligent
- Is energetic
- Is well-informed
- Demonstrates perseverance (sticks to it until accomplished)
- Is respected by staff
- Has the staff's confidence
- Relates well to the community



The following are qualities or actions which generally are considered negative. Please provide your perceptions of your principal using a scale of 5-1 with 5=very much so/often; 4=generally so; 3=sometimes/occasionally; 2=rarely; 1=not at all/never.

- Paternalistic (treats us like children)
- Lacks knowledge
- Has poorly defined goals
- Tells us what to do in a negative fashion
- Ideas for improvement are always the principals
- Indecisive
- Hard-headed/stubborn
- Authoritarian/dictatorial
- Blames others
- We fear retaliation by the principal
- Intimidates faculty and others
- Is satisfied with the status quo (is negative about change)
- Provides poor evaluation of instruction
- Does not provide help for teachers who need help in their classrooms
- Supervision efforts are absent or non-productive
- Communication is limited and formal (not productive)
- Does not recognize or reward special accomplishments
- The way to get along with him/her is to conform
- I and most of the faculty avoid contact with the principal/assistant principal
- Is aggressive in a negative way
- Is arrogant
- Is lazy
- Lacks expertise
- Lacks direction
- Lacks commitment
- Is ambiguous
- Is unduly critical
- Is not accessible
- Is manipulative
- Plays favorites
- Is defensive



**U.S. Department of Education**  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)  
National Library of Education (NLE)  
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



# REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>Teachers' Perceptions of the use of "Empowering-type Activities" by their Building Principals</i>	
Author(s): <i>Otis Lovette, Glenda Holland, Mike McCall</i>	
Corporate Source: <i>Univ. of La. at Monroe</i>	Publication Date: <i>Nov. 17, 1999</i>

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Sample*

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

**1**

Level 1



Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Sample*

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

**2A**

Level 2A



Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Sample*

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

**2B**

Level 2B



Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.  
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

*I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.*

**Sign here, please** →

Signature: <i>Otis Lovette</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>Otis Lovette, Prof.</i>	
Organization/Address: <i>U. of La. @ Monroe 306 Strauss Hall MONROE, LA 71209</i>	Telephone: <i>(318) 342-1251</i>	FAX: <i>(318) 342-1240</i>
	E-Mail Address: <i>edlovette@ulm.edu</i>	Date: <i>11/17/99</i>

*edw*

(over)

### III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

### IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

### V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: <b>University of Maryland ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation 1129 Shriver Laboratory College Park, MD 20742 Attn: Acquisitions</b>
--

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility  
1100 West Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598**

**Telephone: 301-497-4080  
Toll Free: 800-799-3742  
FAX: 301-953-0263  
e-mail: [ericfac@inet.ed.gov](mailto:ericfac@inet.ed.gov)  
WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>**