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Performance appraisals have far reaching consequences on people. If evaluators in any way discriminate against employees, these individuals can suffer devastating and potentially debilitating consequences. This thesis investigates elementary teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with Ontario’s Teacher Performance Appraisal system (TPA), used to appraise teachers in Ontario from 2001 until 2007. I used quantitative data obtained from a sample of 132 teachers to investigate their perceptions of TPA with respect to four dimensions of organizational justice; outcome fairness, procedural fairness, informational fairness, and interpersonal fairness. Using oppression and critical theories as the theoretical framework, my analyses of my data allowed me to compare mainstream and minoritized teachers’ perceptions of their experiences with TPA. I also conducted follow-up interviews with three mainstream and three minoritized teachers. Analyses of my data enabled me to investigate how each group experienced TPA in terms of the four dimensions of organizational fairness. Analyses of the quantitative data revealed that minoritized teachers perceived their experiences less favourably than mainstream teachers. In addition, from my analyses of the qualitative data, I found that minoritized teachers tended to experience mistreatment, including manifestations of racism and homophobia from the administrators who conducted their TPA. The implications of this study call on administrators to
disrupt the cycle of oppression by thinking about the biases, prejudices and stereotypical attitudes they bring intentionally or unintentionally to appraising teachers.
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Chapter One:
Background

Researchers and practitioners have been interested in measuring human performance for a long time (Arvey & Murphy, 1998; Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Hyde, 2001), although, for most people, performance appraisals garner the same enthusiasm as paying taxes. From their study of performance appraisal systems in thirty school boards in 1989, Lawton, Hickcox, Leithwood, and Musella (1989) highlight some far reaching effects performance appraisals can have on people. As they put it, “one of the major reasons for the difficulties associated with personnel evaluation is the intensity of the human interaction and the possibility of an adverse judgment about an individual’s performance, a judgment that may damage a career or cause debilitating personal distress” (p. 13).

Given the possibility that adverse judgments can be made about an individual’s performance, it is possible that performance appraisals might not be fair. Evaluators might allow their biases, prejudices and stereotypical attitudes to influence negatively the outcome assigned, the procedures followed, the information they used, or the interpersonal dynamic. When this happens employees are negatively affected. A number of studies highlight that minoritized employees report being victims of unfair performance evaluations (Blase & Blase, 2003; Byrne, 1971; Huo & Tyler, 2001; Igbaria & Shayo, 1997; Ilgen & Youtz, 1986; Kraiger & Ford, 1985; Riordan, 2000; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989; Wesolowski & Mossholder, 1997; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998; Vecchio & Bullis, 2001; Xin, 1997; Zellers, Tepper, & Duffy, 2003) and all the negative consequences that entails (Adams & Freedman, 1976; Folger, 1986; Lind & Tyler, 1988; Mossholder, Bennett, Kemery, & Wesolowski, 1998; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993; Pillai,
Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; Tepper, Eisenbach, Kirby, & Potter, 1998; Tepper, Lockhart, & Hoobler, 2000).

The outcome, the procedures followed, information used, and the interpersonal dynamics between an evaluator and an evaluee of unfair performance appraisals may impact an employee negatively. For example, an unfair performance review may result in an employee being fired. Apart from the economic consequences this would entail, an employee would likely experience a range of emotional reactions from anger to sadness to depression. The emotional stress of losing one’s job as a result of an unsatisfactory performance appraisal can result in physical manifestations from lethargy to muscle pain to cardiac and respiratory problems (Blase & Blase, 2003). In another situation, an employee may experience similar emotional and physical reactions if an unfair performance appraisal resulted in his/her being put on review which would require more frequent performance appraisals.

In general terms, this thesis investigates some elementary teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with the system used to appraise teachers in the province of Ontario. Specifically, by using quantitative and qualitative data, I compare how minoritized and mainstream teachers perceived and experienced the appraisal system in Ontario.

Statement of the Problem

From October 15, 2001 until April 2007, Ontario’s Teacher Performance Appraisal system (TPA), 2002 was the system used to appraise the performance of all teachers employed in Ontario’s publicly funded school systems. TPA was organized around five domains:

1. commitment to pupils and pupil learning;
2. professional knowledge;
3. teaching practice;
4. leadership and community; and
5. ongoing professional learning.

Each domain incorporated a set of competency statements that described the skills, knowledge and attitudes required of teachers. In total, 16 competency statements formed the basis for teachers’ appraisals. For each statement, lists of behaviours the appraiser ought to look for were identified. These 164 “look fors” were intended to be seen as concrete examples of observable behaviour. Principals, vice-principals and, in some cases, supervisory officers (hereafter, referred to as administrators) were responsible for administering the TPA in Ontario’s public schools.

Experienced teachers were evaluated every 3 years and teachers new to the profession or new to a school board had to be evaluated in each of the first 2 years of employment (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 8). For elementary teachers, five mandated steps were followed:

1. a pre-observation meeting and associated procedures;
2. a classroom observation;
3. a post-observation meeting and associated procedures;
4. completion of a summative report including a rating of the teacher’s overall performance; and

Just like any other performance appraisal, the TPA might not be fair. This unfairness might be the result of oppression and may manifest in discrimination, bias, prejudice or bigotry. Before identifying the problem, it is necessary to situate this study within a broader context.

Leading experts on oppression maintain that oppression signifies a hierarchical relationship in which mainstream, or privileged individuals or groups of individuals, such as White, heterosexual, abled-bodied, males, can hold power over and benefit from the disempowerment of
individuals or groups of individuals who are minoritized or subordinated groups such as those who are not White, not heterosexual, not able-bodied or females (Frye, 1983; McIntosh, 1992; Miller, 1976; Wildman, 1996; Young, 1990). When this happens, minoritized individuals and groups of minorities are said to be minoritized (Personal communication, Jim Ryan, February 10, 2009). Some of the literature I reviewed highlights that specific forms of oppression such as (a) racism (Foster, 1992; Henry, 1992, Lam, C., 1996; Lam, M, 1996; West, 1994, Cashmore, 1996); (b) homophobia (Griffin, 1991; Griffin & Ouellett, 2003; Harbeck, 1992; Katz & LaVan, 2004; Khyatt, 1992; King, 2004; Lavers, 2000; Lipkin, 1999; McCarthy, 1999; Olson, 1987; Rotosky & Riggle, 2002; Sears, 1993; Whitlock, 1989); (c) ableism (Anderson, 1998; Gerber, 1998; Karp & Geller, 1998; Valle, Solis, Volpitta, & Connor, 2004; Yates, Ortiz, & Anderson, 1998); and (d) sexism (Coulter & McNay, 1993; Gilligan, 1982; Sadker & Sadker, 1994) are prevalent in our society.

It is imperative to acknowledge the complex, multiple and cross-cutting relationships between these forms of oppression since individuals and groups of individuals can belong to multiple and cross-cutting social groups (Collins, 1990). Power and privilege are relative. For example, a White lesbian teacher who uses a wheel-chair, despite professional success and whiteness, may be a victim of homophobia by parents, colleagues or students who question her about not having attended a school event with a male partner, or who is questioned or disciplined if she is late for a parent-teacher evening when she is not able to hail a taxi when her own car breaks down. Since schools are a microcosm of society, and administrators and teachers are some of the individuals found in schools, it is likely that some teachers, especially those who are minoritized can experience the various and, at times, multiple and cross-cutting forms of oppression. When this happens, unfairness exists.
Given this reality, in terms of the problem, to focus my study, I examined TPA as the vehicle to investigate if aspects of teachers’ identities, such as their country of origin, primary language(s), gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity or ability/disability status in any way influenced their perceptions about or experiences with the fairness of TPA. In terms of minoritized teachers, as I explain in the next section, despite the existence of legislation and polices designed to protect them and free them from discrimination, I sought to investigate if teachers reported perceiving or experiencing manifestations of the “isms” such as discrimination, bias, prejudice or bigotry as a result of their experience with TPA. Even a cursory read of TPA caused me to raise questions about how administrators might interpret various statements contained in the policy and how these administrators might have demonstrated racism, sexism, homophobia or ableism as they interpreted these statements when they conducted TPA. For example, in the “Commitment to Pupils and Pupil Learning” domain, who defines “inappropriate student behaviour” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 28)? For example, can we expect that all teachers who came to teach in Ontario would have had the same shared understanding of the culture of teaching practiced in Ontario? If not, and if these understandings were different from the appraising administrator’s notions, how might a teacher’s use of practice he/she learned in his/her teacher education program in another country have been reflected in his/her appraisal? To be specific, a teacher from the Caribbean might have considered students who refused to stand to answer questions quite differently from a teacher who was trained in another country. In this and other cases, how, if at all, might the administrator from his/her background have been able to recognize, account for and consider a teacher’s approach that differed from the administrator’s perception of what “inappropriate” student behaviour might have looked like? Could this open up the potential for a manifestation of racism to take place?
Suppose a teacher had chosen to value and promote fairness and justice by adopting anti-discriminatory practices with respect to issues of class rather than only those areas identified in the document as “gender, sexual orientation, race, disability, age, religion and culture” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 28), what impact would this have had upon this teacher’s performance appraisal rating? Additionally, if a gay, lesbian, bisexual, two-spirited, transgendered, questioning teacher or a teacher who was sensitive to or interested in advocating for the acceptance of these people had chosen to focus on issues related to anti-homophobia and heterosexism, would this focus have been respected in the same way as a two week unit on “multiculturalism” would have been? How might this have impacted upon the teacher’s performance appraisal? Is there a chance that a manifestation of homophobia could occur in this scenario?

Moreover, from the second competence statement in the “Teaching Practice” domain, “Teachers communicate effectively with pupils, parents and colleagues” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 30), if a teacher’s first language were not English, and s/he taught in the English system what impact might this have had on the administrator’s assessment of the teacher as an effective communicator? Furthermore, if a teacher had had a speech impairment, to what extent might the administrator have considered this in his/her “objective” appraisal of this teacher? Could a manifestation of racism occur in this situation?

Another example, can be found in the “Leadership and Community” domain. It states, “Teachers participate effectively on committees by organizing (sic) school-based activities, for example school/parish initiatives, graduation, theme days” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 30). What would have ensued if a teacher had chosen to introduce a gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered, two-spirited, questioning or curious-straight alliance committee in, for example, a
Muslim or Roman Catholic community? How might this initiative have been reflected, if in fact it had been permitted to have been undertaken in a given school, in a teacher’s performance appraisal? Does this statement open up the possibility that a manifestation of homophobia could occur here?

The examples cited in the previous paragraph assume that, for whatever reason, a teacher might have wanted to deliberately and intentionally reveal some of his/her demographic characteristics or his/her sensitivity to the issues concerned. However, in respect of other cases where their minoritized status had not been apparent, there could have been some teachers who, for many reasons, might have chosen not to identify, share or see the relevance of sharing the many characteristics that locate people in society. For example, a teacher may have chosen not to disclose his/her sexual orientation, a hearing impairment, a mental disability or other physical or emotional condition that informed his/her identity with the administrator. In this case, how might this teacher’s choice have impacted upon the administrator’s perception of this teacher and to what extent might this have impacted upon a teacher’s overall performance appraisal rating? Could the administrator’s positional power over a teacher allow for manifestations such as bias, prejudice, stereotyping or bigotry occur as forms of racism, sexism, homophobia or ableism?

I chose to investigate some teachers’ perceptions about and experiences with Ontario’s TPA for four reasons: (1) because of the consequences of damage to one’s career or the debilitating personal distress that might ensue as a result of an adverse performance appraisal (Lawton et al., 1989); (2) because of my interest in oppression theory and in a version of critical theory concerned with social justice; (3) because of the current under-representation of minoritized teachers in Ontario’s teaching population, the changing demographics in Ontario’s population and the likelihood that these changes will eventually manifest in its teaching
population; (4) because of the lack of any empirical studies examining how minoritized teachers experienced performance appraisal. To do this I selected a sample of teachers who worked in six English, public, elementary school systems in southern Ontario. As I describe in detail in Chapter Two, I framed my study conceptually using four dimensions from the literature on organizational justice: distributive justice (perceptions of outcome fairness), informational justice (perceptions of informational fairness), procedural justice (perceptions of procedural fairness) and interpersonal justice (perceptions of interpersonal fairness). I used these four dimensions to contextualize my research questions and to situate TPA within its social contexts.

**Situating TPA Within its Social Context**

Given my interest in oppression theory and in a version of critical theory concerned with social justice, which I describe further in Chapter Two, and the potentially serious consequences Lawton et al. (1989) proffer may result from an adverse performance appraisal, I wondered how teachers perceived and experienced TPA. For reasons I will explain later, I believe that minoritized teachers might have perceived and experienced TPA differently than mainstream teachers. Within the literature dealing with workplace diversity, “when attempting to draw inferences from empirical findings, it is substantially important to determine which members of groups are mainstream or [minoritized]” (Gardiner & Tiggermann, 1999, p. 301). My study focused on investigating how some elementary teachers perceived and experienced TPA.

Ontario’s teaching population does not reflect the diversity in this province’s general population. In fact, in April 2006, according to a representative from the Provincial Office of the Elementary Teachers’ Federation of Ontario (ETFO), of those members who self-disclose, “males represent 18.8%, females represent 81.2%, visible minorities represent only 5%, disabled educators only 0.5% and teachers who identify as sexual minorities represent only 1% of
ETFO’s then 70,000 members” (Personal communication, Manager of Fees and Membership Services, ETFO, April 2006). Despite this disproportionately small sample of minoritized teachers, I believe that with increasing diversity in Ontario’s population, the teaching population will also eventually become more diverse. Increased immigration means that a growing number of people from various countries of origin now live and work in Ontario. Consequently, more people in Ontario’s general population than ever identify their ethnicity as non-Caucasian and use (a) primary language(s) other than English or French. For example, between 2001 and 2006, Ontario’s visible minority population increased by 27.5% (Canada’s Ethnocultural Mosaic, 2008, p. 19). Ontario’s visible minorities comprised 22.8% of the population in 2006 (p. 19). “In contrast, just 25 years earlier they accounted for only 6.4%” (p. 19). Also, in terms of primary language(s), 26.1% of Ontario’s population identify their primary language(s) other than English or French (2006 Census of Population, Population by mother tongue, by province and territory (2006 Census (2007), compared to 23.7% in 2001 (2001 Census of Population (2002) Mother Tongue, 2001 Counts for Both Sexes, for Canada, Provinces and Territories) and 21.4% in 1996 (1996 Census of Population (2006), Profile of Federal Electoral Districts (1996 Representation Order).

The questions I raised earlier about TPA led me to anticipate that, minoritized teachers, albeit few in numbers, could potentially experience manifestations of at least racism or homophobia concerning their perceptions about and their experiences with TPA. However, especially given the legislation and policies designed to protect the human rights of teachers in Ontario which I describe in the next section, one would likely have expected minoritized teachers to have had their human rights protected and to have been free from discrimination. In this situation, one would have expected these teachers to have been simply examples of teachers
who are under-represented in Ontario’s teaching population (Personal communication, Manager of Fees and Membership Services, April 2006) and not examples of minoritized teachers.

**Teachers and Human Rights**

I recall, early in the development of my proposal for this thesis, an academic questioning me about the value of undertaking an investigation into minoritized teachers’ experiences with TPA. She questioned, “You don’t expect to find that minorities will be discriminated against do you? There are laws in Canada and in Ontario which protect people from this sort of treatment nowadays” (Personal communication, name withheld to conceal identity, November, 14, 2003). Her question and the follow-up statement inspired me to examine some relevant legislation and policies. I drew on two pieces of legislation related to human rights: The *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (1982), the *Ontario Human Rights Code* (1990), and a policy: The *Anti-Racism and Ethnocultural Policy* (1993), and the Ontario College of Teachers’ *Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession* (2006) as evidence that minoritized teachers should have been protected and free from discrimination. I describe these in the two following subsections.

**Legislation**

Current federal and provincial laws in Canada provide the legislative framework intended to guarantee and protect all people from discrimination based upon, among other things, one’s country of origin, primary language(s), ethnicity, gender, disabilities and sexual orientation. For example, section 15 (1) of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (1982) states, “Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability” (Government
of Canada, Part 1, p. 15). In addition, the *Ontario Human Rights Code* (1990) states, “Every person has a right to equal treatment with respect to employment without discrimination because of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, record of offences, marital status, family status or handicap” (Government of Ontario, Part 1, p. 5). This legislation purports to guarantee Canadians freedom from discrimination and intends to guarantee and protect their human rights. Obviously, one would assume minoritized teachers would be subject to these same rights and freedoms.

**Educational Policies**

One provincial policy and the Ontario College of Teachers’ *Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession* are related to the aforementioned legislation. The *Anti-racism and Ethnocultural Policy* provides the direction to and framework for school boards “to develop and implement antiracism and ethnocultural equity polices” (Government of Ontario, 1993, p. 5). Recognizing the multiple and cross-cutting forms that occur, “the impact of racism becomes compounded when two or more factors, such as race, gender, disability, sexual orientation etc., are presented in the same situation” (p. 5), this policy requires school boards to identify and eliminate “systemic inequities and barriers … on equitable employment practices for staff” (p. 6). In addition, The *Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession* defined as, care, respect, trust and integrity, represent a vision of professional practice. Members of the Ontario College of Teachers, in their positions of trust, are expected to “demonstrate responsibility in their relationships with …colleagues” (Ontario College of Teachers, 2006, ¶ 1-2). The purposes of the Ethical Standards are:

1. to inspire members to reflect and uphold the honour and dignity of the teaching profession
2. to identify the ethical responsibilities and commitments in the teaching profession
3. to guide ethical decisions and actions in the teaching profession
4. to promote public trust and confidence in the teaching profession. (Ontario College of Teachers, 2006, p. 3)

The provincial policy was designed to protect the human rights of teachers in their workplace, and the *Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession* to provide a framework for members such as administrators to demonstrate responsibility in their relationships with teachers as colleagues.

**Purpose of Study**

The problem that motivates the study is to determine if minoritized teachers, despite the existence of legislation and policies to protect their human rights, have been treated fairly at the hands of an administrator who has positional authority over teachers. My study’s overarching purpose was to investigate how some elementary teachers who belong to minoritized groups (teachers who were born in a country other than Canada, identify primary language(s) other than English or French, are other than heterosexual, are other than White, or are, in some way, differently-abled) fared in terms of their perceptions of and experiences with TPA and to compare these perceptions and experiences to those of mainstream teachers (teachers who were born in Canada, identify primary language(s) as either English or French, are heterosexual, are White or are in no way differently-abled). While I read the TPA policy (see Appendix A), as I stated earlier this chapter, I questioned how administrators might have used their positional authority over teachers and how issues of power might have played out as the administrator interpreted some of the statements they were supposed to consider when determining a teacher’s rating. I suspected that it might be possible for some administrators to have demonstrated some forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, homophobia, and ableism against minoritized teachers as they appraised them.
Using a version of critical theory concerned first and foremost with investigating the notion of social justice related to some elementary teachers’ perceptions of their experiences with TPA, I attempted to survey all English language public elementary teachers who worked in a sample of six English public school boards. I hoped to obtain a sample which would be reflective of the elementary teaching population for each of the five aforementioned categories which defined teachers as members of the minoritized or the mainstream groups to compare their perceptions of TPA. In addition, I selected minoritized and mainstream teachers interested in participating in follow-up interviews. We met face to face to discuss these teachers’ experiences with TPA.

I chose to investigate teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with performance appraisal for ten reasons. First, as stated earlier, early in my doctoral studies an academic asked me if I actually thought minoritized teachers would experience any kind of discrimination with the Canadian and Ontarian laws as well as Ontarian educational policies and the Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession all the laws currently in place in Canada and in Ontario. Second, some literature on organizational justice highlights that concerns about justice manifest themselves with respect to performance appraisal systems (Greenberg, 1986). Third, some of the most insightful authors in the field of educational supervision and evaluation suggest that, “one of the major reasons for the difficulties associated with personnel evaluation is the intensity of the human interaction and the possibility of an adverse judgment about an individual’s performance, a judgment that may damage a career or cause debilitating personal distress” (Lawton et al., 1989, p.13). Fourth, performance appraisals have become increasingly important in today’s organizational environment (Geddes & Baron, 1997). Fifth, when the TPA was passed by legislation, it conferred exclusive authority on administrators, circumventing any contractual
stipulations usually negotiated as collective agreements between school board management and teacher federations.

Sixth, one of the expressed purposes of TPA was to “provide for fair…teacher evaluation in every school” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 3). Seventh, as Page (2003) states, “Although increased attention has been paid to the supervisory process in recent years, there is very little literature on whether or how race and culture (or any other aspect of social identity) affect the supervisory process in education” (p. 162). In fact with respect to the seventh reason, Page’s (2003) literature search “on race and supervision yielded only one source in education and very few in the social sciences” (pp. 164-165). According to Page (2003), the small amount of literature that did exist focused on preservice teachers. However, even within this small area, she reports how they “found silences surrounding inequity, multiculturalism, racism, classism, and other issues” (pp. 165-166). Page (2003) also notes that Grant and Zozakiewicz’s (1995) “literature search in preparation for their research verified the lack of theoretical and empirical writing on multicultural supervision in education” (p. 166). In addition, Page (2003) references one study, which “sought to address such silences” (p. 166). She refers to, “Abt-Perkins, Hauschildt, and Dale (2000) [who] examined their own practice as supervisors and the practices of student teachers as they attempted to frame student teaching as a multicultural experience” (p. 166). Page (2003) suggests that “although the authors examined in detail cultural factors in teaching, one omission in the study was how external cultural factors [race, social class, gender, communication style] influenced supervisory communications and relationships themselves” (p. 166).

As I reflected upon the list of questions I raised earlier about how an administrator might interpret just some of the “look fors” as they appraised teachers, I recalled a statement made
proudly by an experienced administrator who worked in a multicultural school in Ontario. The administrator stated, “at my school, we are colour blind – the students aren’t even aware of each other’s colour” (name withheld to protect the administrator’s identity, personal communication, November 18, 2003). Although there are likely many reasons underlying this administrator’s perspective, by extrapolating, one can assume that this administrator believes it is not important to take aspects of one’s identity into account at anytime, let alone during the highstakes TPA process. Page (2003) maintains:

> Often, supervisors appear not to know how to behave in cross-cultural situations. Supervisors may overinterpret or underinterpret the influence of culture [race, ancestry, place of origin, color, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, same-sex partnership status, family status or disability] on the relationship, avoid issues of culture [race, ancestry, place of origin, color, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, same-sex partnership status, family status or disability] altogether, or fear being labeled a bigot, all of which ultimately inhibit the supervisory relationship.

(p. 168)

If Page (2003) is correct, my eighth reason for conducting this study was to investigate this aspect of the teacher-administrator relationship. I believe that if administrators, and especially mainstream administrators, in their positional authority over teachers could engage in forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, homophobia and ableism, manifested as biases, prejudices, stereotypes and bigotry, this would certainly inhibit the supervisory relationship. If this is true, then I wonder if we could have been in any way confident that a “fair, effective, and consistent teacher evaluation [was taking place] in every school” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 3). Given that the development and implementation of TPA had implications for every teacher in every publicly funded school system in Ontario, I was concerned about the potential for forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, homophobia and ableism to occur since TPA was not a policy that occurred in isolation. In fact, as described previously, if these forms of
power over teachers did occur, as my ninth reason, I wondered about the usefulness of legislation such as, the *Ontario Human Rights Code* (1990) and the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (1982) which are intended to guarantee freedom from discrimination of forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, homophobia and/or ableism. In addition, I questioned the worth of educational policies such as the *Anti-racism and Ethnocultural Policy* (1993) which compels school boards to create equitable employment practices and the *Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession* (2006) which identifies values which are intended to guide the practice of members of the teaching profession. Finally, my reading of Foster (1986), during my doctoral course work, inspired me to inspect the TPA and to think about some potential consequences an uncritically administered TPA might have on teachers.

Taken together, these ten reasons inspired me to develop three research questions to compare a sample of minoritized and mainstream elementary teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA. I identify these research questions in the following section.

**Research Questions**

Informed by my study’s conceptual framework, its theoretical underpinnings, the literature dealing with discrimination against minoritized people and mistreatment of teachers described in Chapter Two, and my own interest in minoritized teachers which grew while I was completing my doctoral course work, I identify the following research questions:

1. What were the salient characteristics of teachers’ perceptions of fairness related to TPA?

2. How did teachers’ demographic characteristics interact with their perceptions of fairness with TPA?
3. How did TPA impact mainstream female and minoritized teachers?

**Significance of Study**

My study has the potential to make a contribution to the study of educational administration for four main reasons. First, this study responds to two calls for action to fill gaps in existing literature. Although organizational justice has been studied for approximately 20 years, Cropanzano (2001) and Hubbell and Chory-Assad (2005) call on researchers to examine how all four of the concepts - outcome, informational, procedural and interpersonal fairness related to organizational justice - intersect (Cropanzano, 2001). Second, I take up Page’s (2003) call to action by attempting to “fill a gap in the educational knowledge base by identifying the ways that culture, race, ethnicity, class, language, and other forms of diversity affect the process of supervision” (p. 161).

In terms of the second reason, given the potentially serious and debilitating consequences that an adverse judgment might have on teachers (Lawton et al., 1989), it was worth investigating how teachers perceived and experienced TPA.

Third, given that Ontario’s teaching population is likely to become increasingly diverse and given my hypothesis that minoritized teachers likely did not fare as well as mainstream teachers, my study sought to investigate the relationship between these two ideas and to share my results and findings with the field of educational administration. Fourth, since legislative authority was conferred on administrators to conduct teachers’ performance appraisals and since this legislation provided for no delineated directives about how an appeal process might be worked into collective agreements, a further power differential existed between administrators and teachers which was embedded in the TPA policy. Given this dynamic, oppression theory and a version of critical theory concerned with social justice, it would be likely that the power the
mainstream group could result in forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, homophobia and/or ableism. Given that schools are a microcosm of society, in my case, it is probable that minoritized teachers would fare poorer than their mainstream counterparts. I believe that people interested in educational administration would want to understand these perspectives.

**Limitations or Boundaries of the Study**

In general, boundaries limit the values placed on constructs within theoretical and conceptual models because all theories and conceptual frameworks are constrained by their specific bounding assumptions. These assumptions include the implicit assumptions that all theorists bring to bear on any topic or issue and the explicit restrictions regarding time and space. In this regard, the boundary of my study is limited to reporting some elementary teachers’ perceptions of and their experiences with Ontario’s 2002 version of TPA as it was conducted between October 2006 and April 2007 using the methodology I describe in Chapter Three. No generalizations beyond the results and findings reported in my study should be made. In fact, the low number of participants made it necessary for me to group teachers who belonged to minoritized groups together. I also needed to identify a mainstream group in order to compare mainstream and minoritized teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA. As I explain later, the mainstream group became the mainstream female group.

Finally, I note that one of the significant limitations or boundaries of my study relates to the absence of any theoretical, conceptual or empirical research currently available which investigated the antecedents and consequences of organizational justice related to minoritized teachers’ perceptions of and their experiences with performance appraisal systems. Therefore, as the first of its kind, the instruments and methods I used should be validated further by other researchers with other participants.
Definitions of Terms

I used the following terms in my study:

**Organizational Justice:** Employees’ perceptions of the fairness of treatment received from organizations (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997).

**Distributive Justice or Outcome Fairness:** The perceived fairness of the outcomes that an employee receives from an organization (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). It focuses on teachers’ responses to the content, (Adams, 1965) or “decisions reached” (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 220). It concentrates “not on the absolute level of the outcome per se” (Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001, p. 426), but “whether the outcomes resulted in a match between the outcome they expected and the one they received” (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 220) which is informed by their prior experiences and/or comparisons with other teachers (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 426). “If the [rating received] falls short of their expectations, [teachers] perceive unfairness” (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 221); conversely, “if the rating meets or exceeds teachers’ expectations, they are likely to perceive fairness” (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 221). In this thesis I use the term outcome fairness.

**Procedural Justice or Procedural Fairness:** The perceived fairness of the policies and procedures used to make decisions (Greenberg, 1990). It focuses on the means by which they obtain these decisions. It concerns teachers’ reactions to “the procedures used (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 211) and the means by which they obtain these (Byrne & Cropanzano, 2001; Greenberg, 1990; Levanthal, 1980; Levanthal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975) or the “appropriateness of [the] decision process (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 220). It “focuses on the thoroughness or adequacy of the information provided” (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 220). In this thesis I use the term procedural fairness.
Interactional Justice or Informational Fairness and Interpersonal: The perceived fairness of the way(s) in which the decision-making procedures are implemented and explained (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 211). It consists of two specific types of justice, informational justice and interpersonal justice (Greenberg, 1990, 1993). I address each of these in the following sections.

Informational Justice or Informational Fairness: The perceived fairness of the information used to explain an outcome or procedures used. It focuses on the explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 426). It “focuses on the thoroughness or adequacy of the information provided” (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 220). In this thesis I use the term informational fairness.

Interpersonal Justice or Interpersonal Fairness: The perceived fairness of the interpersonal treatment people receive when procedures are implemented (Bies & Moag, 1986). It refers to teachers’ reactions, attitudes and behaviours toward their supervisors (Hubbell & Chory-Assad, 2005). In other words, it is concerned with the quality of interpersonal treatment teachers receive. It pertains to the communication practices and relates to the degree to which employees are treated with politeness, dignity and respect, or in other words, honesty, propriety, and respect (Bies & Moag, 1986; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). In this thesis I use the term interpersonal fairness.

Minoritized Teachers: A teacher who is characteristically under-represented in the elementary teaching population such as one who was born in a country other than Canada, identifies as other than heterosexual, is other than White, or is, in some way, differently-abled. This teacher can be either male or female.
**Mainstream Teachers:** A teacher who is characteristically representative of the elementary teaching population such as one who was born in Canada, identifies as heterosexual, is White or is in no way differently-abled. This teacher can be either male or female.

**Rating of Exemplary on TPA:** Performance that consistently exceeds the expectations for the set of competencies (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 7).

**Rating of Good on TPA:** Performance that consistently meets the expectations for the set of competencies (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 7).

**Rating of Satisfactory on TPA:** Performance that does not always meet all the expectations for the set of competencies. Performance should be improved (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 7).

**Rating of Unsatisfactory on TPA:** Performance that does not meet expectations for the set of competencies. Performance must be improved (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 7).

**Background of the Researcher**

It is important to describe my background and biases I brought to my study. I was a secondary school French and English teacher for ten years. Early in my teaching career, I learned about the importance of assessment and evaluation to ensure students experienced success and perceived that they were successful. In the positions I have held since then, as a curriculum consultant, vice-principal, program officer at the Ontario College of Teachers and coordinator of postsecondary education with the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, I learned to appreciate even more the importance of assessment and evaluation and how these concepts relate to appraising staff.

In my role as vice principal in an independent school, I was responsible for appraising teachers. Given this responsibility, I turned to the literature on the evaluation of teachers. My
exploratory reading led me to understand that with performance appraisals, adverse judgments are possible, evaluators might allow their biases, prejudices and stereotypes to influence the outcome, information used, procedures followed or the way they interact with an employee and that if employees perceive or experience unfair evaluations they often endure negative financial, emotional, psychological or physical consequences.

Although I did not use Ontario’s TPA to appraise them, as indicated earlier, when I reviewed the 164 look-fors administrators used to appraise teachers, I had some questions about how administrators might interpret them and the effect this might have on Ontario’s elementary teachers employed in public schools. Situated within these contexts, I sought to investigate elementary teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with Ontario’s TPA.

**Organization of the Thesis**

In Chapter One, I examine the importance of investigating minoritized teachers’ perceptions of fairness about and their experiences with Ontario’s TPA. I provide some background, identify the problem I seek to investigate and situate TPA within its social context. I identify the research questions, the four main reasons why the study is significant and explain my study’s limitations and boundaries. In Chapter Two, as Figure 1 illustrates (see p. 24), I summarize the theoretical, conceptual and empirical literature related to organizational justice, teacher evaluation, discrimination against minoritized people and mistreatment of teachers. In Chapter Three I detail the research design and the methodology I used to investigate some elementary teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA. In Chapter Four I describe the results of the statistical analyses that were conducted and present the findings of the qualitative study using the research questions as the organizer. In Chapter Five I discuss the results, draw conclusions, proffer implications, describe the contribution my study makes to the field of
educational administration, make recommendations for future research and proffer conclusions using the four dimensions of fairness as the organizer.
Chapter Two: 
Literature Review

In this chapter I identify the theoretical underpinnings of my study. In addition, I provide a review of the literature I used to contextualize my research questions. Figure 1 shows provides a brief overview of the field of organizational justice. Next, I briefly describe each of the four dimensions of organizational justice. I then review the literature on teacher evaluation, discrimination against minoritized people and mistreatment of teachers. Finally, using my three research questions as organizers, I review the relevant literature for each of the four dimensions of organizational justice and provide the relevant empirical and conceptual literature from the field of teacher evaluation.

Figure 1. Map of the literature reviewed.
Theoretical Underpinnings

Having grown up in a multicultural area of Toronto in the 1970s, having worked in schools with students from hundreds of countries and of different abilities, and having heard stories from educators who (a) come from countries other than Canada, (b) identify their primary language(s) as neither English nor French, (c) are not heterosexual, (d) are visible minorities or (e) are in some way(s) differently abled, about the devastating or debilitating consequential effects of their perceptions about and experiences with situations which cause them to feel marginalized or oppressed in Ontario, I turned to the literature to learn more.

Ryan (2003) states that not all people, including teachers, enjoy the same kinds of privileges in life; some people, including teachers, are decidedly worse off than others. This inequality, as Ryan (2003) posits, “is not the result of chance or happenstance. Rather, there are clearly identifiable patterns in these privileges” (p. 15). He postulates that “these differential fortunes have social causes; they are the products of enduring, yet changing patterns of social interactions” (p. 15). Ryan (2003) also proffers that “the causes of this marginalization and exclusion extend far beyond individuals” (p. 15) and that “while individuals are nevertheless implicated in their own and others’ misfortunes, they are not exclusively responsible for them” (p. 15).

This differential treatment can be accounted for by oppression theory. According to Merriam-Webster’s online dictionary, oppression is defined as “a: unjust or cruel exercise of authority or power b: something that oppresses especially in being an unjust or excessive exercise of power” (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2008). Oppression theory is the generally held belief that one social group, whether consciously or unconsciously, exploits another social group. It involves ideological control as well as domination of the society. This
results in a condition of privilege for the mainstream group relative to the disenfranchisement and exploitation of the minoritized group (Bell, 1997). Oppression is a social phenomenon and has been and continues to be examined within its historical contexts. I use oppression theory, whether it is Frye’s (1983) focus on gender oppression, Hallie’s (1997) examination of racial/ethnic oppression, Pharr’s (1988) work on oppression based on sexual orientation or Ruether’s (1972) focus on oppression of women and peoples of colour, as just some of the leading experts, to describe our current social reality. Although the existing theories of oppression differ at one level, that is, according to the specific target groups addressed, they also share considerable common features. All the theories of oppression recognize the necessity of a power differential in the institutionalization of privilege and dominance over the oppressed and subordinate.

One of the most insidious characteristics of oppression is the degree to which it can be normalized. Because of this normalization, oppression often remains at the edge of collective consciousness. This normalization can allow many, especially those who belong to the mainstream or privileged group to deny its existence and the powerlessness the minoritized or oppressed groups often feel. This is precipitated when the mainstream group remains deaf to their voices or finds ways to blame the minoritized, or oppressed group for their plight. When this happens, people experience manifestations of racism, sexism, homophobia and/or ableism. Recognizing that some individuals in society belong to more than one social group, these individuals are likely to experience multiple forms of some of the manifestations of oppression.

It is well known that, in society at large, “women have faced years of oppression in all economic, cultural, social, and psychological relationships with males” (Eng, 2004, ¶ 6). There is no lack of literature available on this subject. For example, just to mention three, Hanisch (1969)
focuses on explaining how women's cultural and political inequalities are inextricably linked and encouraged women to understand aspects of their personal lives as deeply politicized and as reflecting sexist power structures, Simone de Beauvoir (1949) analyses how women are oppressed, and Moreau, Osgood, and Halsall (2007) highlight the fact that women have traditionally experienced challenges in their pursuit of acquiring managerial positions. Despite the fact that women, even now, are over-represented in the elementary teaching population (Personal communication, Manager of Fees and Membership Services, ETFO, April 2006), it is common knowledge that because of competing familial obligations and other societal pressures, women typically are consistently at a disadvantage in this context.

Building on the literature on oppression theory, over the last decade or so practitioners and scholars have emphasized the inability of our educational institutions to address adequately issues associated with (a) race/ethnicity (Cashmore 1996; Foster, 1992; Henry, 1992, Lam, C, 1996; Lam, M, 1996; West 1994); (b) gender (Coulter & McNay, 1993, Gilligan, 1982; Sadker & Sadker 1994,); (c) sexual preference (Griffin, 1991; Griffin & Ouellett, 2003; Harbeck, 1992; Katz & LaVan, 2004; King, 2004; Khyatt, 1992; Lavers, 2000; Lipkin, 1999; McCarthy, 1999; Olson, 1987; Rotosky & Riggle, 2002; Sears, 1993; Whitlock, 1989); and (d) ableism (Anderson, 1998; Gerber, 1998; Karp & Geller, 1998; Valle, et. al., 2004; Yates, Ortiz, & Anderson, 1998). This literature, in addition to the literature I review later on discrimination against minoritized teachers and mistreatment of teachers, consistently emphasizes five main points. First, oppression does not only take place within society or in external social institutions and other places where normalization can occur, but also within the human psyche (Fanon, 1968; Freire, 1970; Miller, 1976). For example, homophobia is learned and internalized by both heterosexual
and non-heterosexual people. In other words, it is possible for a lesbian to feel the same disgust of and contempt for homosexuality as a straight woman.

Second, oppression against minoritized groups occurs when mainstream groups benefit from disempowering, in conscious and often unconscious ways, members or groups of members in the minoritized groups. Third, capturing and fully understanding one’s social identity is enormously complex. For example, what commonalities do gay, lesbians and transgender people who are harassed or avoided in their workplaces share with new immigrants whose “accents” make them subject to ignorance or racist remarks and jokes by their colleagues?

Fourth, power and privilege are relative, since individuals can hold multiple and cross-cutting membership within multiple social groups. For example, “an affluent professional Black male may enjoy the economic benefits not available to most women, but, simultaneously, face barriers or limitations not experienced by his white colleagues” (Bell, 1997, p. 5). Finally, pain is pain and whether or not the oppression manifests in blatant or subtle forms manifestations of oppression such as discrimination, prejudice, bias or bigotry, when minoritized individuals perceive that their social identity.getIdentities are in some way(s) responsible for mistreatment, they receive the wounds the pain inflicts and, often even years after the occurrence(s), refer to the scars the wounds leave on them.

Given the prevalence of the aforementioned literature, and especially with respect to my study where administrators have conferred authority over teachers, and in the course of conducting TPA, can ultimately affect a teacher’s career, I wanted to see if teachers, and especially minoritized teachers, perceived any manifestations of oppression in the specific forms of racism, homophobia, and ableism. In addition, given that oppression theory acknowledges that mainstream groups hold power over minoritized groups and given that unlike in society at large,
in this day and age, Ontario’s teaching population is over-represented by women (Personal communication, Manager of Fees and Membership Services, ETFO, April 2006), including those in school administration, I wondered if gender would have an impact on teacher’s perceptions of and experiences with TPA.

Beyond oppression theory, which helps us to understand how mainstream groups in society can hold power over and oppress minoritized groups I draw on a version of critical theory concerned with social justice a way of challenging the status quo of the situations in which minoritized people find themselves. It is important to state that although I have read some of Foucault’s work, as just one critical theorist, and although I quote other authors who have written about his work, because Ryan (1998) clearly and succinctly encapsulates Foucault’s complex thoughts, I draw frequently on Ryan’s (1998) work. This critical approach focuses on “finding ways to help schools improve the life situations of disadvantaged groups and individuals” (Ryan, 1998, p. 257), specifically as this relates to my focus on investigating elementary teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA and to compare mainstream and minoritized teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA. One of the most significant aspects of this critical approach in situations where forms of discrimination and oppression occur is the emphasis placed on “taking action that will eliminate the kind of inequitable social conditions that give rise to these sorts of oppressive situations” (Ryan, 1998, p. 258). The version of critical theory I adopt encourages resistance or transgression as possibilities people can use to disrupt the cycle of oppression which operates in many forms through racism, sexism, homophobia and ableism.

Within the literature on critical theory, one line of disagreement exists between traditional approaches and postmodern perspectives. Those with a postmodern critical bent such as “Foucault 1980, Lyotard 1984, Baudrillard 1988…claim the more traditional approaches
cannot adequately account for contemporary social circumstances” (Ryan, 1998, p. 258).

Traditional critical theorists accuse postmodernists of “abandoning the true spirit of critique. They maintain that because so-called postmodern positions have few real political possibilities, they are not really ‘critical’ at all” (Ryan, 1998, p. 258). Tracing all the ways in which these two approaches differ is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, “one line of disagreement between the two perspectives revolves around the pursuit of a utopian state” (Ryan, 1998, p. 258), one in which for example, all people would be equal and would be treated equally and equitably. “On the one hand, traditional critical social scientists like Habermas see their goal as helping humanity to attain a state of *emancipation*, one free from all oppression and exploitation” (Ryan, 1998, p. 259). “On the other hand, those who are slotted into a postmodern perspective like Foucault maintain that social scientists should abandon efforts to attain this illusory condition and look instead towards resistance or transgression as a more appropriate political practice” (Ryan, 1998, p. 258). As Ryan (1998) puts it:

> These respective choices are not arbitrary. They flow directly from the ways in which these social scientists view social relationships, and in particular, how they conceptualize domination and subordination. Their different views of human regulation, the role of the individual self or subject, and the constitution and function of groups of people in the process dictate that their approaches to political action will also differ. (p. 259)

Once again, comparing these two critical perspectives is beyond my scope here (see Ryan, 1998 for an excellent example of this distinction). I approach my study from the postmodern perspective and one more aligned with Foucault than any other critical theorist. My reading of some of his work (Foucault, 1976, 1977, 1980, 1982, 1984) offers us a way of looking at what power is, how it works and that resistance opens up the possibilities to assist those who are disadvantaged. I summarize how Foucault (1980, 1982) explores domination and subordination through his conceptualization of power and how it works under the next sub-
heading, describe how oppression is political in the following section and explain how he sees resistance as ways to combat oppression in the third sub-heading.

**Domination as a Form of Production**

“Foucault’s work revolves around explorations of domination and power” (Ryan, 1998, p. 258). Foucault (1980) maintains:

> power is not to be taken to be a phenomenon of one individual’s consolidated and homogeneous domination over others, or that of one group or class over others … power …is not that which makes the difference between those who exclusively possess it and retain it, and those who do not have it and submit to it. (p. 98)

Furthermore, Foucault explains that, “power in the substantive sense, *le pouvoir*, does not exist” (as cited in Cousins & Hussain, 1984, p. 227). “Such a definition of power…would fail to account for a considerable number of phenomena which, for him, fall into the domain of power relations” (Cousins & Hussain, 1984, p. 227).

Foucault explains how power operates in sites like prisons and hospitals. He posits that even though “power is lodged in local practices, he believes that people do not control it in any simple sense” (Ryan, 1998, p. 269). According to Foucault, “power denotes the ensemble of actions exercised by and bearing on individuals which guide conduct and structure its possible outcomes” (as cited in Cousins & Husssain, 1984, p. 229). For Foucault power is ‘intentional and non-subjective’ (Foucault, 1978, p. 94). “By “intentional”, Foucault means that power relations have a point or an aim, that they are directed toward a certain end and by “non-subjective”, that they are neither possessed nor controlled by individual subjects” (Allen, 2008, p. 54).

“One of the recurrent themes of Foucault’s remarks and analyses of power relations are that the actual effects are often very different from their intended effects” (Cousins & Husssain, 1984, p. 229). Foucault expresses this idea even better when he says, “People know what they
do; they frequently know why they do what they do; but what they don’t know is what they do does” (Foucault, as cited in Ryan, 1998, p. 269). This critical concept is at the heart of how social oppression and critical theories underpin my thesis. By investigating teachers’ perceptions about and experiences with TPA, I hope to give voice to the minoritized teachers and invite all interested people, regardless of their positional authority to read and reflect carefully on my quantitative results and qualitative findings. The story my results and findings tell grants people the opportunities to learn about the consequential effects that forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, homophobia and ableism manifested in subtle or blatant forms of discrimination had on the teachers who participated in my study.

According to Foucault, the subject is involved and plays an important role in the process of domination. “Foucault does not believe that the forces of domination only carry with them constraining laws or practices that are responsible for subduing or crushing the subject. On the contrary, Foucault (1982, p. 212) holds that power actually constitutes or produces subjects or social selves” (Ryan, 1998, p. 269). As Foucault (1982) puts it,

This form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorizes the individual, marks him by his individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him. It is a form of power which makes individual subjects. (p. 212)

By this Foucault means that, “power operates through the promotion rather than negation of subjectivity” (Ryan, 1998, p. 269). “Power provides the conditions that allow men and women to become subjects. Positioning and configuring individuals in social arrangements that are not necessarily of their own choosing” (Ryan, 1998, p. 269). Although some of the following are disputed in some literature on social identity, I take the position that for example, one’s country of origin, primary language(s), gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity/race and ability status are not aspects of ones identity that people choose. In this way, although Foucault recognizes multiple
forms of oppression, I used his work to focus on examining how oppression affects those who have been traditionally marginalized or minoritized in this society. According to Ryan (1998), Foucault maintains that:

power does not act on people from a distance, from the outside, but on the interior...through an individual’s self-intervention on social relations. In other words entrapment proceeds as we become ourselves: we are very much our own prisoners. (p. 269)

In this regard, power does not only act on people, but perhaps through people. In other words, people are not just power’s target, but also its vehicle.

“Foucault’s subject reflects the social circumstances in which it finds itself” (Ryan, 1998, p. 269). In his view, “who we are, who we aspire to be, and how we look at ourselves is very much a product of the situations that present themselves to us” (Foucault, as cited in Ryan, 1998, p. 269). “He shows how places like hospitals and prisons, for example, set up advantages and disadvantages as they produce individual subjects” (Ryan, 1998, p. 270). These institutions, like schools, can be significant sites that shape people socially, but they are not the only places where this occurs. Although advantage and disadvantage need not be identified only with the more enduring categories of subordination such as one’s country of origin, primary language(s), gender, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity and ability status as many scholars have emphasized over many years, my study focuses intentionally on these categories as a way of investigating how minoritized teachers perceived and experienced TPA when compared to their mainstream counterparts.

**Politics and Oppression**

In terms of politics, Foucault does not cite specific ways people can engage in interventions strategies to disrupt oppression. Rather, Foucault focuses on exposing or helping
people to become aware of the forms of domination people experience and his work focuses on analyzing the ways in which these forms of domination work. In my study this means focusing on the ways in which forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, homophobia and/or ableism are manifested against minoritized teachers. By doing this, we can use Foucault’s work to help us to identify the tools we can employ to help minoritized and oppressed people to resist the oppression they experience. Foucault comments about combating domination, “not so much in his studies, but in responses to questions in interview sessions” (Ryan, 1998, p. 271). According to Ryan (1998), Foucault “abandons … illusory dreams of a society free of domination and control” (p. 271). “Given the fundamental part power plays in the constitution of daily life, he believes that personal and societal existence can never be free of constraint and regulation” (Ryan, 1998, p. 271). Ryan (1998), referencing Giddens (1991) “maintains that we must not give up completely on the emancipatory promise of modernity” (p. 271). For Foucault, “instead of conceiving of emancipation in terms of the attainment of some idyllic (illusory) state, we should look at it as something ongoing, a practice or struggle against oppressive situations” (Ryan, 1998, p. 272). As Foucault (1984) puts it:

Liberty is a practice. So there may, in fact, always be a certain number of projects whose aim is to modify some constraints, to loosen, or even break them, but none of these projects can, simply by its nature, assure that people will have liberty automatically, that it will be established by the project itself. The liberty of men is never assured by the intuitions and laws that are intended to guarantee them. This is why almost all of these laws and institutions are quite capable of being turned around. Not because they are ambiguous, but simply because ‘liberty’ is what must be exercised. (p. 245)

“Foucault sees active, ongoing resistance as a way of approaching and eventually modifying oppressive practices. But emancipation and resistance need not necessarily be seen as opposing concepts” (Ryan, 1998, p. 272). “Indeed all concrete efforts at emancipation presuppose not only forms of resistance, but the right to resist” (Ryan, 1998, p. 272). In
Foucault’s world, there is no utopia, people can and will always be confronted with the choice of being able to contest how advantages and disadvantages are distributed. As Ryan (1998) puts it:

While there is no reason to believe that political activity will not meet with success, the reality here is that success will simply provide for the conditions for a new struggle. Once the previous oppressive arrangements have been overturned, people must be prepared to turn around and contest the new forms of domination which have replaced the old. (p. 272)

“Given the particular relationship of domination and the subject, political projects ultimately have to factor the latter into their strategies” (Ryan, 1998, p. 272). “The challenge here will be to not only understand the multiple and changing ways in which subjects are constituted, and as a result entrapped, but also to devise strategies that resist this entrapment” (Ryan, 1998, p. 272).

First, since Foucault “recognizes multiple forms of oppression” (Ryan, 1998, p. 273), including those people who traditionally experience it in Ontario such as those who (a) come from a country other than Canada, (b) identify neither English nor French as their primary language(s), (c) are not heterosexual, (d) are visible minorities, and/or (e) are in some way disabled, Foucault gives us hope that things can change. Second, since “Foucault’s view of domination allows for the possibility of political intervention at the local level” (Ryan, 1998, p. 273), he “provides this space in the way he conceptualizes power and the place he provides for the subject in the process” (Ryan, 1998, p. 273). Third, since “Foucault power does not reside exclusively at the top” (Ryan, 1998, p. 273), [or with legislation, policies or even with the school administrator], but also in important ways, come[s] from below” (Ryan, 1998, p. 273), or from/through the students, parents/guardians and teachers in schools, Foucault offers the hope that anyone including those people who work at the ground level can “take action” (Ryan, 1998, p. 273). “The reason that power also originates at the [ground level] is because it works not just
on the subject from above, but also through the subject” (Ryan, 1998, p. 273). As the vehicles of power these people on the ground are also responsible for producing forms of domination. This understood, disrupting oppression such as the forms of oppression experienced by traditionally marginalized groups, like minoritized teachers, can be undertaken, in theory, by any member of the school community. Yet, as Ryan (1998) puts it, “if they wish to have a lasting impact they will have to join with other like-minded individuals and work together to struggle against …forms of oppression both at the school level and beyond” (p. 274).

**Resistance to Combat Oppression**

Foster (1986) posits that critical theory might be used to discuss concepts that do not presume to give a positive and unilateral definition of history and society and holds them up for inspection. He maintains that “critical theory, by definition, critiques and examines; it holds up the systems we believe in and are somewhat attached to and says consider this more fully” (Foster, 1986, p. 72). He also suggests that, “administration, [of, for example, TPA] is associated with running an organization efficiently and effectively, without regard to ultimate ends or consequences” (p. 72). In addition, he would suggest that administrators carry out policy directives, such as the teacher performance appraisal system and establish a sound organizational structure, a structure that in terms of critical theory may be deficient (Foster, 1986). Foster (1986) inspired me to inspect the TPA and to think about some potential consequences an uncritically administered TPA might have on teachers.

As stated in Chapter One, TPA granted administrators sole responsibility for determining a teacher’s performance appraisal rating. Using social oppression theory as the framework and a critical approach as the theory which underpin my work, my first step was to examine my own location in society. Identifying the many privileges I have in this society, my thesis provided an
opportunity to increase my knowledge of how TPA was perceived and experienced by some elementary teachers in Ontario. Given the questions I raise about TPA in Chapter One, and since Ontario’s population is becoming increasingly diverse and the likelihood the greater numbers of minorities will enter the teaching profession, I wonder if the overwhelmingly number of white, able-bodied, middle-class, heterosexual, males or females have the awareness about the importance a teacher’s “race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, same-sex partnership status, family status or disability” (Government of Ontario, Part 1, p. 5) has on their work. I wondered whether administrators could allow prejudices, biases, stereotypes and bigoted views as manifestations of the forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, homophobia and/or ableism that exist in society at large to impact the teachers they appraised. If so, I wondered how this might have affected a teacher’s performance rating and how this would impact upon teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA? These questions inspired me to “give people the opportunity to share their [sometimes painful] experiences with others” (Ryan, 1998, p. 274) through my study.

As a student of critical theory, I used the Greek definition of “theoria” concerned with differentiating between appearance and reality. I was concerned that legislation and educational policies and standards existed that should have prevented discrimination from occurring, yet, in reality there appeared to be the potential for administrators, with their positional power over teachers to oppress teachers through subtle or blatant prejudices and biases as forms of racism, sexism, homophobia and/or ableism to affect their appraisal of teachers. Critical theory inspired me to investigate the potential damaging or devastating effects this could have had on some teachers. Fortunately, “for Foucault, power is not an attribute of individuals, is not something which is possessed” (Cousins & Husssain, 1984, p. 231). With this in mind, in terms of
resistance as a way of combatting the forms of oppression, my study sought to investigate minoritized teachers perceptions of and experiences with TPA when compared to their mainstream counterparts. By presenting these participants’ perspectives, I hope to help people to understand better some of the important things that happen to people in their and others’ lives. “Crucial with respect to understanding is the opportunity to search out forms of domination and the ways in which they work through individuals” (Ryan, 1998, p. 275). This is what my thesis intends to do. Second, as discussed in Chapter Five, it intends to provide them with a framework about how to resist situations that penalize certain groups (Ryan, 1998). My goal is to proffer a way of thinking about employing strategies that “show people the way to ‘short circuit’ the mechanisms through which they subordinate both themselves and others in the process of being themselves” (Ryan, 1998, p. 275). “These activities should (1) reveal potential strategies, (2) act as examples, or (3) provide opportunities for members to become involved in political action” (Ryan, 1998, p. 275), intended to act as valuable learning experiences for everyone.

In addition to this, I also explored other literature. In this discussion, In searching for any study of minoritized teachers’ experiences with performance appraisal, although not concerned with minoritized teachers, Lawton et al. (1989) focused on the appraisal practices for certified educational personnel in 30 out of the then 187 school boards in Ontario. Their study sought “to determine the degree to which appraisal systems in Ontario were congruent with the researchers’ conceptual model of the ideal performance appraisal system” (Lawton et al., 1989, pp. 12-13). The researchers intended to identify some understandings from the complicated human interactions that occur between the teachers and administrators involved in each of the 30 performance appraisal systems. As mentioned in Chapter One, from their study Lawton et al. (1989) concluded “one of the major reasons for the difficulties associated with personnel
evaluation is the intensity of the human interaction and the possibility of an adverse judgment about an individual’s performance, a judgment that may damage a career or cause debilitating personal distress” (p. 13). Given these possible implications and my concern about examining how elementary teachers perceived and experienced the province-wide mandated TPA system, I developed the three research questions provided in Chapter One based on my interest in teacher performance appraisal systems, minoritized teachers and from my review of the literature in seven areas as presented in Figure 1, Literature Reviewed (see p. 24).

Looking at Figure 1 from the broadest perspective, I show that I brought seven main bodies of literature together and used them to contextualize my research questions. The dotted lines from each of the four main dimensions of organizational justice to the other three bodies of literature: teacher evaluation, discrimination against minoritized people and mistreatment of teachers illustrate that I am interested in exploring the relationships among them. The literature focused on each of the four dimensions of organizational justice provides the conceptual framework for my study. In other words, outcome fairness, procedural fairness, informational fairness, and interpersonal fairness are the lenses through which I looked to investigate elementary teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA. Returning to Figure 1 (see p. 24) as the graphic I used to structure the way I address my review of the salient literature, beginning at the far left of the figure, I draw readers’ attention to the box labeled ‘Organizational Justice’. “The study of justice or fairness has been a topic of philosophical interest that extends back at least as far as Plato and Socrates” (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 425). I briefly describe this area of study in the following section.
Organizational Justice

The study of organizational justice began in 1987 focusing on the fairness of workplace outcomes or processes (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997) as an organizational science. From the beginning, justice was considered to be socially constructed. In other words, an act is defined as just if most individuals perceive it to be on the basis of empirical research (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Greenberg (1990) reports that early social justice theories on organizations were derived to test principles of justice in terms of social interactions not, organizations in particular. These theories were used to investigate various forms of organizational behaviour “to describe and explain the role of fairness in the workplace” (Greenberg, 1987, 1990). The research conducted in organizational justice includes field and survey studies and laboratory research, and “has been among the most frequently researched topics in industrial-organizational psychology, human resource management, and organizational behavior” (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 425) over the last two decades. During this time period the study of organizational justice has evolved. It began with a preoccupation with distributive justice (outcome fairness) and procedural justice (procedural fairness) before adding interactional, or informational justice (fairness) and interpersonal justice (fairness) as its third and fourth dimensions in 1986 (Colquitt et al., 2001). I used all four of these dimensions of fairness in my study.

Returning to Figure 1 (see p. 24), moving downward from the broad field of organizational justice, in the following paragraphs I describe briefly each of the four dimensions of organizational justice in turn. While I used the relevant literature I reviewed from organizational justice to situate all three research questions I also drew on one source of literature to develop each of the three research questions. I drew on the relevant literature on teacher evaluation to inform the development of my first research question, the literature on
discrimination against minoritized people for my second research question and the literature on mistreatment of teachers to formulate the third research question. These three bodies of literature correspond to the three boxes in the right hand column of Figure 1.

**Outcome Fairness**

Outcome fairness emerged from Adams’ (1965) work. He was one of the first authors who took up the issue of fairness in the workplace. He conceptualized fairness from employees’ perspectives. In Adam’s (1965) view, employees determine whether or not they have been treated fairly at work by comparing their own payoff ratio of outcomes (such as performance appraisals, pay or status) to inputs (such as effort or time) to that of their coworkers. This is known as distributive justice or outcome fairness and it pertains to employees’ perceptions about the fairness of managerial decisions relative to the distribution of outcomes such as performance appraisal, pay, or promotion (Folger & Konovosky, 1989).

**Procedural Fairness**

The concept of procedural fairness focuses on the fairness of the manner in which the decision-making process is conducted (Folger & Konovosky, 1989). In other words, the focus shifts from what was decided to how the decision was made (Cropanzano & Folger, 1991).

**Interactional Fairness**

When it is referred to in the literature, interactional fairness is identified as the third type of justice. Instead of presenting another box labeled interactional fairness, I chose to simplify Figure 1 by listing the two types of fairness it includes. Interactional fairness consists of two specific types of justice, informational fairness and interpersonal fairness (Greenberg, 1990,
1993). I describe briefly each of the two types of interactional justice under the following two sub-headings.

**Informational Fairness**

Informational fairness focuses on the perceived fairness of the information used to explain an outcome or procedures used. It is concerned with the explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 426). It “focuses on the thoroughness or adequacy of the information provided” (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 220).

**Interpersonal Fairness**

Interpersonal fairness concerns the perceived fairness of the interpersonal treatment people receive when procedures are implemented (Bies & Moag, 1986). It refers to employees’ reactions, attitudes and behaviours toward their supervisors (Hubbell & Chory-Assad, 2005). In other words, it is concerned with the quality of interpersonal treatment teachers receive, or, in other words, the communication practices used and the degree to which employees are treated with honesty, politeness, dignity and respect (Bies & Moag, 1986; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). As the second column of Figure 1 shows, I draw on three other bodies of literature. I address each of these under the following sub-headings.

**Teacher Evaluation**

Given my study’s focus on Ontario’s 2002 version of TPA, I reviewed conceptual and empirical studies (Johnson, 1990; Kauchak, Peterson, & Drisoll, 1985; Peterson, 2000; Stodolsky, 1984; Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, & Bernstein, 1984) which revealed findings that proved consistent with my own in respect of issues of outcome, procedural,
informational, and interpersonal fairness. I drew on this literature to develop my first research question. I describe this more extensively later when I address my first research question.

**Discrimination Against Minoritized People**

Different minoritized groups represent a very small proportion of Ontario’s teaching population (personal communication, Manager of Fees and Membership Services, ETFO, April 2006). In the absence of data available from the Canadian Teachers’ Federation and the American Teachers’ Federation, it is not surprising that a literature search on any topic involving minoritized teachers reveals very few studies concerning their perceptions of or experiences with performance appraisal. When I searched minoritized teachers’ experiences with performance appraisal, I found only Page’s (2003) aforementioned work which calls researchers to action. This gap in the literature points to the need for a study such as mine. To locate as much background information as possible on this issue, I turned to some studies (Bryne, 1971; Huo & Tyler, 2001; Igbaria & Shayo, 1997; Ilgen & Youtz, 1996; Kraiger & Ford, 1985; Riordan, 2000; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989; Vecchio & Bull, 2001; Wesolowski & Mossholder, 1997; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998; Xin, 1997) which I selected because they involved minoritized people’s experiences with performance evaluations related to outcome fairness, procedural fairness, informational fairness and interpersonal fairness, not in teaching, but in other jobs. I describe this more fully later when I address my second research question.

**Mistreatment of Teachers**

The final body of literature identified in Figure 1 upon which I drew concerned the field of mistreatment of teachers. To formulate my third research question, I selected studies (Blase & Blase, 2003; Keashly, 1988; Tepper, 2000; Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002) from this literature
that focused on outcome, procedural, informational and interpersonal justice. I describe this more extensively later when I address my third research question.

In this next section, I elaborate on the references referred to briefly above to show how my three research questions can be situated within the seven bodies of literature I used.

**What Were the Salient Characteristics of Teachers’ Perceptions of Fairness Related to TPA?**

With respect to this first research question, I found no literature focused on teacher performance appraisal or teacher evaluation viewed from the perspective of organizational justice. Consequently, I had to draw on the empirical literature I reviewed on organizational justice dealing with all of its four dimensions: outcome, procedural, informational and interpersonal fairness. In addition, I referred to empirical and conceptual literature from the field of teacher evaluation (Johnson, 1990; Kauchak, Peterson, & Drisoll, 1985; Peterson, 2000; Stodolsky, 1984; Wise et al., 1984). First, I present the review of the literature related to organizational justice under the four dimensions of fairness. Second, I use these four dimensions of fairness to present my review of the relevant literature pertaining to teacher evaluation.

**Organizational Justice**

**Outcome fairness.**

A perception of the fairness of organizational outcomes received in a given transaction is referred to in the literature as distributive justice or outcome fairness (Byrne & Cropanzano, 2001; Homans, 1961). When organizational theorists deal with the content of fairness, or the decision reached, they refer to it as distributive justice or outcome fairness (Adams, 1965; Deutsch, 1975; Homans, 1961; Levanthal, 1976). For my study, viewed through the lens of outcome fairness, I see performance appraisals operating as outcomes in and of themselves.
(Adams, 1965; Greenberg, 1984, 1986). Teachers’ reactions to them determine whether or not they perceive them as fair. As outcomes, performance evaluations may be perceived as rewards or punishments and may communicate the self-worth, value, and career potential of an employee (Greenberg, 1986). All of the literature (Abrahamson, Seligman, & Teadsdale, 1978; Adams, 1965; Greenberg, 1986; Landy, Barnes-Farrell, & Cleveland, 1980; Levanthal, 1980; Levanthal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980; Merton & Rossi, 1957; Thibaut & Walker, 1975,1978; Tyler, 1987; Tyler, Razinski, & McGraw, 1985) I reviewed, which I describe below, suggest that outcomes are not inherently fair or unfair; they are judged to be fair or unfair based on people’s perceptions about them.

Adams’s (1965) equity theory, based on social exchange theory, is recognized as the first framework developed to evaluate fairness (Colquitt et al., 2001). Adam’s (1965) work is considered the cornerstone of any discussion related to outcome fairness. Succinctly put, equity theory suggests that when outcomes do not meet the standard of proportionality, individuals experience inequity distress. In other words, when outcomes (output) are not proportionate to an individual’s perception of contribution (input), the equity rule is violated. Although the comparison of the input – output ratio gives Adam’s (1965) equity theory an “objective” component. Adams (1965) is clear that this process is completely subjective (Colquitt et al., 2001). When the outcome is unfavorable and the individual feels the equity rule has been violated, one of the psychological tendencies is for the individual to experience frustration, anger, sadness or depression (Abrahamson et al., 1978). According to these authors, another tendency is for these individuals to blame themselves for their plight. It is not the unfavorable outcomes by themselves that induce these psychological consequences, but it is the tendency of these individuals to attribute unfavorable outcomes to internal causes that predisposes them
toward frustration, anger, sadness or depression (Abrahamson et al., 1978), or what Igbaria and Shayo (1997) call low internal attribution.

Levanthal (1980) and Levanthal, Karuza, and Fry (1980) identified three dominant rules: the contributions rule (similar to the equity rule), the needs rule (outcomes should meet the needs of the recipient) and the equality rule (outcomes should be seen to be accessible to all individuals equally). They determined that any type of decision which involves an outcome will be seen as more fair to the extent that it is based on reliable information.

The importance of reliable sources of data was also confirmed in Tyler’s study (1987) for which he interviewed a random sample of 652 respondents from Chicago about their encounters with the police and courts. He found fair judgments were identified as the strongest determinants for overall satisfaction with the outcome and for the respondents’ general feelings toward the encounter. I made use of this finding in my study when I questioned teachers about their perceptions of fairness about the reliable sources of information as a key determinant of their reactions to the outcome they received in TPA.

The literature on relative deprivation, which deals with the experience of being deprived of something to which one thinks s/he is entitled, based on the work of Merton and Rossi (1957), suggests that individuals’ reactions to their experiences cannot be predicted by knowledge of the absolute quality of those experiences, but rather by comparison of others’ experiences. In other words, in assessing outcome fairness, individuals evaluate and compare the outcome (e.g., performance evaluation) they received to a standard or rule (e.g., equity) and/or to the outcome received by a referent, such as one's co-workers or past experience (Adams, 1965; Austin, 1977; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). These researchers’ ideas helped me to focus my study on
trying to understand the relationship between teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA and the rule or referent which they use to react to the outcome.

This idea is corroborated by Tyler, Razinski, and McGraw (1985) who examined the influence of self-interest and fairness judgments on policy evaluations with a random sample of 300 Chicago residents. They conducted interviews with these residents over the telephone about their support or opposition to the benefits they received and with the levels of taxes they were required to pay during the Reagan administration in the United States. Although the results of this study focuses on individuals’ views of government benefits received, taxes paid, and economic and social policies enacted, the most relevant aspect of this finding related to my study is that people differentiate between receiving favorable outcomes and receiving fair outcomes.

Greenberg’s (1986) research on performance appraisals with middle managers recognizes the equity, need and equality rules to judge fairness of outcomes. Using a Q-Sort procedure, which involved having 217 middle managers employed in three different industrial groups; cable-TV companies located throughout the United States (n=95), wholesale pharmaceutical distributing companies located primarily in the Midwest (n=80), and credit unions in the state of Ohio (n=42) arrange three by five index cards under four themes. Greenberg (1986) found that rater familiarity with ratees’ work was one of the dominant concerns related to issues of outcome fairness. Furthermore, Thibaut and Walker’s (1975) seminal work on disputants’ satisfaction with the legal system directed attention toward perceptions of the quality of the decision, in other words, the ability of a procedure to produce accuracy and outcome fairness as the key attributes of the decision. Landy et al. (1980) administered a questionnaire to employees of a large manufacturing firm. They determined, among other findings, that the supervisor’s knowledge of subordinates’ level of performance and their job duties were significantly related to employees’
perceptions of fairness about the accuracy of their performance appraisals. Greenberg’s (1986) finding related to a rater’s familiarity with an employee’s work, Thibaut and Walker’s (1975) emphasis on accuracy of a rater’s decision and Landy et al.’s (1980) finding related to an employee’s perception of a rater’s knowledge of an employee’s work were key aspects which informed the development of my study.

**Informational fairness.**

As part of the interactional justice dimension of organizational justice, informational fairness concerns the explanations provided (Bies, 1987) to justify a decision made about performance appraisals. As a reminder to my readers, as defined in Chapter One, informational fairness concerns reactions to “the ways in which the decision-making procedures are implemented” (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 211) and “focuses on the explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion” (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 427).

Levanthal et al. (1980) encapsulate the main message suggested by the studies I review below when they suggest that decisions will be seen as fair to the extent that they are based on valid information. The following studies informed the questions I raised with teachers about the validity of the information provided to them as they experienced TPA.

Kanfer, Sawyer, Earley, and Lind (1987) studied 38 male and 49 female undergraduate psychology students working under a task evaluation procedure which either did or did not allow them to express their opinions to the person evaluating them. The researchers found that procedures allowing participants to express their opinions about their performance enhanced participants’ judgments of fairness.
Lissak’s (1983) two field studies using a randomized experimental design examined the fairness judgments of enlisted personnel in the Canadian armed forces\(^1\). Lissak (1983) found that respondents judged performance evaluations as more just when they were evaluated under a procedure that allowed them the opportunity to present information about their performance than when respondents were not given this opportunity. Several other studies (Brett, 1986; Kanfer et al., 1987; Thibaut & Walker, 1978) corroborated this finding. In addition, Greenberg’s (1986) study of middle managers’ experiences with fair and unfair performance evaluation highlighted the importance of soliciting input prior to evaluation and using this input when the two concerned parties communicated about the outcome of the evaluation. Greenberg’s (1988) later research suggested that offering explanations of administrative actions greatly improved workers’ reactions to the impact of negative actions. He found that explanations promoted the belief that the decision makers’ actions were fair and the result of administrators’ considered judgment. This finding is echoed in Reuter’s (1977) survey of a workers’ suggestion system which found that if employees felt their suggestions had been adequately considered by management they were more likely to perceive fairness (as cited in Folger & Bies, 1989).

I identified three studies (Barrett-Howard & Tyler, 1986; Greenberg, 1986; Sheppard & Lewicki, 1987) which found that consistent application of standards across people was a key determinant in perceptions of fairness in performance evaluations. In the literature review for their study, Longenecker, Sims, and Gioia (1987) suggest that academics "in particular have expended substantial energy trying to design the perfect instrument that would yield an accurate appraisal, concluding that that effort now appears to be a hopeless, even impossible task” (p. 183), because “appraisals take place in an organizational environment that is anything but

\(^1\) The exact number of personnel involved in this study is not available despite several efforts to make contact with the author.
completely rational, straightforward or dispassionate” (p. 184). When Longenecker et al. (1987) interviewed 60 executives about their views on performance appraisal processes they concluded that executives were more concerned about the consequences of the ratings (for themselves, the ratees and workgroups) than whether their ratings accurately reflected an employee’s performance. All of this literature helped me to focus on asking teachers about their perceptions of and experiences with the pre-observation meeting, the post-observation meeting, the summative report, the review of the Annual Learning Plan, about the detail, comprehensiveness and information used during the debriefing session, about the specificity and constructiveness of feedback offered and if they felt they had the opportunity to engage in dialogue with the administrator assessing them.

**Procedural fairness.**

Before Thibaut and Walker (1975) introduced the concept of procedural justice into the study of organizational justice, the study of justice was primarily concerned with outcome fairness. Thibaut and Walker’s (1975) book summarizing disputants’ reactions to legal procedures introduced the study of process to this literature (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 426) as it relates “to process and decision control” (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Their research focused on third-party dispute resolution procedures such as mediation and arbitration as having both process and decision stages (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). They referred to the amount of influence disputants had in each stage as evidence of process control, or where people were allowed to provide evidence to a decision maker and to ‘decision control’ or, in other words, where people were allowed to have some say in the rendering of the decision (Colquitt et al., 2001). Thibaut and Walker’s (1975) research suggests that disputants were willing to give up control in the decision stage as long as they had control in the process stage. In their words, “disputants viewed
the procedure as fair if they perceived that they had process control (i.e. control over the presentation of their arguments and sufficient time to present their case)” (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 426). According to Folger and Cropanzano (1998), Thibaut and Walker (1975) virtually equated process control with procedural fairness. For example, other researchers often refer to Thibaut and Walker’s (1975) work as “the process control effect”, “the fair process effect” or “voice effect” (Folger, 1997; Lind & Tyler, 1988). In summary, people are found to react more favorably to procedures that allow them to freely communicate their views and arguments. My study’s concern with determining the amount and type of dialogue between teachers and the administrators who appraised them was inspired by this concept proffered by Thibaut and Walker (1975).

Motivated by and using Thibaut and Walker (1975), several theorists turned their attention to examine procedural justice, recognizing that the procedures used to determine a particular outcome can be more important than an outcome itself (Folger & Greenberg, 1985; Folger & Martin, 1986; Martin & Bennett, 1996; Martin & Nagao, 1989). Similarly, although individuals’ reactions may differ depending on the extent to which they focus on outcomes or procedures, both procedural and outcome fairness contribute to individuals’ perceptions of organizational justice (Schminke, Ambrose, & Noel, 1997). In his historical review of empirical studies, Greenberg (1990) established an empirical distinction between distributive and procedural justice: perceptions of fairness arise from evaluations of the outcomes received (outcome fairness) and the procedures used to determine those outcomes (procedural fairness). For example, Tyler’s telephone interview study (1984) of defendants’ reactions to judges’ decisions in traffic and misdemeanor court showed that citizens evaluated fairness in terms of their perceptions about the procedures used regardless of whether they won or lost. My study
incorporated this important distinction when I asked teachers to identify the rating they received and whether they agreed with it. This focus was also inspired by several studies about the practice of performance appraisals demonstrating that when employees are allowed to provide evidence to the decision maker and/or when people are allowed to have some say about the rendering of the decision or when they have opportunities to provide input into the decision, they perceive fairness (Dipboye & de Pontbraind, 1981; Earley & Lind, 1987; Landy, Barnes, & Murphy, 1978; Landy, et al., 1980; Lissak, 1983).

However, although I believed the notion of ‘fair process control’ was important, I was fortunate to read Levanthal’s (1980) work that is concerned with issues of consistency in determining perceptions of procedural fairness. Levanthal (1980) “is credited for extending the notion of procedural fairness into non-legal contexts and organizational settings” (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 426) and beyond the concept of fair process control, placing a greater focus on the issue of consistency (Levanthal, 1980; Levanthal et al., 1980). In general, procedural fairness is an individual's perception of the fairness of the process components of the social system that regulates the distribution of resources. Specifically, in terms of evaluating procedural fairness, I relied on Levanthal’s (1980) six criteria that a procedure should meet if it is to be perceived as fair. Procedures should:

1. be applied consistently across people and across time;
2. be free from bias;
3. ensure that accurate information is collected and used in making decisions;
4. have some mechanism to correct flawed or inaccurate decisions;
5. conform to personal or prevailing standards of ethics or morality; and;
6. ensure that the opinions of various groups affected by the decision have been taken into account. (as summarized in Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 426)
In other words, Levanthal (1980) proposed that procedures should be judged based on their consistency of application, prevailing ethical standards, the degree of their bias, accuracy, correctability, and the extent to which they represent all people concerned (Levanthal, 1980; Levanthal et al., 1980). Levanthal’s (1980) six criteria provide an essential framework which allowed me to analyze the quantitative data.

I found security in knowing that other researchers have focused on consistency, ethicality, accuracy of information as potential factors to determine whether procedures were seen as fair. For example, using the aforementioned six criteria of procedural fairness, Fry and Levanthal (1979) and Fry and Cheney (1981) carried out well known role-play investigations in a number of social situations with college students; they found that consistency was the most serious threat to these students’ perceptions of procedural fairness. In addition, based on questionnaire findings from 168 West German undergraduate psychology students, Barrett-Howard and Lamm (1986) revealed that consistency across persons and ethicality were deemed more important than all the other rules. Greenberg (1986) identified the consistent application of standards as a key concern related to issues of procedural fairness by interviewing middle managers about their experiences with unfair or fair appraisals. This was one reason why in both the questionnaire and qualitative interviews I asked teachers about their views with respect to consistency across people and time.

**Interpersonal fairness.**

Over the last 20 years, researchers (Bies & Moag, 1986; Brockner & Siegel, 1996; Cropanzano et al., 2002; Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000) have engaged in research which found that the perception of fairness of interpersonal treatment is related to reactions, attitudes, and behaviours toward those responsible for making decisions. Bies and Moag (1986)
suggest that people are influenced by a decision maker’s conduct during the enactment of any procedure. Bies and Moag’s survey (1986) of MBA graduates’ reactions to corporate recruiting programs led them to identify two critical aspects concerning interpersonal fairness. First, people focus on interpersonal treatment received from a decision maker. Second, people focus on whether the formal procedure was enacted properly (Bies & Moag, 1986). Based on these findings, I incorporated questions designed to elicit views on these matters as foci in my study.

Five research studies suggest that people are aware of both procedural and interpersonal elements of fairness (Bies & Tripp, 1996; Clemmer, 1993; Messick, Bloom, Boldizar, & Samuelson, 1985; Mikula, Petri, & Tanzer, 1990; Mikkula, 1996). These researchers provide compelling evidence that interpersonal fairness matters to people and that people are concerned about the interpersonal treatment they receive from others. More importantly, I reviewed six studies (Barling & Phillips, 1993; Blodgette, Hill, & Tax, 1997; Malatesta & Bryne, 1997; Masterson et al., 2000; Moorman, 1991; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) which found interpersonal fairness perceptions are associated with formal evaluations done by supervisors. Other empirical research reveals that when individuals perceive they have been communicated with in a sensitive and respectful manner and are treated with politeness and dignity by those carrying out organizational procedures (Bies & Moag, 1986; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001), they are more likely to judge situations as fair. I sought to investigate how the teachers in my study felt about the treatment they received.

In addition to the research just cited, Tyler (1988) found citizens dealing with policy and courts found that honesty and ethical appropriateness (politeness and respect for their rights) were the second and third most important independent factors people used in assessing the fairness of their treatment. This finding led me to include questions to elicit teachers’ views and
helped me to determine the importance of listening to what teachers in my study had to say about their experiences with administrators’ honesty and the ethics they employed to conduct the appraisals of these teachers. Also, Barrett-Howard and Tyler’s (1986) study of four basic dimensions of social relationships in business, government and legal organizations found that the ethicality rule was, in their work, the second most important dimension. Sheppard and Lewicki (1987) found that bias suppression was one of the most frequently cited characteristics of fairness.

In addition, Glass and Singer (1972) reported the results of laboratory studies in which people felt unfairly treated when they were unduly embarrassed or humiliated by a bureaucratic administrator who acted in an arrogant manner. Replicating Glass and Singer’s (1972) work related to performance appraisals, Lane (1988) identified procedural pain (psychological or physiological states such as embarrassment, humiliation and stress) as a criterion of procedural fairness. Lane (1988) found that respondents can become upset, frustrated and angry when dealing with an administrator who is unresponsive to their needs or who acts in an arrogant manner. Bies and Tripp (1996) revealed that intense and personal pain associated with injustice does profound harm to one’s psyche and identity. Finally, theoretical (Lind & Tyler, 1988) and empirical research (Brockner, Siegel, Daly, Tyler, & Martin, 1997) suggest trust and outcome favorably interact. When outcomes are unfavorable people draw on their impressions about the trustworthiness of the other party. I used the literature on organizational justice to contextualize my three research questions. To develop my first research question I also used the literature on teacher evaluation which I review in the following section.
Teacher Evaluation

The literature on teacher evaluation was instrumental in helping me to develop my first research question. Using the four dimensions of fairness as the organizers, I present my review of this literature in the next sections.

Outcome fairness.

Although the literature on teacher evaluation does not employ the terminology used in organizational justice, from my review of a number of studies, I selected five which related to issues of outcome fairness. Peterson’s (2000) extensive literature review of 70 years of teacher evaluation reveals that “the main dissatisfaction of teachers with administrators as evaluators was what the teachers saw as a basic lack of competence on the part of administrators to evaluate: lack of self-confidence, experience, subject matter, knowledge, and perspectives on what it is really like to be in the classroom” (p. 25). This finding is corroborated by Wise et al. (1984) who conducted studies for the National Institute of Education. These studies became known as the RAND Studies, which involved administering extensive surveys to teachers in 32 districts and conducting four follow-up case studies in four school boards in the following four geographically different cities across the United States: Salt Lake City, Utah; Lake Washington, Washington; Greenwich, Connecticut, and Toledo, Ohio. Among other findings, the researchers found that “almost all respondents…felt that principals lacked sufficient resolve and competence to evaluate correctly” (p. 22). Similarly, Kauchak et al. (1985) surveyed a total of 228 elementary and secondary teachers in Utah and Florida. The researchers “found evaluations based on principal visits to be perfunctory with little or no effect on actual teaching practice” (as cited in Peterson, 2000, p. 24). Significantly, teachers perceived that the principal was not knowledgeable (Peterson, 2000). Teachers were critical that principals had not taught at their
level (elementary) or in the subject area (secondary). The questions about administrators’
knowledge of teachers’ work and these administrators’ competency to appraise teachers’ work
inspired my interest in pursuing these lines of inquiry in my study.

Stodolsky (1984) observed 19 elementary teachers who taught both math and social
studies in Chicago. The classroom observations were obtained by pairs of trained observers. One
of the observers recorded information about the activity structure of the classroom and the
second observer used a strict-time sampling rotation method to record what a subset of eight
students were doing in each classroom. The researcher demonstrated that teacher evaluation
based on observations by classroom visit depends on what the teacher is doing at the time of the
visit. Stodolsky (1984) concluded that because most administrators have a very limited time to
evaluate each teacher, the small number of observation results is unreliable data for evaluation.
Given her findings and the literature she reviewed, Stodolsky (1984) states, “the basic validity
and fairness of many current teacher evaluation practices must be questioned” (p. 17). Even
though TPA was developed almost 20 years after Stodolsky’s (1984) finding, the similarity
between how TPA and the teacher evaluation policy system she used in her study led me to
consider investigating teachers’ perceptions of fairness with respect to TPA and their experiences
with TPA.

Finally, Johnson’s (1990) qualitative study of 115 teachers found that “administrators are
rarely prepared to offer…useful advice…virtually never…providing an opportunity for learning”
(p. 266). I used Johnson’s (1990) finding to inform my study’s concern with questioning teachers
about the professional usefulness of the feedback provided to them during their experiences with
TPA.
**Informational fairness.**

From the literature on teacher evaluation as it relates to the informational fairness dimension of organizational justice, based on the frequency with which they are cited, I present a brief review of five studies which guided key aspects of my study. First, Wise et al. (1984) concluded that “the … system [of teacher evaluation] depends too much on the judgment or predispositions of the principal and leads to different ratings for similar teacher practices in different schools” (p. 22). Second, Medley and Crocker (1987) obtained ratings of 46 elementary principals based on the input of 322 teachers in the southeastern United States. In these researchers’ words, “the most important finding … is the low accuracy of the average principal’s judgments of the performance of the teachers he or she supervises” (p. 245). Third, Wolf (1973) found that 293 classroom teachers suggested that “appraisal techniques fall short of collecting information that accurately characterizes their [teachers’] performance” (p. 23). Fourth, Barr and Burton (1926) determined that “ratings differ with individuals … and over time and are therefore manifestly unfair. Ratings … make unfair discrimination very easy … and force the teacher to live up the scheme and not to teach to good pedagogical principles, [forcing] the teacher to play up to the rater and not to children’s interests” (p. 457). Finally, Peterson’s (2000) comprehensive review of the literature on the topic of teacher evaluation revealed that, “no single data source is sufficiently reliable, works for all practitioners, addresses all that a teacher does, or is agreed to by all educators” (p. 66).

All five of the works just discussed highlight the importance of the information used to determine teachers’ ratings. While questioning teachers about the perceived accuracy of the information used in their TPA, we also need to explore their perceptions about the consistency across time and across people of their evaluations.
Procedural fairness.

The themes I identified in the literature on procedural fairness are echoed in five studies in the literature on teacher evaluation. First, Stiggins and Duke’s (1988) three-year study of teacher evaluation practices with a total of 33 teachers in four school districts, two in Oregon and two in Washington, concluded that teachers need to be involved in all phases of the evaluation system. In addition, analysis of 470 responses to a questionnaire\(^2\) found that any evaluation system that does not reflect the interests, concerns, aspirations and needs of teachers is doomed to failure (Peterson, 2000). Second, Peterson and Chenoweth’s (1992) conceptual discussion criticizes teacher evaluation practices because teachers have little control and involvement in their own evaluation (p. 117). Third, Scriven’s (1981) well known theoretical work on teacher performance evaluation suggested that “the number of visits is too small to be representative” (p. 281), undermining the potential for performance appraisals to be viewed as consistent across either time or people. Next, Johnson’s (1990) survey of 115 teachers from New York found that teachers felt that orderly performance of the procedure of evaluation was more important than the content of it. Finally, Cook and Richards (1972) analyzed the performance ratings of 236 teachers and found that “teacher rating scales generate data that were more a reflection of the rater’s point of view than of a teacher’s actual classroom behavior” (p. 11). The latter study suggests the potential that the consistency rule can be violated and introduces the probability that raters’ bias (es) will enter into the performance appraisal process.

In the light of these findings (Cooks & Richards, 1972; Johnson, 1990; Peterson & Chenworth, 1992; Scriven, 1981; Stiggins & Duke, 1988), questions arise about teachers’ perceptions of fairness with respect to the notification given, the pre-observation meeting, the

\(^2\) As of October 12, 2007, despite numerous attempts to contact the author via email, it was not possible to ascertain any further details about the participants who completed these questionnaires (i.e. were the respondents elementary and/or secondary teachers).
classroom observation session, the post-observation meeting, whether they felt any singular weakness or flaw influenced their rating, and how they felt about the extent to which evaluators were consistent across time and people. The studies reviewed in this section led me to question teachers about their perceptions of and experiences related to the consistency with which the TPA was administered. Cooks and Richards (1972), Johnson (1990), Peterson and Chenworth (1992), Scriven (1981) and Stiggins and Duke (1988) also pointed out that administrators’ biases can influence teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA in terms of procedural fairness.

**Interpersonal fairness.**

I reviewed seven pieces of research on teacher evaluation related to interpersonal fairness. First, Barr and Burton (1926) found that “ratings differ with individuals … and over time and are therefore manifestly unfair. Ratings … make unfair discrimination very easy … and force the teacher to live up the scheme and not to teach to good pedagogical principles; [forcing] the teacher to play up to the rater’s and not to children’s interests” (p. 457). Initially, I had not included Barr and Burton (1926) when I was developing my study. However, when I began to review the minoritized teachers’ experiences with TPA, I found myself understanding the potential discriminatory practices and teachers’ need to play to raters’ and not to students’ interests. In addition, Wolf (1973) concluded that teachers perceive ratings as depending more on the idiosyncrasies of the administrator rather than on their own behaviour in the classroom. Next, in Scriven’s (1981) conceptual discussion of the distinction between ‘formative’ and ‘summative’ evaluation, two of this theorist’s seven findings were useful as I developed my instrument to answer this research question. First, he suggests that administrators almost always bring personal prejudices with them, positive or negative, concerning their interpersonal relations and responsibilities with each teacher they observed. Second, he found that administrators bring
their own style preferences to evaluating teachers. In addition, findings from four other studies (Cousins, 1995; Haughey & Howard, 1996; Singh & Shifflette, 1996; Stiggins & Duke, 1988) revealed that an administrator’s ability to inspire trust was important for teachers’ perceptions about the effectiveness of their appraisals. In summary, the research (Barr & Burton, 1926; Cousins, 1995; Haughey & Howard, 1996; Scriven, 1981; Singh & Shifflette, 1996; Stiggins & Duke, 1988; Wolf, 1973) I reviewed helped me to investigate two issues. First, looking beyond issues of simple dislike, I was prepared to consider analyzing my data for the presence of potential bias of the administrators against certain teachers. In addition, I was interested in examining if incidents went beyond bias and related to ethical issues.

**How Did Teachers’ Demographic Characteristics Interact With Their Perceptions of Fairness With TPA?**

As I mentioned in Chapter One, since the teachers in the minoritized categories (those who identify a country of origin other than Canada, use (a) language(s) other than English or French as their primary language(s), (b) are male, (c) are other than heterosexual, (d) identify as visible minorities or (e) are in some way disabled represent such a small percentage of the elementary teaching population in North America, it is not surprising that I could find no studies related to minoritized teachers’ experiences with performance appraisal. In the absence of this literature, I drew from my data and some literature related to minoritized teachers’ experiences with performance evaluation in other jobs to develop my second research question.

I found a large body of literature (Bryne, 1971; Kraiger & Ford, 1985; Riordan, 2000; Vecchio & Bullis, 2001; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998; Xin, 1997) supporting the notion that demographic similarity affects relationships between supervisors and subordinates. In other words, when supervisors and subordinates share similar characteristics of social identity such as
race, gender, etc. there is a greater potential for the relationship to be more positive than when these individuals differ in respect of these characteristics (Riordan, 2000; Williams & O’Reilly, 1998). Bryne’s (1971) social psychological study established a strong association between similarity and interpersonal attraction. He found that demographic similarity, especially in categories important for social identity, facilitates high quality exchange relationships. In other words, he found that visible demographic variables such as age, race, and gender are salient factors during supervisor-subordinate relationships. I found three other studies echoing these findings. First, Kraiger and Ford's (1985) meta-analysis of 88 research results from published studies of rater-ratee race effects between Blacks and Whites in performance ratings found that for both Black and White raters, the size of the rater-ratee race effect was relatively large and positively biased toward subordinates of the rater's race. Next, Xin’s (1997) exploratory longitudinal study conducted over a 10 week period on 150 supervisor-subordinate dyads from participating business students found that when supervisors and subordinates came from different countries of origin there was a negative effect on their relationships (p. 369). Third, Vecchio and Bullis (2001) surveyed 2883 military supervisor-subordinate dyads and found that differences between gender, race and ethnicity were associated with low levels of subordinates’ satisfaction with supervisors and with subordinates’ willingness to continue to work in the U.S. Army. Significantly, they also found that these effects did not fade over time (Vecchio & Bullis, 2001).

Given the small number of minoritized teachers in the teaching profession, it is likely that the minoritized teachers who do exist will be appraised by an administrator who belongs to the mainstream group. I used the findings from Bryne (1971), Kraiger & Ford (1985), Riordan (2000) Williams and O’Reilly (1998), Xin (1997) and Vecchio and Bullis (2001) to develop
questions intended to elicit teachers’ views on the similarities and differences between teachers and administrators’ social characteristics and if this influenced the teachers’ experiences with TPA.

**Outcome Fairness**

I reviewed two studies which relate to minoritized people’s perceptions of outcome fairness. Kraiger and Ford's (1985) meta-analysis of 88 research results cited earlier suggests that there could be systemic biases in job performance ratings which evaluate Blacks more negatively than their actual performance warrants. This finding is corroborated by Igbaria and Shayo (1997) who surveyed employees in a large communications company. The survey data from 69 White and 69 Black employees demonstrated that “Blacks were rated lower on job performance than Whites” (p. 19). These studies, which suggested that demographic differences could account for lower performance ratings, inspired my investigation of how this might have occurred with minoritized teachers regarding their perceptions of and experiences with TPA.

**Informational Fairness**

Igbaria and Shayo’s (1997) aforementioned study also determined that “when some black employees’ performances were rated high, supervisors were more likely to attribute this to factors such as luck, help, job is easy etc. rather than [to these employees’] abilities and effort” (pp. 18-19). These results provide compelling evidence to suggest that the information conveyed to justify a rating is linked to employees’ perceptions of informational fairness. I was interested in exploring this in my study.
**Procedural Fairness**

I identified three studies from my review of the literature on minoritized peoples’ perceptions about procedural fairness. First, Igbaria and Shayo (1997) suggested “because the supervisor’s assessment of a subordinate’s job performance plays such a prominent role in forming opinions about the subordinate’s advancement prospects that any bias in the performance appraisal process inevitably will produce bias in promotion decisions over time” (p. 19). The researchers showed that “if the job performance rating process is biased, then Blacks are effectively penalized twice during the performance appraisal process: once through an assessment of a relatively low level of job performance, and subsequently through low internal attributions that follow from the low level of perceived performance” (p. 19). The suggestion of double jeopardy here inspired me to consider this possibility as I developed my study.

Similarly, Ilgen and Youtz (1986) found that stereotyping, information selection and judgment processes were significant factors affecting the evaluation of minoritized people in organizations. Finally, Wesolowski and Mossholder (1997) who surveyed 124 supervisor-subordinate dyads working at a public utilities company and a computer services company located in the southeastern United States made explicit use of organizational justice literature. These researchers found that when “demographic differences prevent supervisors from exhibiting or being perceived to exhibit [behaviours related to procedural fairness] there is greater potential for subordinates to develop perceptions of unfair treatment” (pp. 353-354). They also found that “mixed race dyads occasioned less positive reactions on [procedural fairness] variables than did same-race dyads” (p. 360), concluding that “when racial dissimilarity is a defining contextual feature, subordinates may have a heightened sensitivity about exchanges with supervisors” (p. 360). The potential for stereotyping, information selection and judgment processes (Ilgen & Youtz, 1986), and the fact that this can stem from demographic differences
(Wesolowski & Mossholder, 1997) caused me to want to investigate this possibility concerning teachers’ perceptions about their experiences with TPA.

Interpersonal Fairness

I drew on three studies dealing with minoritized people’s perceptions about interpersonal fairness to inform the development of my second research question. First, Igbaria and Shayo (1997) suggested that “differences in rated actual and perceived job performance may be explained by disparate treatment discrimination conditions that provide few opportunities or incentives for blacks…to perform at a high level” (p. 12). Wesolowski and Mossholder (1997) demonstrated that “actions by the superior that might be considered less consequential in same-race dyads” (p. 360) “appeared to have interpersonal repercussions in mixed-race dyads as measured by their focus on the interaction dynamics within the superior-subordinate dyads” (p. 360). Finally, Huo and Tyler (2001) administered a questionnaire to a group of unionized employees at an American public university with a wide range of ethnic groups (117 Asian Americans, 58 Latino Americans, 56 European Americans, 45 African Americans). They found fair treatment characterized by neutrality, benevolence and treatment with dignity signaled legitimacy and inclusion within a group. In contrast, they learned that unfair treatment characterized by favoritism, mistrust and treatment with a lack of respect signaled marginalization and exclusion. These researchers determined that what mattered most was how fairly employees’ supervisors treated them at work. Although these studies emphasize ethnicity (Igbaria & Shayo, 1997; Wesolowski & Mossholder, 1997) and linguistic differences (Huo & Tyler, 2001), I was interested to investigate how these differences as well as differences in the aspects of teachers’ identities which allowed me to classify them as minoritized people might play out in teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA.
Although my study did not explicitly investigate the demographic similarities between administrators and teachers, since minoritized teachers interviewed for my study suggested that at least some demographic differences existed between them and the administrators, I draw on Tsui and O’Reilly’s (1989) field study of 272 superior-subordinate dyads in a Fortune 500 multi-division corporation. These researchers found the more dissimilar the supervisor and subordinate were in terms of race and gender, the less personal attraction the supervisor had to the subordinate. Tsui and O’Reilly (1989) concluded that these perceptions and attitudes were likely to contribute to distancing, aloofness and could be expected to impact the level of trust subordinates placed in the supervisors. I wondered if these perceptions or experiences might match that of my participants.

How Did TPA Impact Mainstream Female and Minoritized Teachers?

The phenomenon of employee abuse in the workplace discussed below includes the potential mistreatment of teachers by administrators.

“Internationally, systemic research on the problem of mistreatment at work (often called ‘workplace abuse’ in the literature) notably nonphysical forms of abuse, has increased significantly during the past two decades in countries such as Sweden, Norway, Germany, Austria, Australia and Britain” (Blase & Blase, 2003, p. 8). In North America, organizational justice scholars have only recently begun to address this problem. This literature “suggests that workplace abuse may be a pervasive problem with serious deleterious consequences for both employees and organizations” (Blase & Blase, 2003, p. 8). From a comprehensive review of the literature on workplace abuse, Keashly (1988) developed the concept of ‘emotional abuse’ to emphasize “hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviors …directed at gaining compliance from others” (p. 85). Keashly (1988) identified emotional abuse not as a single event, but as a pattern
behaviours that are unwanted by the target, behaviours that violate norms for appropriate conduct or an individual’s rights, behaviours that result in harm to the target, behaviours that intend to harm the target, and power differences between the abuser and the target of abuse. My study investigated this as well as teachers’ experiences with the extent to which the administrators “engaged in the sustained display of hostile verbal and non-verbal behaviours” (Zellars et al., 2002, p. 1068). Behavioural descriptions consistent with this definition include: aggression, discounting teachers’ thoughts, needs and feelings, isolating and abandoning teachers, withholding resources, denying approval, opportunities and credit, favouring ‘select’ teachers, offensive personal conduct, spying, sabotaging, stealing, destroying teacher instructional aids, making unreasonable work demands, public or private criticism, lying, explosive and nasty behaviour, threats, unwarranted reprimands, giving unfair evaluations, mistreating students, forcing teachers out of their jobs (reassigning, unilaterally transferring, terminating, preventing teachers from leaving or advancing, sexual harassment, and forms of discrimination based on race, gender, sexual orientation etc. (Blase & Blase, 2003; Zellars et al., 2002).

Vigoda (2000) surveyed 303 public sector workers in two municipalities in Israel. In response to feedback received from their supervisors, this researcher found that when employees felt unfairly treated they were likely to react by initially changing their attitudes toward their job, followed by later retaliatory responses such as quitting their jobs. Vigoda’s (2000) finding prepared me to investigate not only teachers’ emotional reactions to their performance appraisal, but also how their experiences with TPA might affect their attitudes and behaviours.

Research has shown that abuse in the workplace is associated with a host of serious adverse effects on an individual’s physical well-being, psychological or emotional well-being,
work performance, and social relationships. Examples of effects on physical well-being include “sleep disorders (e.g. nightmares, insufficient rest), headaches, backaches, fatigue or exhaustion, illness, hyperactivity, weight changes (e.g. significant increases or decreases), irritable bowel syndrome, heart arrhythmia, skin changes, ulcers, substance abuse (first time use) and suicide” (Blase & Blase, 2003, p. 10). Some psychological or emotional effects of abusive workplace behaviour are “depression, anger, rage, helplessness, powerlessness, cynicism, poor concentration, lowered self-esteem, aggression or revenge, hypervigilance, panic attacks, and posttraumatic stress disorder” (Blase & Blase, 2003, p. 10). Negative effects of abusive behaviour on work performance include “reductions in job effort, extra effort, commitment, and satisfaction and morale and include increases in absenteeism and turnover or attrition” (Blase & Blase, 2003, p. 10). Social effects of abusive behaviour noted in the literature are “isolation and loss of friendships” (Blase & Blase, 2003, pp. 10-11). Given the potential devastating and debilitating consequences this form of mistreatment can have on employees, I intended to investigate my participants’ feelings about and the consequential effects of any practice of mistreatment.

Although Zellars et al. (2002) suggest severe mistreatment or abusive supervision is not a common phenomenon, its effects are noteworthy. They note that “a small but growing body of empirical research suggests that abused subordinates report greater job and life dissatisfaction, intentions to quit their jobs, role conflict, and psychological distress” (p. 1068). Although some studies address this issue, Tepper’s (2000) study was instrumental as I developed my study since it was the only one I found which explicitly drew on the literature from the field of organizational justice. Although his study does not deal with teachers’ experiences, the findings emerge as relevant to my interest in investigating teachers’ perceptions of their experiences with
TPA. Tepper (2000) surveyed two groups of participants who worked full-time and had bosses in a medium-sized mid-western city in the United States by using random digit-dialing telephone interviews. The interview questions related to issues of outcome fairness. Tepper (2000) found in the first group of 712 residents and in the second group of 362 residents that:

subordinates who perceived their supervisors as more abusive were more likely to quit their jobs. For subordinates who remained in their jobs, abusive supervision was associated with lower job and life satisfaction, lower normative and affective commitments, and higher continuance commitment, conflict between work and family, and psychological distress. (p. 178)

It was therefore important to want to investigate if the teachers who participated in my study experienced similar perceptions as a result of their experiences with TPA.

**Outcome Fairness**

Mossholder et. al., (1998), Niehoff and Moorman (1993), Pillai et. al., (1999), Tepper et al. (1998) suggest that supervisory practices affect employees’ perceptions, incite affective reactions and influence their performance contribution (as cited in Zellars et al., 2001). Theories of outcome fairness suggest individuals make fairness judgments when they compare their inputs and outcomes with those of a referent, such as a coworker (Adams & Freedman, 1976). Subordinates of abusive supervisors may experience what Martin (1981) referred to as relative deprivation, defined as the belief that they are getting less than they deserve compared to target referents. For example, subordinates of abusive supervisors may feel disadvantaged compared to coworkers if their supervisors spend more time berating them than providing the mentoring functions that prepare these employees for career advancement (Tepper, 1995). Severe mistreatment, such as abusive supervision may also influence subordinates' perceptions of the inputs that figure in their evaluations of outcome fairness. For example, subordinates of abusive supervisors may have to overcome obstacles that increase the time and effort required to fulfill
their responsibilities; for instance, gathering needed information from a superior who is more inclined to provide criticism than constructive feedback will take longer.

In addition, because people are likely to perceive that unfair procedures cause them to perceive outcomes as unfair, or what is called the fair process effect (Greenberg, 1990), the procedural injustices subordinates of abusive supervisors experience may result in the perception that their outcomes are not as favourable as those of subordinates who do not have abusive supervisors. In fact, Tepper (2000) revealed that when supervisors are abusive, subordinates perceive outcomes to be unjust. The studies I referred to in this section helped me to focus on investigating what teachers might have to say about their feelings, reactions to and experiences with these outcomes at the hands of a supervisor who mistreats or abuses employees.

**Informational Fairness**

The justice literature identifies that the sources of information used to communicate performance appraisals can undermine individuals' sense of self-worth and engender anxiety and feelings of helplessness, or psychological distress. For example, in clarifying the nature of inequity distress, Adams and Freedman (1976) recognized that a person's reaction to inequity could not only involve anger and a desire for restitution (the outcomes ordinarily associated with disadvantaged inequity), but could also involve damaged self-esteem when a target feels an agent's behaviour constitutes a personal and intentional attack. Three more recent justice theories are pertinent. First, according to the self-interest model of informational fairness, individuals will experience psychological distress as a consequence of being denied voice in decisions that affect them (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Second, in the group value model of procedural fairness, such distress would stem from being denied voice when voice would facilitate the feeling of connection with a valued group (Lind & Tyler, 1988). Third, according to referent cognitions
theory, psychological distress stems from individuals' believing they would have obtained more favourable outcomes if a decision maker had used different procedures (Folger, 1986) or if information had been conveyed in a different way. These studies (Adams & Freedman, 1976; Folger, 1986; Lind & Tyler, 1988) inspired me to want to investigate how teachers felt about the information used and the extent to which they had a voice in their TPA.

**Procedural Fairness**

Tepper, Lockhart, and Hoobler (2000) surveyed 160 supervisor-subordinate dyads where the subordinates were masters of business administration students, and 110 supervisor-subordinate dyads from several large automobile manufacturers. They found that subordinates’ perceptions of procedural fairness explained the effects of abusive supervision on subordinates’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and conflict between work and family.

Tepper (2000) demonstrated that subordinates who experience long-term abusive supervision may conclude that their organization had not done an adequate job of developing or enforcing procedures that discipline abusers or protect targets of abuse. These conclusions might imply that one or more of the procedural fairness rules Levanthal (1980) described have been violated. As indicated earlier, these rules require that organizational procedures be consistent across people and over time, not be biased by self-interest, be based on accurate information, include provisions for appeal, and reflect the concerns and ethical system of those affected. For example, first the bias suppression and ethicality rules would be violated if subordinates believed their organization was unwilling to discipline an abusive but high-performing manager out of fear that the bottom line would be negatively affected. Second, the accuracy rule would be violated if subordinates believed that organizational representatives had not done a good job of
collecting the information necessary to adequately monitor or document supervisory behaviours that might warrant disciplinary action.

Consequently, as Tepper (2000) suggests, subordinates experience procedural injustice when their supervisors are abusive. I used Levanthal (1980) as the basis for understanding and Tepper (2000) as one way of seeing how abusive supervision can affect any participating teachers’ perceptions of procedural justice. These researchers helped me to be attuned to listening for these teachers’ perceptions about procedural justice, especially in situations where the administrators were abusive.

**Interpersonal Fairness**

Konovosky and Pugh (1994) and Moorman, Blakeley, and Niehoff (1998) show that subordinates’ ability to trust their supervisors mediates the effects of procedural fairness on organizational citizenship behaviour (discretionary actions that promote organizational effectiveness such as helping coworkers with work-related problems, behaving courteously to coworkers and speaking approvingly about the organization to outsiders) and that employees with favourable justice perceptions feel valued and respected and regard their organization’s representatives as more trustworthy. This research is one of the primary reasons I chose to focus on asking teachers to talk about the trust they had for the administrator who appraised them.

Tepper (2000) highlights that abusive supervision is particularly relevant to the data he analyzed which emerged from his two-time telephone interviews with 712 and 475 residents in a mid-western city in the United States because it reflects employees’ perceptions of the interpersonal dimension of fairness (Bies, 2001). According to Bies and Moag (1986), individuals experience interpersonal injustice when organizational representatives fail to treat them with respect, honesty, propriety, and are sensitive to their personal needs. Tepper (2000)
suggests that contextual factors influence whether or not subordinates experience unfairness when they are the targets of behaviours that fit the definition of abusive supervision. For example, as Bies and Moag (1986) stated, "A person may hold a criterion such as personal respect inviolable ... however, if rudeness is seen as an expected part of the procedure itself, as in a stress interview (where an employer has interviewers whose mission is to intimidate an employee for the purpose of finding out how an employee handles stress), then it may not be perceived as unfair because there is an instrumental purpose to its occurrence" (p. 51).

Similarly, for some reason, it might be common and acceptable military practice for a drill instructor to use verbal battery and degradation as part of the process of divesting military recruits of the values they held prior to boot camp (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). Yet, nevertheless, beyond a narrow range of contexts in which hostility may be tolerated, individuals expect others, especially those of higher status, to be aware of communicative acts that constitute face threats, in other words, actions that threaten one's social image and self-image (Goffman, 1967). Although I did not intentionally set out to ask if teachers perceived they had been treated unjustly, the aforementioned studies (Bies & Moag 1986; Bies, 2000; Goffman, 1967; Konovosky & Pugh, 1994; Moorman et al., 1998; Tepper, 2000; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979) helped me to be open to the possibility that this could exist.

Blase and Blase (2003) present a typology to describe some mistreatment behaviour in which administrators engage. They identify three levels of this mistreatment. They characterize Level 1 mistreatment as indirect and moderate. At this level, administrators discount teachers’ experiences, engage in offensive personal conduct, demonstrate a lack of consideration of privacy and withhold resources. They define Level 2 mistreatment as direct and escalating. Level 2 behaviours include breaching confidentiality, isolating teachers, nitpicking, sabotaging,
showing favoritism of other teachers, using vague criticism, and gossiping. The third type of
mistreatment these researchers identify is Level 3 or direct and severe mistreatment. These types
of behaviours include employing unfair evaluation procedures, lying, direct pejorative criticism,
very offensive personal conduct involving prying too intrusively into one’s personal life, forcing
one to leave teaching or making racist, homophobic or sexist remarks. The Blases (2003) present
a useful tool which allowed me to characterize the types of mistreatment reported by my
participants. When characterized this way, I was able to label teachers’ reactions to the treatment
and the consequential effects this treatment had on them.

I use the Blases’ (2003) typology to characterize the types of mistreatment that the
minoritized teachers in my sample experienced. Their experiences are summarized in Tables 26-
28 in Chapter Four. As these tables demonstrate, administrators’ mistreatment such as abuse has
a ripple effect that impacts not only teachers, but their colleagues, students as well as the
teachers’ relationships with friends and family (Blase & Blase, 2003, p. xiii). These researchers’
typology helped me to do two things. First, it helped to identify those behaviours that teachers
came to tolerate because they failed to recognize them as some form of mistreatment. Second, it
allowed me to characterize the teachers’ reactions to these types of mistreatment and the
consequential deleterious effects of the practices of mistreatment they experienced.

In summary, in this chapter I presented the literature I used to contextualize my three
research questions. I used my review of the literature on organizational justice and teacher
evaluation to develop my first research question. I turned to the literature on discrimination of
minoritized people to inform my second research question. Finally, I reviewed the literature on
mistreatment of teachers to help me identify my third research question.
Chapter Three: Methodology

In this chapter, I present an overview of the design of my study, describe the participants and the instruments I developed, and outline the details related to my pilot study. Finally, I explain the procedures I used to collect data, describe the data for both the quantitative and qualitative methodologies I used to conduct my study, and identify the data analytic procedures employed to answer the following research questions:

1. What were the salient characteristics of teachers’ perceptions of fairness related to TPA?

2. How did teachers’ demographic characteristics interact with their perceptions of fairness with TPA?

3. How did TPA impact mainstream female and minoritized teachers?

Overview of the Design

To answer the research questions, I utilized a developmental mixed methods research design (Caracelli & Greene, 1993) over two phases. In the first phase, I employed a survey approach in order to gain a general description of elementary teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA at one point in time from a large random sample (Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). I used a cross-sectional survey design to collect these quantitative data. The quantitative method yielded a source of data necessary to answer my first and second research questions. These data were the vehicles through which I investigated teachers’ perceptions of TPA broadly. As I will explain later in more detail, these data also permitted me to identify teachers’ demographic
characteristics. I used these characteristics to create the classification variables which identified them as members of the minoritized or mainstream groups.

In the second phase, for the pilot study I approached a small sample of teachers to refine the interview questions. I then used these questions to conduct face-to-face interviews with a small sample of teachers to gain a richer understanding of how they experienced TPA beyond what the quantitative approach offered.

Having used a mixed, and more specifically, “sequential” (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p.18) methodology, Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) would label my research design as a quantitative/qualitative sequential methodology. This methodology “starts with a quantitative method and then proceeds with a follow-up qualitative study” (p. 46). According to Held (1980) the mixed, sequential methodology is appropriate because I was investigating teachers’ subjective perceptions about TPA, through the quantitative method, and their objective experiences with it, through the qualitative method. I began by testing my a priori hypothesis that despite legislation, educational policies and standards currently in place to protect human rights against discrimination, given that racism, sexism, homophobia and ableism occur in society at large and that schools are microcosms of society, it might be possible that these forms of oppression could occur in schools. If this were true, then I suspected I might find these forms of oppression which would manifested in different ways such as prejudice or discrimination against minoritized teachers and this would impact these teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA.

Participants

I conducted my study with elementary teachers who worked in English, public school boards in Ontario for two reasons. First, I recognized that Ontario’s teaching population does not
reflect the diversity found in its general population (personal communication, Manager of Fees and Membership Services, ETFO, April 2006). Because there are more elementary teachers than secondary teachers I believed I would be more successful in identifying a sample of minoritized teachers in the elementary rather than in secondary teaching population. Second, since professionally I had taught at the secondary level only, I felt investigating elementary teachers’ perceptions would allow me to learn about a group of teachers with whom my professional interactions had been limited.

In keeping with the mixed methodology research design I used to conduct my study, I recruited the participants for my study in two phases. In the first phase, a total of 169 teachers who worked in six English, public school boards located in Southern Ontario responded to an online questionnaire. These data allowed me to answer my first and second research questions. In the second phase, from the 63 teachers who indicated on the questionnaire a willingness to participate in follow-up interviews, I chose six. I selected three mainstream and three minoritized teachers, using the criteria provided later in this chapter in Table 5 (see p. 100), and interviewed them. During each of these individual interviews, I explored how each teacher experienced TPA in greater depth than the questionnaire allowed me to do. I used these findings to answer my third research question.

Instrument Development

In the absence of any known study focused on minoritized teachers’ experiences with performance appraisal, I used some literature from a number of fields to develop two instruments to conduct my study: a questionnaire (see Appendix B) and an interview script (see Appendix C). Table 1 presents the literature I used to develop questions 12-44 on the questionnaire and the
questions in Parts B-F of the interview script related to each of the four main dimensions of
fairness:

Table 1

*Literature Used to Inform Development of Items on Questionnaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Précis of item on questionnaire</th>
<th>Précis of questions on interview script</th>
<th>Literature used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome fairness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Rating received on TPA</td>
<td>B1. Feeling about rating received</td>
<td>- Adams (1965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cropanzano &amp; Greenberg (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3. Any aspect of identity influenced rating</td>
<td>- Deutsch (1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B5. Changes to be made to TPA to make it fairer</td>
<td>- Levanthal (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- McFarlin &amp; Sweeney (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural fairness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within 20 days</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Blase &amp; Blase (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Fair pre-observation</td>
<td>D2. a) pre-observation meeting</td>
<td>- Levanthal (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ontario Ministry of Education (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Fair classroom observation</td>
<td>D2. b) the observation debriefing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>session</td>
<td>session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Fair post-observation</td>
<td>D2. c) information used to determine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>session</td>
<td>rating received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Fair summative report</td>
<td>D2. f) summative report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. No singular weakness or</td>
<td>C2. Any aspect of identity influenced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flaw unduly influenced rating</td>
<td>perception about procedures involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assigned</td>
<td>in TPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3. Changes to be made to procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of TPA to make it fairer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informational fairness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Fair review of annual learning plan</td>
<td>Précis of questions on interview script</td>
<td>Literature used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1. Sources of information used to explain appraisal rating and the process</td>
<td>- Glickman, Gordon, &amp; Ross-Gordon (2001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. g) annual learning plan</td>
<td>- Levanthal, (1980)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Observation debriefing detailed and comprehensive</td>
<td>D1. Sources of information used to explain appraisal rating and the process</td>
<td>- McGreal (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. e) the feedback received</td>
<td>- Ontario Ministry of Education (2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Observation debriefing reflected use of multiple data sources in conducting TPA</td>
<td>D1. Sources of information used to explain appraisal rating and the process</td>
<td>- Peterson (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. e) the feedback received</td>
<td>- Waite (1995), as cited in Blase &amp; Blase (2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Feedback was specific</td>
<td>D1. Sources of information used to explain appraisal rating and the process</td>
<td>- Stall (1997), as cited in Blase &amp; Blase (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. e) the feedback received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Feedback was constructive</td>
<td>D1. Sources of information used to explain appraisal rating and the process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. e) the feedback received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Involved in a dialogue about performance</td>
<td>D1. Sources of information used to explain appraisal rating and the process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. d) involvement in a dialogue about performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. Any aspect of identity influenced the information used to determine rating?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4. Changes to be made to information used or how collected to make TPA fairer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpersonal fairness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>32. Regardless of day appraised outcome would have been the same</th>
<th>Précis of questions on interview script</th>
<th>Literature used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C6. Feeling about consistency of procedure where no singular weakness or flaw unduly influenced the outcome, procedure or person</td>
<td>- Barnett &amp; McCormack (2004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bies &amp; Moag (1986)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Précis of item on questionnaire</td>
<td>Précis of questions on interview script</td>
<td>Literature used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Appraisal experience was consistent with how administrator conducted with other teachers</td>
<td>C7. Feeling about consistency of procedure related to day conducted</td>
<td>- Blase &amp; Blase (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Overall characterization of relationship with administrator as trusting</td>
<td>C8. Feeling about consistency since appraisal was conducted with how conducted with other teachers</td>
<td>- Cohen-Charash &amp; Spector, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Administrator motivated to protect relationship</td>
<td>C4. Feeling about how fair the administrator conducted the performance appraisal</td>
<td>- Chelune (1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Administrator and teacher strove to understand each other regardless of differences</td>
<td>F1. Comfort disclosing information about professional practice or personal life with the administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Overall comfort level disclosing most issues with administrator</td>
<td>F2. Any aspect of identity influenced comfort with disclosing to administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Comfort disclosing opinions and feelings related to professional practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Comfortable disclosing some personal information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Comfortable disclosing very personal information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the following four subheadings, I detail the literature I used to develop the relevant items for my questionnaire and my interview questions.

**Outcome Fairness**

I drew on the literature cited in Table 1 related to outcome fairness which suggested that individuals evaluate and compare the performance evaluation they received to the standard or rule of equity. I used this literature (Adams, 1965; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Colquitt et al., 1991; Levanthal, 1980; McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992) to develop questions 12 and 13 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B) and questions B 1-5 on the interview script (see Appendix C).

**Procedural Fairness**

Since procedural fairness concerns teachers’ reactions to “the procedures used” (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 211) and the means by which they obtain these (Byrne & Cropanzano, 2001, Greenberg, 1990; Levanthal, 1980; Levanthal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975) or the “appropriateness of [the] decision process” (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 220), I developed questions 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 31 on the questionnaire and question C1 and D2 (a-c and f) on the interview script using the procedural requirements outlined in the TPA policy. I created question 31 on the questionnaire and questions C2 and C3 on the interview script based on Levanthal’s theory (1980) that procedures should be free from bias and on Barnett and McCormack’s (2004) work focused on “teachers’ perceptions if they were treated consistently as determined by equal treatment and where favoritism was avoided” (p. 418). I wrote question 22 on the questionnaire and D2 on the interview script based on the procedural requirement in the TPA policy document that a classroom observation session be conducted.
**Informational Fairness**

Since informational fairness “focuses on the explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion” (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 425), I developed related questions as items to collect data about informational fairness. Question 30 on the questionnaire and questions D1, D2d, D3 and D4 on the interview script emerged from Levanthal’s (1980) concern that the opinions of various groups affected by decisions about TPA ratings are taken into account as well as Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2001) who identify involvement of teachers in dialogue about their performance as one critical procedural aspect to consider. Question 30 on the questionnaire and questions D1, D2d, D3 and D4 on the interview script also originated from Waite’s work (1995) related to the anthropological linguistic analysis of the asymmetries of power in supervisor-teacher talk. In brief, Waite reveals that patterns of the judgment of the supervisor and criticism reduce supervisor-teacher interactions to monologic talk leading to “alienation, atomization and disenfranchisement of teachers” (as cited in Blase & Blase, 2002, p. 20).

Furthermore, I wrote questions 26-30 on the questionnaire and questions D1, D2 a, c, d and e, D3 and D4 on the interview script in reaction to Glickman et al.’s work (2001) suggesting that “supervision at its worst is defined in pejorative political terms: a ‘dog and pony show’, a weapon, a meaningless routine, and an unwelcome intervention” (Blase & Blase, 2002, p. 21). Since measuring the quality of teaching is complex, and examining teacher evaluation is even more so, question 27 on the questionnaire and question D1 on the interview script emerged from the work of Peterson (2000) who posits that the research in this area is clear - teacher evaluation must be dynamic and come from multiple sources (pp. 64-65). In Peterson’s (2000) view, “the
use of multiple data sources can be used to replace haphazard use of hearsay evaluation criteria” (pp. 64-65).

I created questions 28 and 29 on the questionnaire and questions D1, D2e on the interview script from Stall’s work (1997) who concluded that because of the potential for negative political processes teacher evaluation remains a meaningless process for administrators and teachers (as cited in Blase & Blase, 2002, p. 21). Question 25 on the questionnaire and question D2 on the interview script emerged from the TPA policy.

**Interpersonal Fairness**

In reviewing the literature on teacher evaluation, I identified a number of sources suggesting more attention should be paid to the significance of the relationship between a teacher and an administrator who conducts a teacher’s performance appraisal. Glickman et al. (2001), Glickman and Mells (1997), Goldstein (1989), Medley and Crocker (1982), Mitchell, Ortiz, and Mitchell (1987), Stake (1989), Trethowan (1991), Waite (1995), and Wragg (1987) are some authors whom I identified as strong proponents of this. I focused the development of questions 34 and 44 on the questionnaire and question C4, C5, E1, E2, E3, F1 and F2 on the interview script I used to collect data with respect to interpersonal fairness by investigating how teachers’ perceived and experienced the administrators’ treatment toward them (Bies & Moag, 1986; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). In addition, I developed question 32 on the questionnaire and question C7 on the interview script based on Levanthal’s (1980) theory concerned with consistency across time. I wrote question 33 on the questionnaire and question C8 on the interview script based on these questions’ concern with consistency across people and on Barnett and McCormack’s (2004) aforementioned work about teachers’ perceptions of consistent treatment where favoritism was avoided.
I chose to focus on issues related to trust and comfort with disclosure as two characteristics concerning the interpersonal dynamics between teachers and administrators. I provide a description of the literature I used to investigate these characteristics under the subheadings of trust and comfort with disclosure below:

**Trust.**

In terms of trust, as a first step, I examined the following sources: Fullan (2001), Greenfield (1978), Levin, and Riffel (2000) and McLaughlin, (1987). In addition, Blase and Blase (2001) identify trust as one dimension that affects the effectiveness of any supervisory practice. They cite a few scholars’ definitions of trust (Schmuck & Runkel, 1994; McGregor, 1967) as one significant dimension of a relationship.

First, as Schmuck and Runkel (1994) put it “trust is established more by deeds than by words, and is sustained by open-ness in interpersonal relationships” (as cited in Blase & Blase, 2001, p. 21). McGregor (1967) identifies another critical characteristic of trust when he defines trust as, “the knowledge that one person will not take unfair advantage of another person, deliberately or consciously; furthermore, any harm committed accidentally or unconsciously is always expected to be repaired” (as cited in Blase & Blase, 2001, pp. 21-22).

In the light of the importance the aforementioned authors place on trust as a dimension of the relationship between teachers and the administrators they work with, I created question 34 on the questionnaire and C8 on the interview script to investigate teachers’ overall view about trust and questions 35-40 on the questionnaire and questions C5, E1-3, F1-2 on the interview script were written to examine some associated indices. Specifically, I developed questions 35 and 36 on the questionnaire and C5 and E1 on the interview script using Blase and Blase (2001) who state, “people who believe that others are motivated to protect and nurture their relationships are
apt to be trusting” (p. 22). Question 37 on the questionnaire and question E2 on the interview script emerged when I drew on Johnson and Johnson (1987) who advocate for open and honest communication about feelings and opinions as important dimensions when considering trusting behaviour (as cited in Blase & Blase, 2001, p. 22). I composed question 40 on the questionnaire from the Blases’ (2001) statement, “the power of honest, open and accepting communication cannot be overemphasized in developing trust” (p. 24), highlighting the importance of being able to share one’s opinions and ideas without fear of reprisal or criticism even when opinions differ (p. 33) and from Barnett and McCormack’s (2004) work concerned with consistency of treatment (p. 418). Finally, I wrote questions 38 and 39 on the questionnaire and E3 and F1 on the interview script using the Blases’ (2001) notion that “in an atmosphere of trust [the administrator and the teacher] are able to work together to identify and solve … problems” (p. 23). In terms of the interview script, I developed question E1 to investigate teachers’ experiences with a trusting relationship between them and the administrators.

**Comfort with disclosure.**

Lovell and Wilke (1998) best explain why I chose to examine teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with comfort with disclosure when they say, “the degree of trust between people [the teacher and the administrator] affects the types of problems people are willing to share. Without trust, people are likely to say only those things they expect others want to hear” (as cited in Blase & Blase, 2001, pp. 20). I used this to write question 41 on the questionnaire. In addition, I drew on Gordon Chelune’s book (1979), titled *Self-Disclosure*, where he traces some of the significant work conducted in the area of self-disclosure. Chelune suggests the importance of “considering one’s comfort to disclose as phenomenological behaviour” (p. 1). He identifies self-disclosure as a complex phenomenon. Briefly, according to Chelune (1979), the most basic
definition of self-disclosure “must meet three operational criteria: (1) it must contain information about Person A; (2) Person A must communicate this information; and (3) Person A must communicate this information to a target Person B” (p. 2). In addition, I wrote questions 41-44 on the questionnaire, in part, from the Blases’ (2002) reference to Lovell and Wilkes’ (1998) previously mentioned definition of comfort with disclosure and by drawing on Barnett and McCormick’s study (2004) on teacher-administrator relationships, which revealed that “principals who demonstrate … leadership take a personal interest in both the professional and personal well-being of teachers and know them individually” (p. 429). In terms of the interview script, I developed question F1 to address this point.

I also note that questions 1-10 on the questionnaire and the questions in Part A of the interview script focused on collecting demographic information. In addition, question 11, a filter or contingency question, on the questionnaire allowed participants to indicate if they had had their teaching appraised using TPA.

Most questions on my questionnaire were closed-ended questions to which participants responded to pre-determined responses. Questions 3, 46 and 47 were open-ended (Creswell, 2002). In terms of the measurement scales I employed, the questionnaire (Appendix A) used two different types of scales. I used nominal scales to collect demographic data (questions 1-10) (country of origin, primary language(s), gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and ability/disability) and for question 11 (whether the participants’ teaching had been appraised using TPA). I used ordinal scales for all other questions, including question 12 regarding the overall rating teachers received. For the questions using ordinal scales I used a five-point Likert-scale which asked participants to indicate their degree of agreement with the statements. Respondents were asked to complete statements by checking the box beside the statement which
best described their perspective: strongly agree (5), agree (4), not sure/no opinion (3) disagree (2) strongly disagree (1).

**Pilot Study**

I conducted a pilot test of the questionnaire in September 2006 and one for the interview script from September 2006 through January 2007 “to determine that individuals in the sample would be capable of completing the survey and that they would be able to understand the questions” (Creswell, 2002, p. 409) for the main study.

**Piloting the Questionnaire**

For the pilot study, I invited seven colleagues from work to provide written feedback directly on the questionnaire. This allowed me to revise the questionnaire to avoid unnecessary jargon and to ensure the questions were clearly understood. I then sent the web-based questionnaire to another six teachers recommended by one of the co-supervisors of my thesis. In addition, a colleague from work agreed to send this questionnaire to nine other teachers. From these 15 individuals, three teachers responded. Based on the feedback from these teachers, in consultation with my one of my co-thesis supervisors, I made changes to the instrument. For example, originally, I had combined questions 28 and 29 on the questionnaire, asking participants whether the feedback from TPA was specific and constructive. One of the teachers who provided feedback suggested that I separate questions 28 and 29. I took this advice and decided to ask one question about whether the feedback from TPA was specific and another about whether it was constructive. Another teacher suggested that I separate one question-the one which states, the administrator and the teacher work to identify and to solve problems-into questions 38 and 39 which allowed participants to respond to each verb (identify and solve
problems) differently if they chose. I did this. In addition, this teacher advised me to add an
open-ended question. This allowed teachers to add any comments not addressed in the
questionnaire. As a result, I included question 45 as an open-ended question.

Finally, two teachers in the pilot study held conflicting opinions about the placement of
the demographic questions on the questionnaire. I consulted some of the literature available to
inform my choice. I learned that “surveyors differ on this point” (Bourque & Fielder, 1995, p.
55). After reading some literature on this topic (Bourque & Fielder, 1995; Gray & Guppy, 2003),
I chose to place the demographic questions at the beginning of the questionnaire for two reasons.
First, demographic questions are easy for respondents to answer because they know this
information. So, I determined this would be a gentle way to introduce participants to completing
questions pertaining to the high-stakes nature of TPA. Second, one opinion related to question
placement suggests that “respondents who return an incomplete questionnaire tend to leave the
last part of the questionnaire unanswered” (Bourque & Fielder, p. 57, 1995). The first reason,
combined with the fact that the demographic questions were critical to this study because they
would be used as the basis upon which to conduct analyses, provide the rationale I used to place
the demographic questions at the beginning of the questionnaire.

From a sociological perspective, I became aware during this pilot study that since all of
the teachers who completed the pilot studies were members of mainstream groups of teachers, I
realized I had to work assiduously to secure the support from two school boards located in
southern Ontario which I anticipated were likely to have the most diverse teaching population; a
critical issue to this study.
**Piloting the Interview Questions**

The pilot study for the interview questions occurred almost concurrently with the pilot phase for the quantitative aspect of my study. From September 2006 through January 2007, I received initial feedback from my co-supervisors and from the same seven work colleagues who participated in piloting the questionnaire. These individuals helped me to revise my initial interview script. As a result, I made seven changes to my interview script. My initial script asked questions which were based too much on the responses obtained from the questionnaire. Originally, I had questions such as, ‘I understood from reading your response to the questionnaire that you received a rating of good, would you please tell me how you felt about that.’ So, the first change I made was to rework these questions to allow participants to communicate freely without having to worry about responses made on the questionnaire. Second, four of my seven colleagues suggested I ask specifically about the seven components related to informational fairness outlined as questions D2 a-g. Third, I added an ice-breaker question which asked participants why they agreed to participate in a follow-up interview. Fourth, I decided to explain to interviewees that my study sought to investigate mainstream and minoritized teachers’ experiences with TPA, so I confirmed their country of origin, primary language(s), gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity and ability/disability status. Fifth, I asked participants to comment generally about the four dimensions framing my study: outcome, informational, procedural and interpersonal fairness. Sixth, I included questions which allowed participants to propose changes related to each of the four concepts which would make TPA fairer. Finally, during the pilot interviews I learned how important it was to breakdown the questions into manageable components. For example, rather than asking if participants felt TPA allowed for fair, effective and consistent appraisals of teachers, I asked about each characteristic separately.
Data Collection Procedures

Questionnaire

After receiving ethical approval, in September 2006 I contacted 14 Elementary Teacher Federation Presidents of locals in southern Ontario (see Appendix D for a copy of the information letter/consent form). Six of these Presidents distributed an invitation (see Appendix E) to complete my questionnaire and a reminder notice (see Appendix F) to their members. Table 2 identifies each local (which was assigned a number to protect the anonymity of each local), details the number of members in each local as of February 2005, provides the number of members who responded, the number of members from each local I needed to eliminate, and finally the final number of respondents for each local who were eligible to participate in my study. Only two locals, locals three and four, as identified in Table 2, used their Elementary Teachers’ Federation of Ontario (ETFO) email systems. The remaining locals relied on duplicating sufficient copies and distributed these hard copies to the union stewards in each school who were instructed to deliver them to their fellow members.
Table 2

Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Number of members as of February 2005</th>
<th>Number of members responded</th>
<th>Number of members eliminated</th>
<th>Number of eligible respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,284</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,564</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,755</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,141</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24,587</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before continuing, it is important to note that I used the number of members as of February 2005 for two reasons. First, since, as I stated on my questionnaire, my study concerned teachers who had had their teaching performance appraised from September 2003 to June 2006. The number of teachers as of February 2005 reflected the number of teachers who had been eligible to participate. The second reason relates to the fact that these numbers were the most recent counts available at the time I collected my data.

In the end, since 10 respondents indicated they had not been appraised using TPA and since 27 respondents left the questionnaire completely blank, it was necessary to eliminate these teachers from my study. In the end, I report a total of 132 eligible participants. The time and effort the presidents of each of the six locals invested delivering the invitations and the follow-up reminders resulted in my sample covering 0.69% of the targeted population of elementary
teachers in the six locals. I note that I do not consider 0.69% to have been a response rate since I had no control over whether members received the questionnaire. If I considered this to have been a response rate, I could speculate this could be attributed to three main, but interrelated, reasons. First, I believe most teachers never received the invitation to complete the questionnaire. As evidence, I knew three colleagues in two of the six locals. I learned that none of these individuals received the invitation (Personal communication, December 12, 2006).

Second, the nature of a teacher’s job -working with children- does not easily lend itself to affording them with the time to complete a voluntary, on-line questionnaire. For example, according to Marilyn Laframboise, former Chair of the Ontario College of Teachers, “Fewer than five per cent of the membership voted in the 2003 College election” (2006, ¶6) which was conducted online. Furthermore, since teachers work directly with students during the day and spend time in the evening marking or preparing lessons, I question teachers’ ability to access or spend time on a computer which is not directly related to the tasks they need to complete. Third, given that school boards and teacher federations in two of the six locals share email systems and given the high-stakes nature of the TPA, it is reasonable to assume they might not have completed the questionnaire. I can understand why teachers might have been apprehensive about sharing personal information about their experiences with TPA for fear that their union or school board might be able to monitor their activity while online.

Table 3 provides details about the number and percentage of participants in six categories: country of origin, primary language(s), gender, sexual orientation, visible minority and ability/disability status.
Table 3

_Detailed Demographic Information for Participants from Questionnaire_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>85.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India and Kenya *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Primary language(s)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>84.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Dutch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and French</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Gujarati</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Sinhalese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Italian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Spanish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Ukrainian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Urdu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>78.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>92.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-heterosexual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visible Minority Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not visible minority</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>88.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible minority</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability/Disability Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abled</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>85.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind or Visually Impaired</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/deaf or Hard-of-Hearing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disabled</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with a Mental Illness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Challenged</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentages might not add up to 100.00 because of rounding.

*Country of origin.*

Of the 132 respondents, 113 teachers (85.60%) were born in Canada and 19 (14.39%) were born in a country other than Canada. As indicated in Table 3, one of the respondents, case
#31, identified by * indicated both India and Kenya as the country of origin. Since it was not possible to determine this individual’s country of origin, and since one can only have one country of origin, I eliminated this respondent from analyses which used country of origin as a variable, and I treated this as a missing value. In addition, the respondents who identified England (case # 21, 74, 87, and 88) and Scotland (case #119) were clustered with the group which indicated Great Britain (case #43) as their country of origin. Finally, as shown in Table 7, of the 19 respondents who identified a country of origin other than Canada, 17 agreed to participate in follow-up interviews. However, of these 17, 2 respondents did not provide any contact information, so the number of eligible respondents in this group was reduced to 15. As Table 8 shows, I conducted a follow-up interview with one participant born in a country other than Canada and with five who were born in Canada.

*Primary language(s).*

Of the 132 respondents, 112 (84.85%) respondents identified English as their primary language, another 14 (10.61%) identified English as one of their primary languages, and 3 (2.27%) of the respondents identified English and French as one of their primary languages, I was left with only one (0.76%) respondent who identified neither English nor French as their primary language(s) to conduct analyses related to primary language(s). As Table 7 illustrates, of the 10 respondents who identified a primary language other than French or English, one agreed to participate in a follow-up interview as shown in Table 8. The remaining five teachers I interviewed identified English or French as their primary language(s).

*Gender.*

One respondent did not identify his/her gender. Thus, there was one missing value in this category. Of the other 131 respondents, 104 teachers (79.39%) of the respondents indicated that
they were female and 27 or (20.61%) of these respondents were male. Initially, given that males are numerically under-represented in the elementary teaching profession, I intended to classify males as members of the minoritized group and females into the mainstream group. In the end, because of the literature cited in Chapter Two which acknowledges that in this society women have faced years of oppression, I wanted to investigate how teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA compared by using gender as the first variable upon which to conduct analysis. Rather than using gender as either a category to classify teachers as members of the minoritized or mainstream, I problematized gender to investigate if the differences between males and females were statistically significant. Finally, as Table 7 shows of the 27 male respondents, 21 agreed to participate in follow-up interviews. However, of these 21, one respondent did not provide any contact information, so I reduced the number of eligible respondents in this group to 20. As Table 8 illustrates, although, ultimately gender proved not to be a variable which was statistically significant, although not a category of analysis in terms of my classification of teachers into minoritized or mainstream groups, I conducted interviews with two males and four females.

Sexual orientation.

Four (3.03%) respondents did not answer this question so I considered these missing values. Of those respondents who did complete this question, 122 (92.42%) of respondents identified as heterosexual. The remaining group of six representing (4.55%) of the respondents who answered this question were clustered together and named as the sexual orientation minoritized group. I conducted analyses using the 122 heterosexuals as the mainstream group and the six non-heterosexuals as the minoritized group. Finally, as Table 7 illustrates, of the six respondents in this minoritized group, four respondents agreed to participate in follow-up
interviews, but one provided no contact information so I was left with only three participants eligible to be interviewed. As Table 8 shows, I interviewed one person who identified as non-heterosexual and five people who identified as heterosexual.

Visible minority status.

One respondent did not identify his/her status as a visible minority. Consequently, there was one missing value in this category. For the remaining group, 14 (10.69%) identified as members of a visible minority group and 117 (88.64%) of respondents identified as not belonging to any visible minority group. Of these 14 respondents, seven were South Asian, and two were Black. There was one respondent for each of the following groups: Southeast Asian, Latin American, West Indian and Aboriginal. Although seven of the 14 respondents identified as South Asian, I clustered all of the other respondents together as members of visible minorities. I used this collective group to identify the minoritized group and the 117 respondents as the mainstream group to conduct analyses based on visible minority status. Finally, as Table 7 shows, of the 14 respondents in this minoritized group, eight respondents agreed to participate in follow-up interviews. However, since two respondents did not provide contact information, only six respondents were considered eligible to participate in follow-up interviews. As Table 8 illustrates, I interviewed three of these six participants and three more who identified as White.

Ability / Disability status.

Of 132 respondents, 113 (85.61%) participants identified as abled and 18 (13.64%) indicated having some form of disability. For the purposes of further analyses, given the diversity of respondents in each of the disabled categories, I clustered all five sub-groups as a disabled minoritized group. I used the 18, in some way disabled, as the minoritized group and the 113 in no way disabled as the mainstream group. Finally, as Table 7 shows, of the 18
respondents in this category, 14 agreed to participate in follow-up interviews. Although I
approached all of these, as Table 8 illustrates, I was unable to interview any participants who
indicated having some form of disability so all of the interviews were conducted with abled-
-bodied teachers.

**Determining Possible Analyses of the Quantitative Data**

In terms of deciding which quantitative analyses I could conduct, I ran chi square tests for
all six of the categories. Since the p values for four of the six categories (the primary language,
sexual orientation, visible minority and abled/disabled categories) were greater than the alpha I
set as .05, I determined there were not enough data to allow me to reject the null hypothesis for
the aforementioned four categories. The total number of respondents in these categories did not
yield enough data upon which to base my study so I looked for an alternative way of determining
categories for analyses.

Since I was interested in how gender would impact teachers’ perceptions of and
experiences with TPA, I isolated gender as a variable. To do this, I originally considered
examining four gender groups: mainstream females, mainstream males, minoritized females and
minoritized males. However, it did not appear feasible given the unequal sample sizes as shown
in Table 4:
Table 4

*Frequency and Percentage of Gender and Minoritized Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream females</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoritized females</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream males</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoritized males</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the small sample sizes, I looked for an alternative way of analyzing my data. It appeared that there were a sufficient number of mainstream females and mainstream males. It also seemed that if I combined minoritized females and minoritized males into one group called minoritized teachers using the criteria identified in Table 5, I would be able to conduct further analyses comparing the three groups: mainstream females, mainstream males and a minoritized group.
Table 5

Classifying Teachers as Members of Minoritized or Mainstream Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic information</th>
<th>Minoritized</th>
<th>Mainstream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td>Born in a country other than Canada</td>
<td>Born in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary language</td>
<td>Neither English nor French</td>
<td>English or French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>Other than heterosexual</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible minority</td>
<td>Other than white</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability/disability</td>
<td>Differently-abled</td>
<td>Not-differently-abled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specifically, I was interested in whether there were any differences among the groups with respect to the four dimensions of fairness as reviewed in Chapter Two. Table 6 presents the sample sizes of these groups:

Table 6

Frequency and Percentage of Gender and Minoritized Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream females</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream males</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoritized teachers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I computed a composite mean and standard deviation for the mainstream female, mainstream male and minoritized groups for each of the four dimensions of fairness. I used this to conduct ANOVA to compare these three groups. As presented and explained in Chapter Four,
I conducted two different post-hoc tests. I used Scheffé for informational fairness and Dunnett’s C for outcome, procedural and interpersonal fairness. I used these results to answer my second research question as presented in Chapter Four.

I also explored differences among the groups in terms of the rating assigned and the extent to which teachers agreed with the rating. I used, question #12; rating received on TPA to conduct cross-tabulations to determine the number and percentages for each of the three groups which received one of the four ratings (exemplary, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory). This question uses a four point scale with four representing the highest possible score; exemplary and one as the lowest possible score; unsatisfactory. To investigate differences between the three groups in terms of the extent to which teachers agreed with the rating I used questionnaire item question #13; agreement with rating on TPA. This scale uses five as the highest possible value; strongly agree, three as the neutral value or not sure/no opinion, and one as the lowest value; strongly disagree. I examined the number and percentages of teachers who strongly agreed to strongly disagreed for each of the four possible ratings assigned; exemplary, good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory for each of the three groups of teachers. I present these results in Chapter Four.

In summary, I used the results of ANOVA and cross-tabulation to answer my second research question. In addition, I conducted interviews with three mainstream females and three minoritized people to answer my third research question. I describe the methodology I used to collect the qualitative data in the next section.

Interviews

Sixty-five survey respondents indicated a willingness to participate in an individual interview. Table 5 (see p. 100) displays the criteria used to classify teachers as members of the minoritized and mainstream groups. Table 7 shows the dispersion of participants in terms of the
locals to which these teachers belong as well as the number of teachers who self-identified in each of the six categories (country of origin, primary language(s), sexual orientation, visible minority and disabled). It also shows the total number of participants for each category. Some participants were not willing to participate in follow-up interviews or did not supply contact information. Therefore the number of eligible participants in each category represents the total number of participants in each category who could have been contacted to participate in an interview.

Table 7

Volunteers Willing to Participate in Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Country of origin *1</th>
<th>Primary language(s) *2</th>
<th>Gender *3</th>
<th>Sexual orientation *4</th>
<th>Visible minority *5</th>
<th>Disabled *6</th>
<th>Total numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible**</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
*1-those not born in Canada
*2-those who did not identify either English and/or French as their primary language
*3-those identified as male
*4-those who identified as other than heterosexual (i.e.) lesbian, gay male or bisexual
*5-those identified as other than Caucasian
*6-those who identified as having at least one form of disability

**Since some participants either did not agree to participate in follow-up interviews or agreed but did not supply contact information, I reduced the number of eligible participants to the number indicated in this row.
Although I was interested in interviewing a sample of teachers who represented each of my six categories, the sample size was too small to disaggregate the participants into the six categories of interest. Accordingly, I selected interview participants based on the classification of teachers into mainstream and minoritized groups identified in Table 5 (see p. 100).

From the 63 respondents who agreed to participate in a follow-up interview, I used the criteria displayed in Table 5 (see p. 100) to purposefully select minoritized teachers for these interviews. I examined the list of eligible participants as presented in Table 7 to identify those teachers who had the most minoritized characteristics. For example, since Marla was a visible minority, spoke a language other than English or French and identified her country of origin as other than Canada, she was an appropriate candidate since she met these criteria. Using a random table of numbers for these eligible participants, I identified six minoritized teachers who met at least one of the minoritized criteria. Using another random table of numbers of eligible participants who did not possess any minoritized characteristics, I selected five of these mainstream teachers from the list of eligible participants. I contacted six teachers who met some minoritized criteria and five mainstream teachers using the email addresses they provided on the questionnaire. The three minoritized and three mainstream teachers listed in Table 8 responded to my email and agreed to be interviewed. Each participant used a pseudonym of their choice.

Table 8 shows how I identified the teachers’ characteristics. The boxes checked with an x mark each aspect of each demographic characteristic each teacher self-identified. Conversely, each box left unchecked identifies each teacher as a member of the mainstream group for each demographic characteristic. Initially, I had called mainstream teachers dominant teachers so I changed the pseudonyms these teachers had chosen to begin with the letter “D” and for the
minoritized teachers to begin with the letter “M” and used these names to analyze the data. To make it easier from my readers, I kept this nomenclature in this final version of the thesis.

**Table 8**

*Interviewees’ Demographic Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>CO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Legend: VM=visible minority (non-Caucasian), D= disabled, SO = sexual orientation (non-heterosexual), PL= primary language CO=country of origin (other than Canada).

I met each teacher I selected to be interviewed at OISE/UT and interviewed each one. The interviews lasted between one and one and a half hours. I transcribed each interview and sent a transcript to each participant to validate. I interviewed the participants, tape recorded and transcribed the interviews within 24 to 36 hours of their occurrence for two reasons. First, I was genuinely interested in transcribing the teachers’ comments to paper. Second, as an inexperienced qualitative researcher I wanted to ensure I captured the content as accurately as possible.

At the most basic level, I wanted the interviews to be conversations (Kvale, 1996). Kvale (1996) defines qualitative research interviews as attempts to understand the world, in this case teachers’ experiences with TPA, from their own point of view, to unfold the meaning of peoples’ experiences. Given Kvale’s (1996) definition, I used Patton’s (1990) work to inform my approach to interviewing teachers using an informal conversational interview. I used the
interview guide approach, or the standardized open-ended interview so that teachers’ responses would be open-ended and not restricted to choices I provided (Patton, 1990).

**Data Analytic Procedures**

I explain how I analyzed my data under the sub-headings analyses of the data from the questionnaire and analyses of the interview data.

**Analyses of the Data From the Questionnaire**

I used SPSS 14 statistical software to analyze the data I collected from the results of the initial 132 participants who completed the questionnaire I administered. I describe the procedures I used to analyze these quantitative data under the following sub-subheadings.

**Data Cleaning**

The first procedure I used involved assigning each of the locals a numerical code prior to merging the entire file into one data base. The next procedure involved cleaning the data (Creswell, 2002, p. 228). To do this I sorted the data by cases in ascending order for each variable using SPSS. I then arranged the values of each variable from the smallest to the largest case. This enabled me to spot out-of-range or misnumbered cases. Then I used a filtering procedure to make the following two changes to the data. First, of the 169 responses received, ten participants indicated on question 11 that they had not had their teaching appraised using TPA between September 2003 and June 2006. Second, 27 participants had opened the questionnaire, but had left the entire questionnaire blank. I eliminated both of these groups. Table 2 (see p. 91) summarizes this visually.

Next, when I examined the frequency distribution I made the following recoding changes. First, in the visible minority category, participant #71 indicated being a Caucasian in a
minoritized community and participant #85 identified White as a visible minority. I reclassified these respondents into the non-visible minority category.

In addition, participant #13 identified as East Indian. According to Statistics Canada, people of East Indian origin belong to the South Asian community, so I reclassified this respondent as a member of the South Asian visible minority group. Participant #67 claimed to be West Indian. It was not clear if this teacher was from West India or the West Indies. However, regardless, I classified this respondent as a member of a visible minority category. Similarly, for the disability category, participant #9 identified as not being able to smell, participant #28 indicated being mildly arthritic, participant #75 claimed to be a cardiac patient with low blood pressure, and participant #93 reported just having had a brain tumour removed. For the purposes of this study, I reclassified these respondents into the disabled category. In addition, participant #31 identified as having limited hearing, so I reclassified this respondent into the D/deaf or disabled category.

Missing data is information that is not supplied by participants to specific questions or items. I should note that in the cover letter of my questionnaire, for ethical reasons I invited participants not to answer any questions with which they were not comfortable. In total, I had 8 out of 132 (6.06%) participants who, for some reason, missed answering questions which would have allowed me to identify some aspects of their demographic characteristics. There were no participants who missed identifying their country of origin or primary language(s). However, one participant missed identifying his/her gender, and the same number missed identifying their visible minority and ability/disability statuses. Of all the missing information, 4 out of 132 (3.03%) missed identifying their sexual orientation. Apart from this missing information, all the
participants responded to all the questions on my questionnaire. Therefore I report no other missing information. Apart from missing values, I found no other anomalies in the data.

**Descriptive Statistical Procedures**

I calculated the mean and standard deviation for both the mainstream female, mainstream male and minoritized groups for every item on the questionnaire. Then, I eliminated the questions about philosophical beliefs and questions about the purposes of TPA because, as I explain later, they were less relevant to the construct of fairness as operationalized in this study. Therefore, I analyzed only those questionnaire items specifically related to the four types of fairness: outcome, informational, procedural and interpersonal fairness identified as my study’s conceptual framework. Table 9 presents this information:

Table 9

*Item Level Mean and Standard Deviations Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item on questionnaire</th>
<th>Mainstream females</th>
<th>Mainstream males</th>
<th>Minoritized teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome fairness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Rating received on TPA*</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Agreement with rating</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural fairness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Notification received within 20 days</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Fair pre-observation meeting</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Fair classroom observation session</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Fair post-observation session</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Fair summative report</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. No singular weakness or flaw unduly influenced rating assigned</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item on questionnaire</td>
<td>Mainstream females</td>
<td>Mainstream males</td>
<td>Minoritized teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Fair review of annual learning plan</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Observation debriefing detailed and comprehensive</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Observation debriefing reflected use of multiple data sources in conducting TPA</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Feedback was specific</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Feedback was constructive</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Involved in a dialogue about performance</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informational fairness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Regardless of day appraised outcome would have been the same</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Appraisal experience was consistent with how administrator conducted with other teachers</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Overall characterization of relationship with administrator as trusting</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Administrator motivated to protect relationship</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Administrator motivated to nurture relationship</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Could express opinions and feelings about professional practice openly and honestly</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Could work with administrator to identify problems</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Could work with administrator to solve problems</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As presented in Chapter Four, to help me better understand any relationship between teachers’ demographic characteristics and their self-reported ratings obtained on the TPA, I compared the rating each of the three groups of teachers received. I then compared the extent to which the three groups agreed with each of the four possible ratings received.

**Inferential Statistical Procedures**

**Exploratory factor analysis.**

To explore the structure of the questionnaire which asked teachers about aspects of fairness of TPA, I conducted exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Prior to conducting EFA I needed to do make three changes to my data. First, since, in my questionnaire’s cover letter, I had invited participants not to answer questions with which they were not comfortable and provided respondents with the option of selecting ‘not sure/no opinion’, I ended up with 63
missing values. To solve this problem, and as the first change, I assigned all the ‘not sure/no opinion’ responses with a value of three along the five point Likert scale. As the second change, I eliminated two respondents who missed answering any of the questions related to purpose. These steps resulted in increasing the number of participants from 51 to 114. Finally, since, I was interested in identifying only the factors related to organizational justice (outcome fairness, informational fairness, procedural fairness and interpersonal fairness), I eliminated questions 15-19; related to exploring teachers’ perceptions about the purposes of TPA as identified in the TPA policy and question #14; related to investigating if teachers believed that some form of TPA should exist.

I examined correlational relationships between items using Pearson’s r. I noticed that many items correlated with items grouped under the same heading. Table 10 presents only the marked correlations where Pearson’s $r = .60 - .80$ and the high correlations where Pearson’s $r = .80 – 1.00$:

**Table 10**

*Correlation Analysis Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item on questionnaire</th>
<th>Marked correlation $r = .600 - .800$</th>
<th>High correlation $r = .801 – 1.00$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[21] Fair pre-observation meeting</td>
<td>22, 23, 24, 26, 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Fair post-observation session</td>
<td>21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 12, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Fair summative report</td>
<td>13, 21, 22, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 12, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Fair review of annual learning plan</td>
<td>23, 24, 26, 27, 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Observation debriefing detailed and comprehensive</td>
<td>21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 38, 39,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item on questionnaire</td>
<td>Marked correlation $r = .600 - .800$</td>
<td>High correlation $r = .801 - 1.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Observation debriefing reflected use of multiple data sources in conducting TPA</td>
<td>23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 36, 38, 39, 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Feedback was specific</td>
<td>26, 27, 29, 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Feedback was constructive</td>
<td>22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Involved in a dialogue about performance</td>
<td>22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 36, 38, 39, 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedural fairness**

| 22. Fair classroom observation session | 21, 23, 24, 30, 33, 35, 36, 37 |  |
| 31. No singular weakness or flaw unduly influenced rating assigned | 23, 24, 33, 39, 40,  |  |
| 33. Appraisal experience was consistent with how administrator conducted with other teachers | 22, 31, 12, 38, 39, 40, 41 |  |

**Interpersonal fairness**

<p>| 34. Overall characterization of relationship with administrator as trusting | 22, 23, 24, 29, 30, 33, 39, 42, 43, 44 | 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41 |
| 35. Administrator motivated to protect relationship | 13, 23, 24, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 33, 22, 29 | 34, 36, 41 |
| 36. Administrator motivated to nurture relationship | 23, 24, 29, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 13, 26, 27, 30, 21, 22 | 34, 35, 39 |
| 37. Could express opinions and feelings about professional practice openly and honestly | 23, 35, 36, 38, 39, 43, 44 22, 30 | 34, 40, 41 |
| 38. Could work with administrator to identify problems | 23, 26, 27, 29, 30, 35, 36, 37, 41, 42, 43, 24, 33, 44 | 34, 39, 40 |
| 39. Could work with administrator to solve problems | 23, 26, 27, 34, 42, 43, 44, 33, 24, 31, 41 | 34, 35, 36, 37, 38 |
| 40. Administrator and teacher strove to understand each other regardless of differences | 23, 27, 33, 24, 29, 30, 42, 43, 44, 31 | 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item on questionnaire</th>
<th>Marked correlation $r = .600 - .800$</th>
<th>High correlation $r = .801 - 1.00$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. Overall comfort level disclosing most issues with administrator</td>
<td>35, 36, 38, 44, 39, 23, 24, 29, 33</td>
<td>34, 37, 40, 42, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Comfort disclosing opinions and feelings related to professional practice</td>
<td>34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44</td>
<td>37, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Comfortable disclosing some personal information</td>
<td>34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 38,</td>
<td>41, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Comfortable disclosing very personal information</td>
<td>34, 37, 38, 40, 41, 35, 39,</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. No items correlated markedly or highly for items 3, 9 or 21, so they were removed from this table.*

I scanned the significant values in Table 10 and report the highest item as .88 with none greater than .90. This confirmed that singularity was not likely to be a problem with these data. I report the determinant as 5.77E-014, which is 0.00058, greater than the necessary value of 0.00001. This suggested that the items correlated well and that none of the correlation coefficients was particularly large. I report the Kaiser-Myer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy at .932, “which is superb” (Field, 2005, p. 6 ¶ 1). These results “increased my confidence that factor analysis was appropriate for these data” (Field, 2005, p. 6 ¶ 1). I ran Bartlett’s test of specificity to ensure that I would be able to see relationships among the variables. With a value reported at sig. = .000, less than the alpha I set at .05, I realized that I would be able to see relationships among the variables and that this was not an identity matrix. I then conducted correlation analysis of items # 20 – 44 on the questionnaire to explore if EFA was an appropriate technique to reduce the number of variables to a manageable number.

Taken together, the data analytic techniques I conducted confirmed that EFA was the next technique to conduct to allow me to answer my first research question. Thompson and Daniel (1996) explain that EFA is used to reduce complex variables to a simpler factor structure.
I chose to use EFA since “unlike CFA [confirmatory factor analysis], EFA isolates factor solutions without consideration of the theoretical expectations of the researcher, even when such expectations are available” (p. 198). To explore the structure of my questionnaire which asked teachers about the salient characteristics of fairness related to TPA I conducted EFA. I did this by selecting the principal axis factoring method and oblimin as the oblique rotation method and used scree plot. Following Kaiser’s recommendation, I extracted factor solutions by selecting the factors with eigenvalues greater than one; the default option in SPSS to produce the most parsimonious and interpretable factor loadings. In other words, I wanted to see which items clustered under each factor.

The first time I conducted EFA with 24 variables I chose an unlimited number of factors. Four factors were extracted. These four factors accounted for 66.54% of the total variance. After rotation, the four factors accounted for 53.50%, 7.28%, 3.24% and 2.48% respectively. In terms of communalities, item# 20; teachers believed they received notification about TPA within 20 days, had a very low communality (.19). Since I had created the items on the questionnaire with three dimensions in mind; informational fairness, procedural fairness and interpersonal fairness, I looked at the results of the pattern matrix to learn if the items that clustered made conceptual sense. Table 11 presents this:
### Table 11

**Pattern Matrix for 4-Factor Solution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. Comfortable disclosing some personal information</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Overall comfort level disclosing most issues with administrator</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Comfort disclosing opinions and feelings related to professional practice</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Administrator and teacher strove to understand each other regardless of differences</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Could express opinions and feelings about professional practice openly and honestly</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Overall characterization of relationship with administrator as trusting</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Comfortable disclosing very personal information</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Could work with administrator to solve problems</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Administrator motivated to protect relationship</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Could work with administrator to identify problems</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Administrator motivated to nurture relationship</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Appraisal experience was consistent with how administrator conducted with other teachers</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Feedback was specific</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Observation debriefing detailed and comprehensive</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Feedback was constructive</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given my interest in examining which items related to which dimension of fairness, I decided this factor analysis would not be appropriate conceptually. I examined the scree plot, as shown in Figure 2 to explore whether other factor solutions would be possible and more interpretable for my study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Observation debriefing reflected use of multiple data sources in conducting TPA</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Involved in a dialogue about performance</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Fair review of annual learning plan</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Fair pre-observation meeting</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Fair classroom observation session</td>
<td></td>
<td>.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Fair summative report</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Fair post-observation session</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. No singular weakness or flaw unduly influenced rating assigned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Regardless of day appraised outcome would have been the same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Notification received within 20 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Scree plot.

Figure 2 shows that it would be possible to extract only three factors since after three the curve begins to tail off. I requested an alternative factor analysis.

The second time I conducted EFA with 24 variables I restricted my result to three factors. These three factors accounted for 63.84% of the total variance. After rotation, the three factors accounted for 53.42%, 7.22%, 3.22% respectively. This time, in terms of communalities, all items contributed to the proposed factor structure. Once again this time, item# 20; teachers believed they received notification about TPA within 20 days, had a very low communality (.11). Since I had created the items on the questionnaire with three dimensions in mind; informational
fairness, procedural fairness and interpersonal fairness, I looked at the results of the pattern matrix presented in Table 13 (see pp. 123-125). The first factor shows a strong association between the items on the questionnaire that relate to interpersonal fairness. The second factor identifies the questionnaire items related to informational fairness. The third factor groups all of the items on the questionnaire which are associated with procedural fairness.

The results of EFA confirmed that items # 20-44 on the questionnaire measure three dimensions of fairness; interpersonal, informational and procedural. As presented in Chapter Two, the literature on organizational justice identifies outcome fairness as another dimension of fairness. I examined the items on the questionnaire that relate to this dimension. Only one item on my questionnaire; question #13; agreement with the rating assigned, used the Likert scale like questions 13-44. I retained this single item and used it in further analyses.

EFA led me to rethink six items which I thought related to procedural fairness. Procedural fairness focuses on the means by which teachers obtain decisions about their performance. It concerns teachers’ reactions to “the procedures used” (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 211) and the means by which they obtain these (Byrne & Cropanzano, 2001, Greenberg, 1990; Levanthal, 1980; Levanthal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1975) or the “appropriateness of [the] decision process” (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 220). It “focuses on the thoroughness or adequacy of the information provided” (Gilliland & Langdon, 1998, p. 220). However, EFA revealed that these six items were actually associated with the informational fairness factor which relates to the perceived fairness of the information used to explain an outcome or procedures used. In other words, informational fairness is concerned with the explanations provided to people that convey information about why procedures were used in a certain way or why outcomes were distributed in a certain fashion (Colquitt et al., 2001, p. 426).
The data-driven EFA solutions allowed me to see that six items on the questionnaire were related more accurately to the definitions for informational justice than for procedural justice as I had predicted initially. I present this in Table 12:

**Table 12**

*Changes of Thinking about Items Related to the Informational Fairness Factor*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>My initial thought</th>
<th>Factor analysis revealed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q25-Fair review of Annual Learning Plan</td>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26-Detailed and comprehensive observation debriefing</td>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27-Observation debriefing reflected use of multiple data sources</td>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28-Feedback was specific</td>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29-Feedback was constructive</td>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30-Involved in a dialogue about performance</td>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>Informational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except for these six items, the other 18 items loaded on the factors I anticipated. As described in Chapter Three, I checked the internal consistency between the items within each factor. I present these results in the next section.

*Reliability.*

I investigated the internal consistency of each composite variable using Cronbach’s alpha. A value of .7 or above indicates a reliable composite. I report these results in Chapter Four.
ANOVA.

To answer my second research question, I wanted to determine if there was a statistically significant difference among the perceptions of mainstream female, mainstream male and minoritized teachers about fairness with TPA as viewed through the four dimensions of fairness; outcome, procedural, informational and interpersonal. I ran ANOVA using the three groups; mainstream females, mainstream males and minoritized people as the independent variables against the four composite dependent variables: outcome fairness, informational fairness, procedural fairness and interpersonal fairness. This allowed me to examine differences among mainstream females, mainstream males and minoritized teachers’ perceptions of TPA. I present these results in Chapter Four.

Analyses of Interview Data

Having transcribed each interview I read each one many times. This allowed me to get both a sense of how each teacher experienced TPA and to identify the preliminary themes which emerged. I was overwhelmed by the richness of the data. The teachers’ stories caused me to become aware of issues not directly related to my research questions. Teachers’ criticism of the TPA policy as misaligned with the current practices of assessing students in Ontario and these teachers’ desires to have professional development as opposed to appraisals were two such examples. It was challenging to restrict myself to the research questions.

The four dimensions of fairness were the a priori codes, in other words, the codes developed before examining the data. However, with such rich data, especially as they related to interpersonal fairness, since I wanted to remain open to what emerged, I also used inductive codes, in other words, codes that I developed by directly examining the data. To do this, as a first step, I followed Kvale’s (1996) five analytic methods framed around:
1. meaning condensation, 
2. meaning categorization, 
3. narrative structuring, 
4. meaning interpretation, and 
5. generating meaning through ad hoc methods.

Kvale’s methods proved useful. I condensed the meaning of teachers’ experiences, as determined by my conceptual framework. I categorized this meaning within the four factors, or four dimensions of fairness. I structured the meaning of their experiences in terms of the what, who, when, why and how. Taken together, these analytic methods enabled me to interpret the content of teachers’ experiences within the four part foci I had. Finally, I used my recollection of interviewees’ body language and tone of voice to allow me to create more meaning about their experiences with TPA. Then, I used Padilla’s (1991) concept modeling method for organizing my data for final analysis. According to Padilla, one way to explain a situation is to identify various assumptions contained in the data and organize them into a coherent whole. In the concept modeling method, assertions contained in the data were fundamental elements for analysis. First, I identified the assertions in the data that related to each of the four main concepts, namely, teachers’ experiences with outcome, informational, procedural and interpersonal fairness. Next, I reduced long statements from interview transcripts and excerpts from documents to short paraphrases, and entered these data into appropriate cells of the matrix. After I observed how data were arrayed across the six teachers, I highlighted areas of convergence and divergence among them. For the interpersonal concept, initially, I examined only my data using teachers’ experiences related to trust and their comfort with disclosure as the foci. The first way I approached my analyses of the data was to use the traditional linear approach. This meant that I used some literature on the topics of trust and comfort with disclosure to analyze the teachers’ responses to the interviews questions as one way of analyzing
these data. Having analyzed these data, I realized that another, unanticipated, theme seemed to be emerging. This theme related to the mistreatment of teachers. Having identified this theme, I wondered if there was any literature available that addressed it. I was fortunate to have discovered that the Blases (2003) had developed a typology related to mistreatment of teachers. I present my findings in Chapter Four and discuss them in Chapter Five.

I found the qualitative aspect of my study challenging for two reasons. First, I was consciously aware of my struggle to put aside my own biases. Personally, I had hoped that with years of official policies in place in Canada, far fewer and less overt manifestations of racism and homophobia such as discrimination would have presented. The second reason I found this aspect of my study challenging was because I am more comfortable thinking deductively than inductively. Taken together, I invested many days in the interpretative qualitative approach during which time I sought to understand how participants perceived their experiences with TPA. I collected the interview data and used an inductive strategy to produce a description and analysis of recurring themes. As I worked to do this, I was guided by Merriam’s (2002) advice:

In attempting to understand the meaning a phenomenon has for those involved, qualitative researchers build toward theory from observations and intuitive understandings gleaned from being in the field. Typically, findings inductively derived from the data in a qualitative study are in the form of themes, categories, typologies, concepts, tentative hypotheses, and even substantive theory.

(Merriam, 2002, p. 5)

To address this concern, I rationalized that from the participants’ perspectives these teachers’ performance appraisal experiences were likely to be viewed as quite significant experiences. In addition, from my perspective, I endeavoured to carefully analyze the data by consciously putting aside my own biases; allowing the data to tell the story with me as their conduit. In the end, I was thankful for the struggle because as presented in Chapter Four, I was able to use minoritized teachers’ stories and some available literature to identify a typology of practices
about mistreatment of teachers and the consequential effects endured by the minoritized teachers I studied.
Chapter Four: Results

In this chapter, I present the results of my investigation of elementary teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA as they relate to my research questions.

What Were the Salient Characteristics of Teachers’ Perceptions of Fairness Related to TPA?

As described in Chapter Three, when I restricted factor analysis of the items on the questionnaire to three factors, as Table 13 shows, my second attempt at EFA allowed me to identify three of the four dimensions of organizational justice: interpersonal, informational, procedural fairness:

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Matrix for 4-Factor Solution</th>
<th>Interpersonal fairness</th>
<th>Informational fairness</th>
<th>Procedural fairness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. Comfortable disclosing some personal information</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Overall comfort level disclosing most issues with administrator</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Comfort disclosing opinions and feelings related to professional practice</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Administrator and teacher strove to understand each other regardless of differences</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Could express opinions and feelings about professional practice openly and honestly</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Overall characterization of relationship with administrator as trusting</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Interpersonal fairness</td>
<td>Informational fairness</td>
<td>Procedural fairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Comfortable disclosing very personal information</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Administrator motivated to protect relationship</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Could work with administrator to solve problems</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Could work with administrator to identify problems</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Administrator motivated to nurture relationship</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Appraisal experience was consistent with how administrator conducted with other teachers</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Regardless of day appraised outcome would have been the same</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Feedback was specific</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Observation debriefing detailed and comprehensive</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Observation debriefing reflected use of multiple data sources in conducting TPA</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Feedback was constructive</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Involved in a dialogue about performance</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Fair review of annual learning plan</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Fair classroom observation session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Fair summative report</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Fair post-observation session</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. No singular weakness or flaw unduly influenced rating assigned</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the three factors I extracted, using the single item on the questionnaire, I created the outcome fairness variable. Taken together, these four factors were the salient characteristics of teachers’ perceptions of fairness related to TPA and are the factors, or the four dimensions of fairness, which frame my study conceptually as defined in the Chapter One under the appropriate section of “Definitions of Terms”. These results allowed me to answer my first research question. In other words, the salient characteristics of teachers’ perceptions of fairness related to TPA were; outcome, informational, procedural and interpersonal fairness. These factors have high internal consistency as measured by Cronbach’s alpha as presented in the following section.

**Reliability**

Cronbach's alpha is an index of reliability associated with the variation accounted for by the true score of any "underlying construct" (Hatcher, 1994). I had four dimensions of the construct of fairness that I sought to measure; outcome, informational, procedural and interpersonal fairness. Table 14 identifies the number of items from the questionnaire, the item number(s) on the questionnaire and the Cronbach’s alpha for factor (dimension of fairness). I present the reliability of the items on the questionnaire as they relate to each of the four dimensions of fairness in Table 14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interpersonal fairness</th>
<th>Informational fairness</th>
<th>Procedural fairness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Fair pre-observation meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Notification received within 20 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Question item number(s) from questionnaire</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 31</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* = * cannot be calculated with only 1 item.

As shown in Table 14, I identify one item related to outcome fairness, six items related to informational fairness, six items associated with procedural fairness and 13 items concerned with interpersonal fairness. In terms of Cronbach’s alpha, the widely acceptable value in the social sciences is 0.70. Obviously, with only one item on the questionnaire related to outcome fairness, I am not able to calculate Cronbach’s alpha for this dimension of fairness. However, with six items on the questionnaire related to informational fairness, I report this value at 0.91, a very high reliability index for those items. In addition, I report a value of 0.87 for the six items related to procedural fairness which is also considered high. Finally, I report a very high reliability index of 0.96 for the 13 questionnaire items related to interpersonal fairness. In summary, for the three composites, I report the internal consistency among the items within each factor was exceptionally high. This suggests a high level of reliability of participants’ answers to related items on the questionnaire. In other words, a respondent who disagreed on one item often disagreed on other related items and vice-versa.
In summary, I used these four factors or dimensions of fairness as the composites to conduct further analyses, using inferential and descriptive statistical procedures on these data to answer my second research question as presented in the next section.

**How Did Teachers’ Demographic Characteristics Interact With Their Perceptions of Fairness With TPA?**

Using the three factors, or three dimensions of fairness that emerged from the EFA, and the one factor (outcome fairness) I created as explained in Chapter Three as the organizer, I present the results of my quantitative analyses of the data I collected using the methodology I described in Chapter Three.

**Investigating Significant Differences between Mainstream Female, Mainstream Male and Minoritized Groups**

I created composite scores by calculating the mean of all items contributing to each of the three factors, or the three dimensions of fairness. I used these composite scores for each factor to conduct ANOVAs to evaluate the hypothesis that there would be statistically significant differences among mainstream females, mainstream males and minoritized teachers in terms of their perceptions about outcome, procedural, informational and interpersonal fairness. Table 15 provides the results of the one way ANOVA means and standard deviations for the three groups: mainstream females, mainstream males and the minoritized teachers.
Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations for the Three Groups for Four Dimensions of Fairness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Outcome fairness</th>
<th>Procedural fairness</th>
<th>Informational fairness</th>
<th>Interpersonal fairness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream females</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.00 (1.15)</td>
<td>4.05 (0.76)</td>
<td>3.46 (1.01)</td>
<td>3.67 (.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream males</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.72 (1.45)</td>
<td>3.69 (1.06)</td>
<td>3.01 (1.30)</td>
<td>2.96 (1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoritized teachers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.24 (1.60)</td>
<td>3.38 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.91 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.93 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.68 (1.41)</td>
<td>3.74 (0.96)</td>
<td>3.20 (1.11)</td>
<td>3.30 (1.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome fairness.

Examination of the sample statistics results presented in Table 15 shows that in terms of outcome fairness, mainstream females appear to have a numerically higher mean score than the other two groups. Minoritized teachers appear to have the lowest scores. To investigate whether mainstream females, mainstream males and minoritized teachers had differences in the agreement with the rating assigned, I conducted a one-way ANOVA. The independent variable was the three groups: mainstream females, mainstream males and minoritized teachers. The dependent variable was the single item; agreement with rating as the item related to outcome. The ANOVA was significant, F(2, 129) = 4.16, p = .02. The strength of the relationship among the three groups and outcome fairness, as assessed by $\eta^2$ was weak with differences among the three groups accounting for 6.15% of the variance related to outcome fairness.

Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means. Since the test of homogeneity of variance significance value is .00, which is less than the p value set at
.05, for outcome fairness, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated. Therefore, I conducted posthoc comparisons with the use of Dunnett’s C test, a test that does not assume equal variances among the three groups. When the range between the lower bound and upper bound contains “0”, there is said to be no significant difference between the groups. Table 16 shows that in terms of outcome fairness, there are no significant differences between mainstream females and mainstream males, no significant differences between mainstream males and minoritized teachers but that there are significant differences between mainstream females and minoritized teachers. Specifically, mainstream females tended to agree more that the outcome of TPA was fair than minoritized teachers (MD = .76).

**Table 16**

*Dunnett’s C Test of Differences among Mainstream females, Mainstream males and Minoritized*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Lower bound</th>
<th>Upper bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome fairness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream females</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoritized teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream males</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoritized teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Procedural fairness.*

Examination of the sample statistics results presented in Table 15 shows that in terms of procedural fairness, mainstream females appear to have a numerically higher mean score than the other two groups. Minoritized teachers appear to have the lowest scores. To investigate whether mainstream females, mainstream males and minoritized teachers had differences in their
perceptions of procedural fairness, I conducted a one-way ANOVA. The independent variable was the three groups: mainstream females, mainstream males and minoritized teachers. The dependent variable was the composite mean score of the six items related to procedural fairness on the questionnaire. The ANOVA was significant, \( F(2, 129) = 7.22, p = .00 \). The strength of the relationship among the three groups and outcome fairness, as assessed by \( \eta^2 \) was weak with differences among the three groups accounting for 10.21% of the variance related to procedural fairness.

Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means. Since the test of homogeneity of variance significance value is .01, which is less than the \( p \) value set at .05, for procedural fairness, the assumption of variances was violated. Therefore, I conducted posthoc comparisons with the use of Dunnett’s C test, a test that does not assume equal variances among the three groups. When the range between the lower bound and upper bound contains “0”, there is said to be no significant difference between the groups. Table 17 reveals that in terms of procedural fairness, there are no significant differences between mainstream females and mainstream males, no significant differences between mainstream males and minoritized teachers but that there are significant differences between mainstream females and minoritized teachers. Specifically, mainstream females tended to agree more that the procedures use to conduct TPA were fair than minoritized teachers (MD = .67).
Table 17

\textit{Dunnett’s C Test of Differences among Mainstream females, Mainstream males and Minoritized}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Lower bound</th>
<th>Upper bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedural fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream females</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream males</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoritized teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream males</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoritized teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Informational fairness.}

Examination of the sample statistics results presented in Table 15 shows that in terms of informational fairness, mainstream females appear to have a numerically higher mean score than the other two groups. Minoritized teachers appear to have the lowest scores. To investigate whether mainstream females, mainstream males and minoritized teachers had differences among their perceptions of informational fairness, I conducted a one-way ANOVA. The independent variable was the three groups: mainstream females, mainstream males and minoritized teachers. The dependent variable was the composite mean score of the six items related to informational fairness on the questionnaire. The ANOVA was significant, $F(2, 129) = 3.95, p = .02$. The strength of the relationship among the three groups and outcome fairness, as assessed by $\eta^2$ was weak with differences among the three groups accounting for 5.85% of the variance related to informational fairness.

Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means. Since the test of homogeneity of variance significance value is .52, which is greater than the p value set
at .05, for informational fairness, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not violated. Therefore, I conducted posthoc comparisons with the use of Scheffé test, a test that assumes equal variances among the three groups to evaluate pairwise differences among the means. Table 18 displays these results:

**Table 18**

*Scheffé Test of Differences among Mainstream females, Mainstream males and Minoritized*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informational fairness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream females - Mainstream males</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoritized teachers</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream males - Minoritized teachers</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of informational fairness, Table 18 shows there are no significant differences between mainstream females and mainstream males, no significant differences between mainstream males and minoritized teachers but that there are significant differences between mainstream females and minoritized teachers. Specifically, mainstream females tended to agree more that the information used to conduct TPA was fair than minoritized teachers (MD = .56)

**Interpersonal fairness.**

Examination of the sample statistics results presented in Table 15 shows that in terms of interpersonal fairness, mainstream females appear to have a numerically higher mean score than the other two groups. Minoritized teachers appear to have the lowest scores. To investigate whether mainstream females, mainstream males and minoritized teachers had differences in their perceptions about interpersonal fairness, I conducted a one-way ANOVA. The independent
variable was the three groups: mainstream females, mainstream males and minoritized teachers. The dependent variable was the composite mean score of the 13 items related to interpersonal fairness on the questionnaire. The ANOVA was significant, $F(2, 129) = 8.70, p = .00$. The strength of the relationship among the three groups and interpersonal fairness, as assessed by $\eta^2$, was weak with differences among the three groups accounting for 10.12% of the variance related to interpersonal fairness.

Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means. Since the test of homogeneity of variance significance value is .01, which is less than the $p$ value set at .05, for interpersonal fairness, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated. Therefore, I conducted posthoc comparisons with the use of Dunnett’s C test, a test that does not assume equal variances among the three groups. In terms of interpersonal fairness, Table 19 reveals there are no significant differences between mainstream females and mainstream males, no significant differences between mainstream males and minoritized teachers but that there are significant differences between mainstream females and minoritized teachers. Specifically, mainstream females tended to agree more that their perceptions about the interpersonal dimension of TPA was fair than minoritized teachers (MD = .74).
Table 19

Dunnett’s C Test of Differences among Mainstream females, Mainstream males and Minoritized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>95% Confidence interval</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean difference</td>
<td>Lower bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream females</td>
<td>Mainstream males</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minoritized teachers</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream males</td>
<td>Minoritized teachers</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the results of ANOVA revealed consistently significant differences between the mainstream female and minoritized groups for each of the four dimensions of fairness. The results also show no statistically significant differences between the mainstream male and mainstream female groups or between the mainstream male and minoritized groups in terms of these dimensions of fairness. In terms of the final analysis, I wondered about the rating each group received and each groups’ perception about this rating. To investigate this, I conducted cross-tabulation analysis to compare the mainstream female and minoritized groups.

Investigating the Rating Received and Perceptions about the Rating Received

As presented in Table 1 (see p. 78), two items on the questionnaire allowed me to investigate how the mainstream female and minoritized groups of teachers perceived the fairness about TPA in terms of outcome fairness. The first item, question #12 on the questionnaire, asks participants to identify the rating they received and the second item, question #13 asks them to identify the extent to which they agreed with the rating assigned. Since, as described in Chapter Three, unlike the other three dimensions of fairness, the outcome fairness dimension uses two
different scales, one for question #12 and another for question #13, it was necessary to present the results for each question separately under the subheadings, rating received and agreement with rating:

**Rating received.**

In the section titled ‘Definition of Terms’ in Chapter One, I provide the definitions for the ratings: exemplary, good, satisfactory and unsatisfactory using the language provided in the TPA policy. I note here that ratings of exemplary and good are perceived to be favourable ratings whereas ratings of satisfactory and unsatisfactory are considered unfavourable. If the value of four represents the highest possible rating (exemplary) and one represents the lowest possible rating (unsatisfactory) mainstream females (Mdf=3.90, SD = .64) appeared to have received higher ratings on TPA than minoritized teachers (Mdf=3.08, SD = .74). Table 20 presents the cross-tabulation results for rating received on TPA for the mainstream female and minoritized groups:

**Table 20**

*Cross-tabulation Results for Rating on TPA for Mainstream females and Minoritized*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating on TPA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th></th>
<th>Good</th>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th></th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>Mainstream females</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoritized teachers</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41.44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44.14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 20 shows, over 90% of mainstream females received a rating of exemplary or good, compared to only 77% of the minoritized teachers who received such favourable ratings.
Just over 13% of mainstream females received ratings of satisfactory or unsatisfactory, compared to 24% of minoritized teachers who received such unfavourable ratings. It is noteworthy that the minoritized group had a higher percentage of respondents who had a rating of satisfactory and even one respondent in the minoritized group had a rating of unsatisfactory.

**Agreement with rating.**

If the value of five represents the highest level of agreement; strongly agree, four is agree, three is neutral or not sure/no opinion, two is disagree and one is strongly disagree, mainstream females (Mdf=4.00, SD = 1.15) appeared to have agreed more with the rating assigned on TPA than minoritized teachers (Mdf=3.24, SD = 1.60). Table 21 shows the extent to which each group agrees with the rating assigned:

**Table 21**

*Cross-Tabulation Results for Mainstream Female, Mainstream Male and Minoritized Regarding Rating and Agreement with Rating on TPA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Rating on TPA</th>
<th>Agreement with TPA rating received</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Not sure / No opinion</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream female Exemplary</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoritized</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyses of the cross-tabulation in Table 21 reveal that when teachers, regardless of their mainstream or minoritized status received ratings of exemplary, they tended to in some way agree with the assigned rating. When they received a rating of good, however, 25% of mainstream females in some way disagreed, compared with almost 40% of minoritized teachers who felt this way. When teachers received a rating of satisfactory, 60% of mainstream females compared to only 40% of minoritized teachers in some way agreed. For minoritized teachers, 100% in some way disagreed, and specifically, 40% disagreed and 60% strongly disagreed when they received a rating of satisfactory. In contrast, only 40% of mainstream females who received such a rating in some way disagreed. In addition, the only teacher between the groups who was assigned a rating of unsatisfactory was a minoritized teacher. This minoritized teacher strongly disagreed with this rating.

In summary, my second research question guided my investigation about how teachers’ demographic characteristics interact with their perceptions of fairness about TPA. The analyses of the quantitative data reveal significant differences between mainstream females and minoritized teachers with respect to all four of the dimensions of fairness. It also revealed there were no significant differences between neither the mainstream female and mainstream male groups or between the mainstream male and minoritized groups. It is also clear that minoritized
teachers tended to receive less favourable ratings than mainstream females and that minoritized teachers tended to agree less often with the rating assigned to them than mainstream females. These results are further supported by my analyses of the findings which emerged from my interviews with three mainstream females and three minoritized teachers. I use these findings to answer my third research question. I present these findings in the following section.

How Did TPA Impact Mainstream Female and Minoritized Teachers?

My purpose for collecting qualitative data was to obtain additional information to enable me answer my third research question. These data allowed me to look epistemologically at issues of justice as teachers’ subjective experiences instead of an externally-determined phenomenon with a single interpretation. It was the qualitative aspect of this study which gave voice to the teachers. These teachers’ own explanations of their experiences with TPA and the contexts they faced helped me to identify the importance of subjectivity in teachers’ perceptions of justice.

I used the following four subheadings: outcome, informational, procedural and interpersonal fairness as the dimensions of organizational justice and as the conceptual framework to focus my study. I used this conceptual framework as the coding scheme to analyze my qualitative data.

Outcome Fairness

Primarily, responses to questions 1-5 on Part B of the interview script (Appendix C) provided my qualitative data. With respect to the follow-up interviews, as Table 22 illustrates, Darla, Diana and Darlene self-identified as members of what I label ‘mainstream teachers’, as defined in Chapter One, and all three received a rating of exemplary. In contrast, all three
minoritized teachers, as I also define in Chapter One, Marla, Max, and Marvin, received a rating of satisfactory.

**Table 22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>VM</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>Rating assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Legend: VM=visible minority (non-Caucasian), SO = sexual orientation (non-heterosexual), PL= primary language CO = country of origin (other than Canada).

In terms of my analyses of the qualitative data, all three mainstream teachers agreed with the rating assigned: Darla stated, “I received the exemplary rating which was the highest one. I felt it was fair. I was quite happy with that” and, “I think I deserve what I got.” Diana responded, “Yes” and Darlene said, “I received a very high rating and I was pleased with it.” Of all the mainstream teachers, Darlene makes the most explicit link between an expected outcome and the actual rating received when she says:

> I put a lot of thought and planning into it [the lesson] and when I saw what was going to be evaluated, I made sure that something for each of those categories would be presented. So given the fact of my preparation and thoughtfulness and preparedness and the way the lesson did play itself out, I think that I warranted the rating given the preparation.
In contrast, all three minoritized teachers expressed disagreement with the rating each received. For example, when asked if she agreed Marla said, “No, not really.” Max did not “feel it revealed an accurate picture of [him] at all”, and although Marvin admitted to having “some weaknesses as a teacher”, looking at the information provided, he did not agree with the rating. In fact, Marvin reported, “I thought it was one of my better lesson plans of all time and I had the kids working in small groups, I had them working individually, I did whole class teaching” and “the kids worked so well.”

Each of the minoritized teachers talked about the psychological consequences related to the outcomes received. For example, Marla’s sadness is expressed when she recounted the administrator asking why she was crying and her frustration is revealed when she told me that she had to call the union which she hoped would provide her with guidance to deal with what she perceived as an unfair judgment about her performance. Marla also conveys frustration when she reported having taken time off work to stay home when the administrator refused to remove the reference to Marla’s unwillingness to participate in assemblies after Marla presented evidence that she had participated in assemblies. Max reported feeling very angry about the number of inaccuracies presented in his evaluation and Marvin revealed that he suffered severe depression as a result of the evaluation he could not understand.

In addition, minoritized teachers compared their experiences with other teachers. For example, Marla reported that other visible minorities “felt that this [poor outcome on performance appraisals] was happening because she wasn’t of such and such kind of race.” Max questioned, “So every other teacher is getting an ‘exceptional’ and I got ‘satisfactory’ and I thought, something is really funny here, like we don’t have these brilliant incredibly exceptional teachers and then we have Max down here as satisfactory. So when I got that I said there is really
something wrong.” Finally, Marvin stated “I have no doubt that it [the performance appraisal] wouldn’t have been done the same way with other members [teachers].”

Reporting teachers’ perceptions about the congruence between expected and received results, Darla reported, “Well, when you look at all the things they look at to evaluate you, everything that I was supposed to do I did. Like the planning, the execution of the lesson and the way I interacted with the children. Everything that I should have done, I did well.” She credited herself with having done “it properly.” She continued to say that the TPA “just helped reinforce what [she] was doing.” In contrast, however, the three minoritized teachers I interviewed reacted to the incongruence between the rating anticipated and the one received. In Marla’s view, “the lesson went very well” … “the students were involved and the lesson was well done and well written.” In reaction Marla felt, this rating did not reflect her as a teacher. I report Max having reacted with fury to the rating assigned to him. He said, “I was expecting either a good or an exceptional [exemplary]. I worked really, really hard on the portfolio and the day that she [the administrator] came to observe me I felt that everything went well, the class was managed well. The lesson was intact. Everything went well.” Similarly, Marvin stated, “I’m pretty sure that I did everything right. I know the lesson plan was good and I know that I did a good job that day.” In reaction Marvin reported, “I felt like it [the appraisal] had nothing to do with my teaching ability.”

In terms of teachers’ reactions to and perceptions about the validity or dependability of administrators’ judgments, Darla responded favourably, everything she was supposed to she did well and the TPA rating reinforced what she was doing. In contrast, Diana questioned the administrator’s willingness to go into the detail necessary to conduct a thorough performance appraisal. Darlene reacted by stating, “I don’t think it really gauged what happened”, claiming
that she “felt a little bit let down that he [the administrator] looked at the lesson overall instead of looking at the specifics of the lesson to be able to give [her] feedback.” Marla believed the TPA to have been a waste of time and expresses frustration that at least if she were going to be assigned a rating of satisfactory, “the appraisal should come out with some kind of a solution.” For example, [talking from the administrator’s perspective] “these things I have seen in you and I want these things to be fixed.” This did not happen for Marla. Marvin’s reaction to the administrator’s judgment resulted in severe depression. He reported, “I was …depressed at that point because it drove me crazy and I felt like I couldn’t do anything.” He stated, “if she [the administrator] had just focused on what she saw in class there was no way she could have given me the rating she wanted to give me.” Max reacted angrily to the administrator’s judgment. Max justified reacting this way by citing a number of inaccuracies the administrator used upon which to base this rating: the number of additional qualification courses he had completed, the degrees he possessed and the number of workshops in which he participated annually. Max’s reaction confirmed the importance of examining issues related to informational fairness which I take up in the next section of this chapter. Table 23 presents a summary of the information I just described.
Table 23

*Interview Participants, Ratings, Agreement with Ratings and Reactions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating assigned</th>
<th>Agreement with rating</th>
<th>Reactions to congruence between anticipated and assigned rating</th>
<th>Reactions about validity or dependability of administrator’s judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mainstream</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darla</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>“I think I deserve what I got”</td>
<td>“Everything that I should have done, I did well”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>“Yes”</td>
<td>“She wasn’t going to go into all that detail”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>“I was pleased with it”</td>
<td>“I don’t think it really gauged what happened”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I felt a little bit let down that he [the administrator] looked at the lesson overall instead of looking at the specifics of the lesson to be able to give me feedback”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minoritized</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>“No, not really”</td>
<td>“The lesson went very well” (Marla, line 46) “the students were involved and the lesson was well done and well written”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>“No”</td>
<td>“I was expecting either a good or an exceptional”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>“No”</td>
<td>“I was furious”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I was …depressed at that point because it drove me crazy and I felt like I couldn’t do anything”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“If she [the administrator] had just focused on what she saw in class there was no way she could have given me the rating she wanted to give me”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Chapter Five I discuss my findings and relate them to the literature I reviewed to develop my study. I do this to explain how the issue of reliability of the administrators’ judgment is reflected as one of main themes which emerged relates to my analyses of the interview data concerning outcome fairness. The issue of reliability raises questions about the validity of information used in determining the rating. I present the results of this in the following section.

**Informational Fairness**

Primarily, responses to questions 1-4 on Part D of the interview script (Appendix C) provided my qualitative data with respect to informational fairness. Analyses of the qualitative findings enabled me to understand mainstream and minoritized teachers’ experiences related to issues of informational fairness.

One theme that emerged from my analysis of the qualitative data raises issues about the validity of the information used to determine teachers’ ratings. For example, Darla referenced her lesson plan which she felt had been well written and had a conversation about this lesson plan with the administrator. In contrast, Diana questioned the sources of data used claiming her rating was based on the administrator’s “anecdotal observations of [her] in the time [they] worked together.” She reported that during the post-observation session, “we just read for typos and she [the administrator] asked me if I had a problem with anything and I said no and signed.” Darlene also reported the use of seemingly appropriate information by referencing the lesson plan which provided details about the materials she used, the assessment strategies, groups, accommodations for different kinds of learners etc. Although she stated, “I was somewhat frustrated because the principal didn’t go to all of the groups; in terms of data, although it was a positive experience, it wasn’t a complete experience.” Darlene added that she “felt a little bit let down that he [the administrator] looked at the lesson overall instead of looking at the specifics of
the lesson to be able to give [her] feedback.” In contrast, Marla cited information used by the administrator with which she disagreed. For example, the administrator criticized her for not being involved in assemblies. However, she reported always preparing her students to participate in assemblies, that she was even a master of ceremonies at one event. In addition, she identified two situations where alleged complaints were made about her demoralizing students. However, the administrator, citing confidentiality as the reason, would not provide answers about the details to Marla’s questions about the alleged complaints.

Marla also suggested the rating was not based on her lesson, but rather on the opinions of her colleagues to which Marla reacted, “the appraisal is supposed to be mine” and “other teachers should not have the right to speak on my behalf.” Max expressed concern over the emphasis put on the portfolio used as part of this TPA. He questioned, “how is that [a portfolio] a fair assessment of a teacher’s teaching abilities?” He said that administrators should base the appraisal on seeing teachers in their classrooms, examining how teachers talk with students, what their plans are in terms of curriculum, how they implement the curriculum, and how they are dealing with assessment instead of the portfolio which he claimed engenders appraisal results which are proportionate to the teachers’ abilities to market themselves. Additionally, Max questioned the administrator’s omission of the number of additional qualification courses, workshops, courses and degrees he had completed. He referenced a 50-page addendum in which he rebutted the information used as the basis for his appraisal. Max invited the administrator to discuss the issues he identified in the addendum, but wondered if she had even read it. Max claimed that the administrator “used it [evidence] selectively in order to get [him] the mark [rating] she wanted to give him.” Finally, Marvin questioned the reliability and validity of the information used when he stated, “if she [the administrator] had just focused on what she saw in
the class there was no way she could have given [him] the rating she gave [him].” Like Marla, Marvin reported “I don’t think she should have relied on hearsay about what is happening in the classroom.” In addition, he stated, “I have no idea what she [the administrator] used to come up with the rating…say[ing] I’m not a very good teacher.” Instead of discussing Marvin’s teaching during the post-observation meeting, Marvin reported the administrator’s telling him he should not coach sports. Table 24 presents a summary of the findings I just described.

### Table 24

*Interview Participants’ Reference to Information Used and Their Reactions to the Accuracy of the Judgment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reference to information used</th>
<th>Reactions about accuracy of administrator’s judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mainstream</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darla</td>
<td>referred to written report about a well written lesson plan and had a conversation about it</td>
<td>“I got what I deserved and I did well”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>anecdotal observations of [her] in the time [they] worked together (line 445)</td>
<td>“No problem with it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td>lesson plan</td>
<td>“I was somewhat frustrated because the administrator didn’t go to all of the groups, in terms of data, although it was a positive experience, it wasn’t a complete experience” “I felt a little bit let down that he [the administrator] looked at the lesson overall instead of looking at the specifics of the lesson to be able to give [her] feedback”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minoritized</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla</td>
<td>involvement in ceremonies, two alleged parental complaints, other teachers’ input</td>
<td>defensive, confusion and anger “The appraisal is supposed to be mine and ‘other teachers should not have the right to speak on my behalf’”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Reference to information used</td>
<td>Reactions about accuracy of administrator’s judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>portfolio courses, workshops and degrees</td>
<td>portfolio garners results proportionate to teachers’ ability to commercialize themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>hearsay evidence from other teachers coaching sports</td>
<td>“I don’t think she should have relied on hearsay about what is happening in the classroom” In addition he states, “I have no idea what she [the administrator] used to come up with the rating…say[ing] I’m not a very good teacher” “If she [the administrator] had just focused on what she saw in the class there was no way she could have given me the rating she gave me”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedural Fairness**

The responses to questions 1-9 on Part C of the interview script (Appendix C) provided my qualitative data about teachers’ perceptions of procedural fairness. The results of qualitative analyses about teachers’ experiences with the procedures revealed two concerns. The first concern relates to the administrator’s using only one lesson as part of the procedure. The essence of Marvin and Darlene’s concerns is best reported by using Darlene’s words: “I don’t think that one lesson is enough data to be able to make any kind of conclusion fairly.” The second concern focuses on issues related to consistency across time and people.

Darla reported that the administrator “followed all the steps she should have, giving plenty of time and wasn’t intimidating.” Like Darla, Darlene reported favourably about the procedures used. Diana reported less favourably focusing on the issue of time. She talked about feeling short-changed by having her appraisal conducted at the end of the year and having a post-observation session focused on reading for typos, rather than on substantive issues. She reported that the administrator stated that she should not worry and that she would be getting the highest rating.
Marla had nothing favourable to report about the procedures used. She reported the pre-observation meeting was rushed and the administrator was not friendly and did not use a pleasant manner. She reacted with frustration that she had no post-observation session where she could have expressed her disagreement with the administrator’s judgment. Max’s concerns focused on the administrator’s unwillingness to discuss the concerns Max articulated in a 50-page addendum in which he addressed what he believed were inaccuracies in the summative report. Not having the opportunity to discuss these concerns frustrated him and caused him to feel he had not been treated like other teachers. This is evident when, referencing the lack of evidence explaining why other teachers were being given a more favourable rating than Max, he stated, “I thought something is really funny here, like we don’t have these brilliant incredibly exceptional teachers and then we have Max down here as satisfactory. So when I got that I said there is really something wrong.”

Marvin reported inconsistency when he recounted a conversation related to the administrator’s expectations about lesson plans: “I wanted to do day plans on a computer because I am adept at using the computer, but she [the administrator] said no, and in the end she said, well you need to look at this guy’s program because it is on computer and I was like, you just told me I wasn’t allowed to do that.” Table 25 summarizes this visually:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reference to input into TPA</th>
<th>Reactions about administrator’s consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mainstream</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darla</td>
<td>Administrator followed all of the steps she should have, giving plenty of time and wasn’t intimidating</td>
<td>no issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Although administrator followed all the steps, she felt short-changed that it took place at the end of the year The post-observation session focused on reading for typos She was told not to worry that she would get the highest rating</td>
<td>no issue since she received the highest rating possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td>Didn’t think that one lesson was enough data to be able to make any kind of conclusion</td>
<td>concern with the procedural issue but on concern with administrator favouring others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minoritized</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla</td>
<td>The pre-observation session was rushed Administrator was not friendly and used an unpleasant manner Was mad that she had no post-observation session where she could have told her what she thought</td>
<td>felt isolated by administrator’s non friendly and unpleasant manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Administrator wouldn’t discuss the 50 page addendum when she challenged the accuracy of some of the administrator’s statements</td>
<td>felt something was really funny with the notion that there were all these brilliant teachers and he was only satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>He didn’t think that one observation made a fair evaluation Wanted to do day plans on a computer and told initially no but then the administrator suggested he should have done lesson plans on the computer</td>
<td>compared to another teacher when h initially had wanted to use the computer for lesson plans like the other teacher had done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpersonal Fairness

The responses to questions 1-3 on Part E of the interview script provided data related to trust and questions 1-3 on Part F of this interview script supplied data pertaining to participants’ comfort level with disclosure. Taken together, they were my qualitative data as my two areas of foci related to interpersonal relationships. The qualitative data revealed that interviewees had a rich understanding of this phenomenon. The results provided information about minoritized teachers’ experiences with practices of mistreatment by administrators and their consequential effects.

Darla reported having a trusting relationship with the administrator. Darlene identified the administrator’s lack of attention to the detail in her lesson as the only negative comment concerning her experience with the interpersonal dynamics. In contrast, none of the minoritized teachers reported a trusting relationship with the administrator. For example, Marvin reported:

I really do think my identity influenced this. I don’t know if was because I am a guy, or because of my heritage, the way I look or because of my friends…but I didn’t trust her.

In terms of comfort with disclosure, mainstream teachers reported favourably. For example, Darlene stated, “I felt quite comfortable.” In contrast, minoritized teachers, Max responded, “I didn’t have a relationship her that was cordial or friendly” and Marvin reported, “I didn’t feel comfortable because I didn’t trust her”

It is noteworthy that even as mainstream teachers, Darla and Diana reported sensitivity to and empathy for minoritized teachers. Darla reported:

Well, before I did this [interview] you know, I didn’t think anything about identity. I was wondering why it kept coming up, but now since we’ve talked
about things I have started to consider that ya, I guess, mine went fine because of certain factors. Perhaps because I know how to speak English and that I’m Canadian, whatever else. Possibly those factors need to be taken into consideration for others who are not in the majority category.

Diana was more direct when she stated:

Can I just say this? When we talked about identity my sense is that if you [another teacher] were not in the same ethnicity, sexual orientation category as she [the administrator] was, then my perception is that it would be another weakness and another reason to target somebody.

The results of the minoritized teachers’ experiences confirm Darla and Diana’s speculations as presented in Table 26-28. The richness of the examples of mistreatment of minoritized teachers led me to use the Blases’ typology on abusive to analyze my data beyond issues of trust and comfort with disclosure. Before considering this, I remind the readers of this thesis again that, in these tables, Level 1 refers to indirect, moderate mistreatment, Level 2 refers to direct, escalating mistreatment and Level 3 refers to direct and severe mistreatment. “Please note that this heuristic does not imply that Level 1 administrator mistreatment behaviors resulted in less harm to teachers when compared to Level 2 or Level 3 behaviors: to the contrary, the degree of harm related to any single aggressive behavior varied from one abused teacher to another” (Blase & Blase, 2003, p. 23). In addition, I identified the consequential effects in the ‘Reactions and Consequential Effects’ columns on Tables 26-28. I used this as one way of organizing my findings with respect to interpersonal fairness.
Table 26 summarizes the interaction between Marla and the administrator who conducted her performance. Analyses of Marla’s account reveal that she endured four incidents of Level 1 abusive behaviour. Three of the four appear to have left her feeling wounded with a diminished sense of self-esteem. The fourth incident seems to have left her feeling so psychologically damaged that she no longer felt safe returning to school. Marla also experienced two incidents which appear to be Level 2. These incidents involved enduring vague criticism, being the victim of gossip and having to cope with breaches of confidentiality. With respect to being subjected to vague criticism, Marla presented as having a diminished sense of self-esteem. The other incidents left Marla feeling outraged at the unfairness of the administrator using other teachers’ judgments to inform her opinion about the rating.

Table 26

Marla’s Experiences Related to the Blases’ Categorization of Levels of Mistreatment by Administrators. Her Reactions to Them and Their Consequential Effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of participant</th>
<th>Act of mistreatment</th>
<th>Reactions and consequential effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrator’s negative reaction to her when Marla reported that she got her teaching degree in Canada</td>
<td>discounting teacher’s experience</td>
<td>diminished sense of professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrator’s unwillingness to answer her questions about her need to know the details related to two parental complaints</td>
<td>discounting teacher’s experience</td>
<td>diminished sense of professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrator reassigns her to grade 3, then grade 6 then Special Education despite her wish to remain teaching grade 3</td>
<td>discounting teacher’s experience</td>
<td>diminished sense of professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrator’s refusal not willing to correct comments of inaccuracies Marla points out (i.e.-reference to Marla not having students participate in assemblies</td>
<td>discounting teacher’s experience</td>
<td>outraged so much that she refused to return to school and contacted the union for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of participant</td>
<td>Act of mistreatment</td>
<td>Reactions and consequential effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marla</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 administrator reports 2 parental complaints but hides behind confidentiality as reason for not sharing details of the complaint</td>
<td>vague criticism</td>
<td>diminished sense of professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>administrator’s use of other teachers’ opinions to inform evaluation</td>
<td>gossiping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>breaching confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 administrator did not conduct a post-observation session</td>
<td>unfair evaluation procedures</td>
<td>felt isolated and confused about where the information came from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrator uses other teachers’ comments in Marla’s evaluation</td>
<td>unfair evaluation procedures</td>
<td>outraged and confused since it was hard for her to understand what both the administrator did and why the administrator was referencing other teachers’ comments; this concerned her deeply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla reports getting the impression that the administrator didn’t like her because she was South Asian or spoke Punjabi</td>
<td>racism</td>
<td>felt isolated, unmotivated because she felt discriminated against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla felt this ongoing treatment was happening because she wasn’t such and such a race [Caucasian]</td>
<td>racism</td>
<td>outraged and confused about the administrator’s mistreatment of her because she was not Caucasian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Legend: Level 1 refers to indirect, moderate mistreatment, Level 2 refers to direct, escalating mistreatment and Level 3 refers to direct and severe mistreatment.

As Table 27 illustrates, Max experienced three incidents of Level 1 mistreatment. Two of the three related to offensive personal contact and lack or respect for his privacy. The third incident involved Max feeling discounted when the administrator was unwilling to consider the 50-page addendum he wrote in reaction to perceived inaccuracies in the summative report. In each of the three situations Max appeared to be wounded. Max also experienced two incidents
which Blase and Blase (2003) would characterize as Level 2 mistreatment. First, he experienced a breach of confidentiality. He believed the administrator appeared to have spoken with other teachers about his result on TPA. In reaction, Max felt furious that he had been isolated. Second, Max reported being a victim of favoritism. He explained that he learned that the administrator had changed other teachers’ ratings when they complained. However, when he attempted to present his 50 page rebuttal, the administrator ignored him. This left him feeling isolated.

In terms of Level 3 mistreatment, using the Blases’ framework, Max experienced six different incidents ranging from experiencing unfair evaluation procedures to direct pejorative criticism to manifestations of sexism and homophobia such as gender stereotyping. For example, in terms of experiencing the unfair evaluation procedure, he reports the administrator intentionally omitting references to the number of courses, workshops and degrees he had completed and the administrator’s unwillingness to discuss a 50-page addendum which contained corrections to inaccuracies in the summative report. In reaction, Max felt anger and outraged at this injustice and thought the administrator was getting back at him for being the union steward. In addition, Max explained that he felt confused about from whence the information contained in his summative report came. Next, in terms gender stereotyping Max experienced another manifestation of sexism. Max reported having the impression that the administrator thinks men should not be teaching in the primary division. In support of his view, he talked about the administrator questioning his early childhood education qualifications. As result of this, Max said he felt isolated and trapped at the power of the administrator to determine his teaching placement in the junior as opposed to primary division which was his preference. In terms of experiencing homophobia, Max reported the administrator asking him if were married or had any children. Although this question seems inappropriate, Max reported feeling
interrogated. He explained that he felt disoriented, shocked and harassed by the question. He believed the administrator’s purpose was to get him to identify his sexual orientation which he found would result in continued homophobic treatment.

Table 27

*Max’s Experiences Related to the Blases’ Categorization of Levels of Mistreatment by Administrators. His Reactions to Them and Their Consequential Effects.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of participant</th>
<th>Act of mistreatment</th>
<th>Reactions and consequential effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>administrator shared her story about an unpleasant encounter with a woman’s group which included a lot of lesbians</td>
<td>offensive personal conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>administrator’s unwillingness to discuss a 50-page addendum which contained corrections to inaccuracies in the summative report</td>
<td>discounting teacher’s experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>administrator appears to have talked with other teachers about his TPA results</td>
<td>breach of confidentiality isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>administrator engages in discussions with other teachers who want to have their ratings changed and she acquiesces</td>
<td>favoritism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>administrator intentionally omitted references to the number of courses, workshops and degrees completed and the administrator’s unwillingness to discuss a 50-page addendum which contained corrections to inaccuracies in the summative report</td>
<td>unfair evaluation procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Max

he wonders if the administrator thinks men should be teaching in the primary division

administrator questions his Early Childhood Education qualifications

administrator asked him if he was married or had any children

administrator lied about a situation involving EQAO results which had been resolved by the union in Max’s favour

administrator did not acknowledge his expertise in curriculum when discussing his Early Childhood Education qualifications administrator says, “I don’t see it in you. What did you do, sleep during your courses?”

Experience of participant | Act of mistreatment | Reactions and consequential effects
---|---|---
sexism | felt isolated and trapped at the power of the administrator to determine his placement teaching a junior as opposed to primary class
homophobia | felt interrogated, disoriented, shocked and harassed that the administrator was trying to identify his sexual orientation
lying | was furious
unfair evaluation procedures | felt very angry and felt he would not be able to trust another administrator again
direct pejorative criticism | felt anger and confusion and did not understand why she would say that

Note. Legend: Level 1 refers to indirect, moderate mistreatment, Level 2 refers to direct, escalating mistreatment and Level 3 refers to direct and severe mistreatment.

As presented in Table 28, in terms of Level 1 mistreatment when resources were withheld, Marvin had to do his own fundraising for the sports he coached. Marvin felt upset about this because he felt his professionalism was being undermined. He also felt discounted and disrespected. Next, with respect to Level 2 mistreatment, when asked about his personal life, his marital status or whether or not he had children, he felt isolated. He also reported feeling that he was being sabotaged when he felt the administrator placed the most difficult students in his class. In the third incident, Marvin reported feeling wounded by the nitpicking behaviour of the administrator in terms of whether lesson plans were hand-written or typed. In terms of Level 3
abusive behaviour, Marvin identified eight incidents. These ranged from unfair evaluation procedures, direct abuse and pejorative criticism, offensive personal conduct, lack of consideration of privacy, fear of revivification, (living it all over again), to feeling that he was being forced out of teaching to what the Blases’ framework would be characterized as manifestations of the racism and sexism as forms of oppression. For example, Marvin reported that the administrator used information obtained from other teachers to determine the rating that had nothing to do with his teaching ability. As a result, Marvin told me he felt drained and unmotivated. He continued to explain that these feelings caused him to have to see his doctor who diagnosed him with severe depression. In addition, during the TPA procedure, Marvin brought many materials with him for the administrator to see. He categorized an example of direct pejorative criticism when the administrator asked him cynically during the debriefing session if he actually read all the materials he had brought to that session. In reaction, Marvin reported feeling angry. Finally, Marvin explained when the administrator asked personal questions, he experienced what the Blases call fear of revivification, or the fear of living something all over again. He explained that although he found the administrator’s invasion into his personal life highly inappropriate and offensive, he chose to suffer in severe depression rather than confronting or enlisting the support of his union to challenge the administrator’s behaviour for fear of having to raising raw emotions and feelings to the surface all over again.
### Table 28

*Marvin’s Experiences Related to the Blases’ Categorization of Levels of Mistreatment by Administrators. His Reactions to Them and Their Consequential Effects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of participant</th>
<th>Act of mistreatment</th>
<th>Reactions and consequential effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td>administrator made him do his own fundraising for school sports he coached</td>
<td>withheld resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>administrator made an issue about the presentation of lesson plans first suggesting they had to be hand written then telling him he should do them using a computer</td>
<td>nitpicking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assigned 5 of the most difficult students in the school to his class</td>
<td>sabotage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td>administrator asked other teachers about his personal life</td>
<td>breach of confidentiality isolated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>felt the administrator used information obtained from other teachers to determine the rating that had nothing to do with his teaching ability</td>
<td>unfair evaluation procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>felt the administrator did not like him</td>
<td>abused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator interrogates him about the resources he brought to a debriefing session saying, “You don’t actually read all this stuff”</td>
<td>direct pejorative criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>administrator asked him if he was married or had any children made him feel that she was driving him out of teaching</td>
<td>forcing him out of teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Blases’ typology of the three Levels of the types of mistreatment administrators use provided a heuristic. I used this to organize the information Marla, Max and Marvin identified in their interviews.

As I continued to read and interpret these findings, I identified another dominant theme. I found that these minoritized teachers were more likely to experience practices of mistreatment from the administrators who appraised them than mainstream teachers. I presented these findings in this chapter and discuss them in Chapter Five using the Blases’ typology of the practices of mistreatment of teachers.

In this section, I presented my analyses of the findings which I used to answer my third research question about how TPA impacted mainstream female and these minoritized teachers. My analyses of the findings suggested that with respect to outcome, informational, procedural and interpersonal fairness, these minoritized teachers were more likely to experience TPA less favourably than mainstream teachers.
In summary, in this chapter, I presented the quantitative results and qualitative findings I used to investigate some elementary teachers’ perceptions about and experiences with TPA. I used this information to answer my three research questions. In the following chapter, I discuss these findings in more detail.
Chapter Five:
Discussion, Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

The purpose of my study was to investigate elementary teachers’ perceptions about and experiences with TPA. For the most part, I did this by comparing the minoritized teachers with the mainstream teachers using the criteria for each group provided in Table 5 (see p. 100). In the end, I report only significant differences on the questionnaire results between the mainstream female and the minoritized groups. The quantitative approach allowed me to focus mainly on teachers’ perceptions about TPA. The qualitative method enabled me to concentrate primarily on the teachers’ experiences with TPA. In this chapter I discuss the quantitative results and qualitative findings and relate them to the literature I reviewed. EFA allowed me to answer my first research question: What are the salient characteristics of teachers’ perceptions related to TPA? I identified four dimensions of fairness; outcome, informational, procedural and interpersonal. These four factors also relate to the four dimensions of organizational justice which framed my study conceptually. I used these four dimensions of fairness to discuss how I use my results and findings to answer my second and third research questions. I use the four dimensions as the subheadings to discuss these research questions in the following section.

Discussion

Outcome Fairness

In terms of my quantitative results, as presented in Chapter Four, only two items on my questionnaire focused on issues related to outcome fairness. Question#12, rating received on TPA, focuses only on the outcome. Question #13, agreement with rating on TPA on the questionnaire, is concerned with investigating teachers’ perceptions of outcome fairness. In terms of my qualitative findings, I asked teachers to identify the rating they received and asked
them how they felt about the rating assigned. I discuss the results and findings of each question in turn using the question stems as the organizers.

**Rating on TPA.**

In terms of the rating assigned on TPA, my results revealed two conclusions. First, women have traditionally been oppressed in our patriarchal society (Eng, 2004; de Beauvoir, 1949; Hanisch, 1969; Moreau, Osgood, & Halsall, 2007). In my study, although I found differences between the mainstream males and mainstream females, in terms of the rating they received on TPA, and, as was the case with all the other dimensions of fairness the differences were not statistically significant. Second, the minoritized teachers were almost twice as likely as mainstream females to receive a rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory. It is noteworthy that the only unsatisfactory rating was assigned to a minoritized teacher. The results of my data echo findings similar to those of Kraiger and Ford (1985) and Igbaria and Shayo (1997) who suggested that minoritized people are rated lower or more unfavourably on performance appraisals than mainstream people.

Although I did not specifically ask the teachers if they shared demographic similarities with the administrators who conducted their appraisals, in the cases of all three of the minoritized teachers I interviewed, it was clear that at least one of the demographic characteristics differed between them and the administrators. In terms of my qualitative findings, the three mainstream teachers received a rating of exemplary while the three minoritized teachers received a rating of satisfactory. My results and findings reflect the findings of Kraiger and Ford (1985) and Igbaria and Shayo (1997) who demonstrated that Blacks were rated lower on job performance than Whites.
Taken together, the results of the aforementioned studies and my study open up the possibility that these minoritized teachers could be victims of various forms of oppression such as racism and homophobia manifested in systemic biases and prejudices which affect job performance ratings. Ryan’s (2003) hypothesis that there are clearly identifiable patterns in the privileges enjoyed by the mainstream groups in society is confirmed in my study as in others he reviews to the effect that forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, homophobia and/or ableism manifested in discrimination is systemic. In the following sections I discuss how this hypothesis is confirmed in terms of these minoritized teachers’ perceptions about and experiences with TPA.

**Agreement with rating on TPA.**

As described in the literature (Abrahamson et al., 1978; Adams, 1965; Greenberg, 1986; Landy et al., 1980; Levanthal, 1980; Levanthal, Karuza, & Fry, 1980; Merton & Rossi, 1957; Thibaut & Walker, 1975; Tyler, 1987; Tyler, et. al.,1985) I reviewed suggests, outcomes are not inherently fair or unfair; they are judged to be fair or unfair based on people’s perceptions about them. My results reveal that these minoritized teachers agreed less with the rating assigned to them than the mainstream female group. Also, when teachers were assigned a rating of good, the minoritized teachers were more likely than mainstream females to disagree with the rating assigned. Finally, when the ratings were unfavourable, these minoritized teachers were unanimous in their disagreement and more than twice as likely as mainstream females to in some way disagree with the these unfavourable ratings.

In terms of my qualitative findings, two patterns emerged. The first pattern is that the mainstream teachers I interviewed agreed with the ratings they received on their TPA, while none of the three minoritized teachers expressed this view. Second, in my sample, the
minoritized teachers were more likely to see incongruence between the ratings they expected and those received than mainstream teachers. This finding appears to reflect Adam’s (1965) equity theory, in that when peoples’ perceptions of outcomes did not meet the standard of proportionality; in other words when they perceived a difference between the outcome they thought they deserved and the one they received, people experienced inequity distress.

As described in Chapter Four, I found that these minoritized teachers felt the equity rule had been violated and that all three minoritized teachers exhibited this inequity distress which manifested as the psychological tendencies of experiencing frustration, anger, sadness and depression. For example, I found that although two of the three mainstream teachers, Diana and Darlene, experienced feeling let down by the process, the three minoritized teachers experienced more severe psychological manifestations in reaction to the outcome assigned.

Certainly, the issue of double-jeopardy; being penalized once for receiving a low job evaluation and subsequently the low internal attributions one experiences as a result of this rating (Igbaria & Shayo, 1997), appears to have affected the three minoritized teachers I interviewed. For example, Marla expressed her sadness by crying and showed her frustration when she chose not to return to work after her union representative explained that she had to sign the summative report despite the evidence she presented to the administrator that she had, in fact, participated in assemblies. In addition, Max reported feeling very angry about the number of inaccuracies presented in his summative report and Marvin reported suffering severe depression as a result of the rating assigned which he could not understand. These findings are also in keeping with the literature on mistreatment of teachers I reviewed which found that when subordinates of abusive supervisors compare what they put into their work (input) to what they receive in return
(outcome) to another colleague (Adams & Freedman, 1976), subordinates of abusive supervisors tended to experience the aforementioned symptoms of relative deprivation (Martin, 1981).

Tepper’s (2000) findings are similar to those of Igbaria and Shayo (1997). He found that subordinates of abusive supervisors have to overcome obstacles that increase the time and effort required to fulfill their responsibilities. These results are also reflected in my study. For example, Marla had to take time off work, Max had to write a 50-page addendum report in which he addressed the inaccuracies presented in his summative report, and Marvin had to seek medical treatment and support from his colleagues to cope with his severe depression.

Although I did not ask the questions necessary to enable me to identify which one of the rules (Levanthal, 1980, Levanthal et al., 1980) had been violated – contributions, needs, or equality – my qualitative findings allowed me to investigate these authors’ hypothesis that decisions will be seen as fairer to the extent that they are based on reliable information. In this case, like Tyler (1987), I found that teachers’ perceptions of fair judgments were associated with their overall satisfaction with the outcome: a process that involved comparing their outcomes to those of their co-workers. In my study, I found that the three minoritized teachers I interviewed compared the outcomes they received to those of their coworkers. As described in Chapter Four, all three minoritized teachers were confused about the ratings when they compared themselves with other teachers.

The second pattern that emerged relates to the questions teachers in my sample had about the competence of the evaluator. My findings raised the same questions as Greenberg (1987) and Landy, et al. (1980) in terms of the importance of supervisors’ familiarity with and knowledge of subordinates’ work respectively. Similar issues were raised in the literature related to teacher evaluation. Peterson (2000) summarizes this when he says that teachers are critical when
principals had not taught at their level (elementary or secondary) or in their subject area(s). This literature (Greenberg, 1987; Landy et al., 1980; Peterson, 2000) and my interview findings highlight a common concern about the capability of evaluators to appraise work with which they are not directly familiar.

The importance that Thibaut and Walker (1975) place on a procedure such as TPA to produce accuracy was a key attribute also reflected in my findings. I identify this as the third pattern. Questions about the reliability of the administrators’ judgment raised in my study are reflected in some of the literature on teacher evaluation. My results suggest that the three minoritized teachers were more likely than mainstream teachers to express unfavourable views about administrators’ judgments related to issues concerning reliability, or the dependability and consistency, of administrators’ judgments. In addition, these teachers were more likely to report stronger emotional reactions to the administrators’ judgment. This pattern is also reflected in the literature. For example, in a synthesis of conceptual and empirical studies, Peterson (2000) suggests that, “teacher evaluation satisfies very few people who have a vested interest in it” (p. 28). My findings echo this sentiment and also suggest that these minoritized teachers are less likely to be satisfied with it than mainstream teachers.

My results also resonate with Peterson’s (2000) summary of literature on this topic to the effect that “the main dissatisfaction of teachers with administrators as evaluators was what the teachers saw as a basic lack of competence on the part of administrators to evaluate: lack of self-confidence, experience, subject matter, knowledge, and perspectives on what it is really like to be in the classroom” (p. 25). My results also reflect those in Stodolsky’s (1984) study which raises questions about the reliability of the data used for evaluating teachers, given the limited time administrators spend evaluating each teacher and the small number of observation sessions
used to determine the ratings. Similarly, in my study, Darlene and Marvin’s concern about basing appraisals on one lesson is echoed in one of the seven conclusions Scriven (1981) makes in his conceptual discussion about formative and summative evaluation: “the number of visits is too small to be representative” (p. 281). Since this is true about the way TPA was conducted by administrators in Ontario, it raises questions about the reliability of TPA ratings.

The questions that arose in my study about the accuracy, consistency and dependability of the administrator’s judgments are also reflected in three other studies. First, Wise et al. (1984) found that “almost all respondents…felt that principals lacked sufficient resolve and competence to evaluate correctly” (p. 22). Next, Kauchak, Peterson and Drisoll (1985) found that teachers perceived the principal as not sufficiently knowledgeable about the grade(s) and/or subject(s) teachers teach. Finally, Johnson (1990) concluded, “administrators are rarely prepared to offer…useful advice…virtually never …providing an opportunity for learning” (p. 266). Taken together, my results and the findings in the aforementioned literature reveal a concern about the reliability of administrators’ judgments. As the interview data I obtained from minoritized teachers suggest, when the reliability of administrators’ judgments is questionable, the validity of the information used to determine their ratings is called into question. I discuss this issue in the following section.

**Informational Fairness**

My analyses of my quantitative data reveal that these minoritized teachers had a less favourable perception about informational fairness than the mainstream female group. This means that, when compared to mainstream female teachers, the minoritized teachers tended not to perceive that the observation debriefing session was detailed, comprehensive, or that it reflected use of multiple data. In addition, in contrast to mainstream female teachers, these
minoritized teachers were less likely to feel that the feedback provided on their performance was either specific or constructive. The results also suggest that, in contrast to mainstream female teachers, these minoritized teachers were less likely to perceive that they were involved in a dialogue about their performance and that the review of the annual learning plan was fair.

Levanthal et al.’s (1980) work highlighted the importance of basing outcomes on valid information as a key determinant of people’s perceptions of fairness about a decision. Similarly, one of the key themes emerging from my analyses of the qualitative data relates to questions about the validity of the information used to determine teachers’ ratings. Three patterns emerged from my analysis of the qualitative data which I discuss in turn.

The first pattern I found was that, as was the case of the six studies (Greenberg, 1986; Kanfer et al., 1987; Lissak, 1983; Reuter, 1977; Thibaut & Walker; Brett, 1986) on informational fairness as described in Chapter Two, the minoritized teachers in my study appeared to have no opportunity for input into the appraisal process. It is not surprising then that these teachers expressed concerns about the validity of the information used as the basis for their evaluations. In fact, my results suggest that the information used for mainstream teachers was more likely to be based on seemingly appropriate sources of information, such as a lesson plan or a classroom observation session. In contrast, the information used for the ratings of minoritized teachers appeared to be based on information extraneous to their classroom practices. I substantiate this view by pointing out that mainstream teachers made no reference to information used beyond the lesson plan or the observation of the lesson. In contrast, references made to Marla’s participation in assemblies, Max’s attendance at workshops and Marvin’s coaching sports are examples which suggest that different sources of information were used to evaluate the three minoritized teachers than for the mainstream teachers in my study. These findings, combined with Marla and
Marvin’s references to the administrators’ use of other teachers’ opinions to gather information about their performance, raises questions about the information used. In other words, these minoritized teachers expressed concern about informational fairness.

In terms of the second pattern, three studies (Greenberg, 1986; Barrett-Howard & Tyler, 1986; Sheppard & Lewicki, 1987) I reviewed highlight the importance of consistency of standards across people as a key determinant of perceptions of fairness in performance reviews. Therefore, it is not surprising that the minoritized teachers I interviewed identified concerns about the inconsistency of standards applied to them and other teachers. All three minoritized teachers questioned the validity of the information used to determine their rating and identified their experiences with TPA as unfair.

Cornelius (1985) showed that the perceived accuracy of perceptions of accurate information greatly influences employees’ perceptions of fairness (as cited in Lind & Tyler, 1988). The conclusions of the following four studies are reflected in the findings of my study: the information used depended too much on the principals’ judgments (Wise et al., 1984), the information used was of low accuracy (Medley & Crocker, 1987), performance appraisal systems fail to collect information that accurately characterizes teachers’ performance (Wolf, 1973) and since ratings differ between individuals unfair discrimination is made easy (Barr & Burton, 1926).

The third pattern which emerged in my study relates to the consequential effects of the perceived inaccuracy of information used to appraise teachers. All three of the minoritized teachers in my study: Marla, Max and Marvin, demonstrated severe psychological consequences ranging from sadness, to frustration, to severe depression respectively when the information used
to explain their evaluations was perceived as unjust (Barrett-Howard & Lamm, 1986; Lind & Tyler, 1988; Baron, 1993, Gilliland, 1994).

In terms of both my quantitative and qualitative approach, I would suggest that further research be done to investigate administrators’ perspectives about what information they used to determine teachers’ ratings. Both my quantitative results and my qualitative findings suggest congruence with Igbaria and Shayo’s (1997) results which found that the information conveyed to justify a rating is linked to employees’ perceptions of informational fairness. My findings echo those of other studies which suggest that the apparent lack of valid information raises questions about the consistency (Levanthal, 1980; Levanthal et al., 1980) of TPA across teachers. It appears that some administrators are biased with respect to certain teachers and that these biases may influence the ratings they ultimately assign. This finding is reminiscent of Igbaria and Shayo (1997) who found that on the rare occasion when some Black employees’ performance was rated high (which was rare), supervisors attributed this to luck, help given, or that the job was easy. I address this in the following section.

**Procedural Fairness**

Differences in teachers’ perceptions about procedural fairness related to six items on my questionnaire that pertained to procedural fairness. These items relate to what is called in the literature as the ‘process control effect’ (Folger, 1997; Lind & Tyler, 1988) or, in other words, the extent to which teachers’ perceived they had input into the procedures used while they experienced TPA. The results revealed that, when compared to mainstream female teachers, these minoritized teachers were less satisfied that they received the required 20 days of notification before the appraisal process began. In contrast to mainstream females, these minoritized teachers did not perceive that the pre-observation meeting, the classroom observation
session, the post-observation session or the summative report were fair. Finally, the three minoritized teachers were less able to agree that no singular weakness or flaw influenced the rating they received than mainstream female teachers.

Although I also address this in my discussion of the qualitative findings, the quantitative results provide some evidence of congruence with other studies which raise concerns about the extent to which performance appraisals are consistent across people (Barrett-Howard & Lamm, 1986) and not shaped by superiors’ biases (Igbaria & Shayo, 1997), stereotypical attitudes (Ilgen & Youtz, 1986) and the extent to which demographic dissimilarity between supervisors and their employees negatively influences the way the performance appraisal was conducted (Wesolowski & Mossholder, 1997).

Another noteworthy result emerged when the classroom observation session loaded in the EFA as an item related to the procedural fairness factor rather than as an informational fairness item. Teachers appear to have considered the classroom observation session as part of the procedure rather than as an item related to informational fairness as I would have anticipated. This finding raises the same questions as other studies about the practices of relying on the typical “visit-and-report procedure” (Peterson, 2000, p.69), a quick and short observation visit, where principals use prefabricated, one size fits all, generic checklists as data gathering systems, which culminate in written reports and an assigned rating. A critique of past and current practices of one shot, quick visit and report procedures, figures prominently in the literature on teacher evaluation (Bridges, 1992; Hill, 1921; Johnson, 1990; Lewis, 1982; Peterson & Chenoweth, 1992).

In terms of my qualitative findings, the first important theme to emerge with respect to procedural fairness was the lack of ‘fair process control’ (Folger, 1997; Lind and Tyler, 1988)
the three minoritized teachers felt they had during their experience with TPA. For example, Marla felt the procedures were rushed, Max reported needing to write a 50-page addendum in an attempt to correct a number of inaccuracies he claimed were presented in his summative report, and Marvin expressed frustration about the administrator’s seemingly contradictory views about whether lesson plans were to be written by hand or by using a computer. As Colquitt et al. (2001), Cropanzano (1988), Folger (1997), Lind and Tyler (1988), Schminke, Ambrose and Noel (1997) and Thibaut and Walker (1975) showed, people’s lack of input into the procedures used results in their perceiving the process to be unjust. The administrator’s refusal to remove the statement that Marla failed to participate in assemblies, the administrator’s unwillingness to read Max’s 50-page addendum and Marvin’s administrator’s contradictory messages about how lesson plans were to be written are examples from my qualitative data which are reflected in other studies to which I just referred. This raises questions about violations of Levanthal’s (1980) consistency rule. During my interviews with them, Marla, Max and Marvin expressed strong and emotionally charged reactions about their perceptions of how the procedure unfolded. The evidence they use to suggest the consistency rule was violated suggests that, in their view, they were isolated and treated differently than the other teachers. Most notably, it appears the fair process effect (Folger, 1997; Lind & Tyler, 1988), or the lack of opportunity to have their views and arguments considered or addressed, caused them to feel that the procedure was not fair.

My findings replicate the findings of three other studies (Fry & Levanthal, 1979; Fry & Cheney; 1981, Barrett-Howard & Lam, 1986) which revealed that these minoritized teachers perceived that the consistency rule had been violated and consequently they found the procedure to be unjust. This conclusion is also evident in four studies (Peterson & Chenowith, 1992; Scriven, 1981; Cook & Richards, 1972; Johnson, 1990) related to teacher evaluation that
highlight the lack of teachers’ involvement in the process as problematic. Other well known
researchers in this field found that any teacher evaluation system that does not reflect the
interests, concerns, aspirations and needs of teachers is doomed to failure (Peterson, 2000;
Stiggins & Duke, 1988), or at least to be perceived by teachers as procedurally unfair.

The next pattern which emerged followed directly from teachers’ lack of voice or ability
to be involved with the TPA procedure. Igbaria and Shayo (1997) found that since a
subordinate’s performance is assessed by a supervisor, the failure of the subordinate can be
associated with the rating being influenced by the biases of the supervisor. They reported that
minoritized teachers were penalized twice: once through the assessment of a low level of job
performance, and subsequently through low internal attributions, or feeling badly inside oneself
about the results that follow from the low level of perceived performance (Igbaria & Shayo,
1997). In other words, as discussed under outcome fairness, the minoritized teachers I
interviewed experienced severe psychological consequences of a TPA procedure which
discharded or failed to consider their direct involvement. During my interviews with the
minoritized teachers although teachers were not asked to identify the social identity
characteristics of the administrators, I learned that in all three cases at least one aspect of social
identity was different within each teacher-principal dyad. My findings seem to reflect the
findings of at least one study (Wesolowski & Mossholder, 1997) dealing with minoritized people
and performance appraisal. The first finding is that mixed dyads appear to result in less positive
reactions about issues of procedural fairness than shared social identity dyads. The second is that
when demographic differences prevent supervisors from exhibiting or being perceived to exhibit
behaviours related to procedural fairness, the frequency of perceived procedural unfairness
among subordinates is greater.
Finally, my findings reflect a pattern reminiscent of that identified in Tepper’s (2000) study of abusive supervision. Tepper (2000) and I found that the more procedural rules (Levanthal, 1980) that are violated, the greater the likelihood that subordinates will perceive procedural injustice. In my study, as discussed under outcome fairness, the accuracy rule appears to be violated, and as discussed here, the consistency rules for the minoritized teachers who participated in my study not only appear to have been violated, but the rule of bias suppression appears to have been breached as well. Given that the minoritized teachers I interviewed reported that at least three of the six procedural rules appear to have been violated, it is not surprising that these teachers would have perceived their experiences as procedurally unfair. As evident from my interviews with minoritized teachers, they express concern about the consistency with which their TPA was conducted. Their concern about this consistency raises questions in their minds about the biases that play out in the interpersonal relationships between themselves and the administrators who conducted their TPA. I discuss this in the next section.

**Interpersonal Fairness**

Thirteen items on my questionnaire related to interpersonal fairness or teachers’ reactions, attitudes and behaviours toward the administrators responsible for making the decisions about their TPA (Bies & Moag, 1986). My analyses of the results suggest in terms of trust, when compared to mainstream females, these minoritized teachers did not perceive that they had a trusting relationship with the administrator who conducted their TPA. Specifically looking at the indices of trust, all three of the minoritized teachers did not believe the administrator protected or nurtured the relationship. In addition, in contrast to mainstream females, these minoritized teachers were less likely to feel that they could work with the administrator to identify or solve problems. Also, I found that these minoritized teachers were
not as comfortable disclosing information about themselves compared to mainstream female teachers. Specifically, these minoritized teachers were not as comfortable disclosing their opinions and feelings about their professional practice, personal or very personal information openly and honestly compared to mainstream female teachers. When compared to mainstream female teachers, these minoritized teachers also were less likely to agree that the administrator and they strove to understand each other regardless of differences. Also, in contrast to mainstream female teachers, these minoritized teachers tended to believe less that the outcome of the appraisal would have been the same regardless of the day it was conducted. Finally, when compared to mainstream females, these minoritized teachers did not feel that their appraisal experience was conducted as consistently as it was with other teachers.

My results reflect a consistent pattern identified in four other studies. First, Huo and Tyler (2001) highlighted that what mattered most was how fairly employees’ supervisors treated them. Second, Igbaria and Shayo (1997) found that differences between anticipated and actual performance ratings can be explained by disparate treatment as a form of discrimination. In other words, in their study, the discrimination was conscious, direct and straightforward, as opposed to disparate impact where the discrimination was not intentional, but rather was just the unfortunate result. Third, a supervisor’s actions tend to have more interpersonal repercussions when the supervisor and employee are of different races (Wesolowski & Mossholder, 1997). Finally, Tsui and O’Reilly (1989) found supervisors tend to be more aloof with employees of races different from their own. Huo and Tyler (2001), Igbaria and Shayo (1997), Tsui and O’Reilly (1989), and Wesolowski and Mossholder, (1997) dealt only with ethnicity as the minoritized characteristic on which they focused, whereas my study addressed five such characteristics.
Ideally, I had hoped to collect enough data to conduct fine-grained analyses to investigate if teachers’ primary language(s), sexual orientation, visible minority or disability status as minoritized characteristics might have influenced these teachers’ perceptions of the interpersonal relationships between teachers and administrators. However, given my sample size, I had to aggregate these into one overall categorical variable. My findings were similar to those identified in the aforementioned studies (Huo & Tyler, 2001; Igbaria & Shayo, 1997; Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989; Wesolowski & Mossholder, 1997).

In terms of interpersonal fairness, analyses of my qualitative data reflected patterns similar to those identified in the studies I reviewed fields of organizational justice, teacher evaluation, discrimination against minoritized people and mistreatment of teachers. I found that interpersonal fairness mattered to the three minoritized teachers and that these teachers are concerned about the interpersonal treatment they receive from others (Bies & Tripp, 1996; Clemmer, 1993; Messick et al., 1985; Mikula et al., 1990; Mikkula, 1996). I also found that the minoritized teachers in my study held perceptions of interpersonal fairness that were associated with direct supervisor evaluations in the same way as other employees (Barling & Phillips, 1993; Blodgett et al., 1997; Malastesta & Byrne, 1997; Masterson et al., 2000; Moorman, 1991; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997).

The first pattern is that all three of the minoritized teachers I interviewed held similar perceptions about the ways the administrator communicated with them. I found that since these minoritized teachers reported not feeling they were communicated with in a sensitive and respectful manner (Bies & Moag, 1986; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001), they judged the communication to have been unfair.
Another pattern reflects the findings by Konovosky and Pugh (1994) and Moorman et al. (1998) who showed the importance of trust as a key determinant of perceptions of interpersonal fairness. All of the teachers I interviewed, with the exception of Darla, provided compelling evidence to suggest that they did not trust the administrators. This finding is not surprising given that each one suggested that their treatment lacked honesty, propriety, sensitivity or respect (Bies & Moag, 1986).

The third pattern I found was reflected in other studies about organizational justice (Bies & Moag, 1986; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Instead of being treated with honesty and ethical appropriateness, the minoritized teachers in my study perceived their situations to be unfair since they experienced the opposite form of treatment. In this case, my study aligns with Lane (1988), replicating Glass and Singer (1972), who identified procedural pain (psychological or physiological states such as embarrassment, humiliation, and stress) as the consequential effects of unfair interpersonal treatment. As described in the outcome fairness section, I found all three of the minoritized teachers exhibited much more severe symptoms than Lane (1988) delineates. However, pain is pain, and as Bies and Tripp (1996) found, pain, associated with injustice, does profound harm to one’s psyche and identity, as the minoritized teachers in my study experienced.

The next pattern that emerged in my study reflected the findings in the seven studies (Barr & Burton, 1926; Cousins, 1995; Haughy & Howard, 1996; Scriven, 1981; Singh & Shiflette, 1996; Stiggins & Duke, 1988; Wolf, 1973) that I reviewed related to teacher evaluation. In terms of their perceptions of the interpersonal treatment the three minoritized teachers’ felt that their TPA experience ranged from some teachers believing that their experiences depended on the idiosyncrasies of the administrator (Wolf, 1973), to other teachers
perceiving that the administrators brought prejudices with them (Scriven, 1981) to others feeling that they were victims of discrimination (Barr & Burton, 1926). In fact, the issue of discrimination leads to the themes I just identified in the literature as experienced by the minoritized teacher in my study.

My study also reflects the findings of Igbaria and Shayo (1997) who explained that differences in actual rated and perceived job performance can be attributed to disparate and indirect treatment discrimination conditions that prevent minoritized people from having the opportunity to do well. Similarly, my study shared a finding with Huo and Tyler (2001) who concluded that what mattered most was how fairly employees’ supervisors treated them at work. In particular their study demonstrated that unfair treatment for minoritized people is often characterized by favoritism, inability to trust the supervisor, and disrespectful treatment. I document similar perceptions on the part of the minoritized teachers who participated in my study.

Another theme I identified relates to these minoritized teachers’ experiences with a range of abusive supervisory behaviours. Like Goffman (1967), I used the Blases’ (2003) typology of administrator mistreatment to highlight selected examples of the abusive behaviours minoritized teachers in my study experienced. My findings, as presented in Tables 26-28 (see p. 152-159) suggest that all three minoritized teachers reported between two and seven types of mistreatment which the Blases (2003) characterize as abuse.

Finally, taken together in terms of interpersonal fairness, I found that the minoritized teachers in my study were concerned with issues related to the administrators’ biases against them. My interview data raise questions about the ethicality of administrators who appraise minoritized teachers.
Conclusions

From my study, I draw four main conclusions.

Conclusion #1

By using the Blases’ typology of the practices of mistreatment of teachers, the first conclusion is that the minoritized teachers in my study were more likely to experience practices of mistreatment from the administrators who appraised them than mainstream teachers.

Conclusion #2

Furthermore, just like in society at large, the teachers in my study who identified as having a country of origin other than Canada, were not Caucasian, spoke a primary language other than English or French and who were not heterosexual were minoritized. In my study, when compared to the mainstream female group, minoritized teachers consistently endured either subtle or overt manifestations of forms of oppression such as racism, sexism and homophobia.

Conclusion #3

Given that (a) Canada has had more than three decades of official multiculturalism policies, (b) over 30 years have passed since the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) was enacted, (c) over 10 years have passed since both the Ontario Human Rights Act (1990) and the Antiracism and Ethnocultural Equity in Schools Policy (1993) were legislated, it was surprising to find that minoritized teachers I sampled reported manifestations of racism, sexism and homophobia such as the mistreatment, prejudice and discrimination at the levels indicated by my findings. In addition, given the existence of the aforementioned two pieces of legislation, the one policy, and the Ontario College of Teachers’ Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession (2006), it is clear that much more work needs to be done to reduce or at
least disrupt the severe consequences these minoritized teachers are experiencing at the hands of administrators who engage in a range of types of mistreatment and forms of oppression against teachers.

**Conclusion #4**

The last conclusion I proffer concerns the issue of gender. As mentioned in Chapter Two, although women have historically experienced years of oppression and have been traditionally disenfranchised in the workplace this was not the case for the teachers in my sample. Although further research in this area needs to be completed, “a subordinate [in the case of my sample, male teachers] group has to focus on survival. It becomes very important for subordinates to become highly attuned to the [mainstream groups] as a way of protecting themselves.” (Tatum, 2000, p. 12). This hypothesis has been tested in at least one study. Jim Allan (1993) conducted in-depth interviews with fifteen male elementary teachers working in Iowa. He examined the impact of gender in the elementary teaching profession where women are over-represented. Allen (1993) found that male elementary teachers “were constantly under scrutiny when it came to issues relating to their maleness or masculinity” (as cited in Eng, 2003, ¶ 10). According to Allan (1993):

> On one hand, they had to display attributes of masculinity and model actions of a “real man” in the manner that was acceptable in the elementary classroom. However, they also felt that “pressures to conform to stereotypically feminine qualities to establish the sensitive caring relationships necessary to effectively teach children.” (p. 114)

This dual conflict is best summarized by Allan (2003) when he states that for the men in his study, “gender is highly problematized, and they must negotiate the meaning of masculinity every day” (p. 114).
Implications

My study suggests that the time has come for all members of the educational community to carefully examine the extant literature on ethical decision-making before any more teachers are appraised in this province. The literature I reviewed and my findings show that the current practices of teacher evaluation are not working and that they are grounded in data of questionable validity and reliability. In fact, Barr and Burton’s (1926) study, conducted over eight decades ago, highlighted the potential for discrimination in teacher evaluation practices used then. It is problematic that over 80 years later, my study offers such similar results.

My study also highlights that forms of oppression such as racism, sexism and homophobia occur against these minoritized teachers. These are manifested as subtle and overt discriminatory practices which affect the lives of the minoritized teachers I sampled. It is likely that Ontario’s teaching population is going to become increasingly more diverse. We know that manifestations of racism, sexism and homophobia such as discrimination can have devastating and debilitating consequences (Lawton et al., 1989) and that since these teachers work with students, it is clear these effects impact ultimately upon the students these teachers teach. This understood, unless Ontario’s educational administrators are willing to begin to reflect consciously on the ways in which their actions manifest in the forms of oppression such as racism, sexism and homophobia, the cycle of oppression will continue. Administrators need to think about the biases, prejudices and stereotypical attitudes they intentionally or unintentionally bring to appraising teachers, or we will continue to perpetuate the cycle of oppression against these minoritized teachers and the consequences that all the various forms of this oppression entails. Given the far-reaching effects TPA has on all members of the educational community,
the time has come for people to develop strategies to resist the oppression experienced by the
minoritized teachers in my sample.

My study brings to the fore that “the causes of this [discrimination] extend far beyond
individuals” (Ryan, 2003, p. 15) and that while these minoritized teachers “are implicated in
their own and others’ misfortunes, they are not exclusively responsible for them” (p. 15). As
Foucault would summarize, power is not a thing, it is something that is exercised through action,
it does not belong to any one individual, and it can be transformed through resistance. Disrupting
this cycle is critical if we hope to influence positively Ontario’s students who will become future
leaders. If we are not prepared, willing or able to do this for Ontario’s teachers, I argue that we
should do it for the students and disrupt the cycle of oppression and, in so doing, build a better
future.

**Contributions to the Field of Educational Administration**

My study makes a contribution to the field of educational administration in five main
ways. First, by administering a questionnaire I was able to gather some data that, for the first
time, investigated how three minoritized teachers perceived their experiences with TPA. The
data confirmed the hypothesis implied in the theory which underpins my study. This hypothesis
was that just as forms of oppressions such as racism, sexism and homophobia occur in society at
large, since schools are microcosms of society manifestations of racism, sexism and homophobia
such as discrimination against these minoritized teachers were probable. I expected by
investigating these minoritized teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with TPA I would see
how these forms of oppression would play out and be able to identify some manifestations of
them.
Second, the greatest struggle, but also the greatest learning for me in the journey of completing this study emerged from the interviews, I felt privileged to have had the opportunity to listen to teachers tell me their stories about their experiences with the high stakes nature of TPA. Before I began this thesis, I was familiar with Lawton et al.’s (1989) work suggesting, “one of the major reasons for the difficulties associated with personnel evaluation is the intensity of the human interaction and the possibility of an adverse judgment about an individual’s performance, a judgment that may damage a career or cause debilitating personal distress” (p. 13). However, having had the opportunity to listen to three minoritized teachers put some human faces on this theoretical position.

Third, my analyses of interview data involved referencing a typology based on some literature related to mistreatment of teachers to understand that despite the existence of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) the Ontario Human Rights Code (1990) school board policies as required by the Anti-Racism and Ethnocultural Equity in School Boards, (1993) policy and the Ontario College of Teachers’ Ethical Standards for the Teaching Profession (2006), the three minoritized teachers in my study still live in fear and are victims of the very aspects of their identities that the aforementioned legislation and policies are intended to protect. From my relatively privileged place in society and as an educator who has committed himself to the principles of acceptance and understanding of the differences among individuals, this thesis wounded me spiritually. It also opened my eyes as I hope it does for other members of this society. My greatest hope is that my findings will help educators to open their eyes to and empathize with the experiences of these minoritized teachers. I also hope that they will be moved to alter their discriminatory thinking and behaviour.
Fourth, my study responded to two calls for action. First, although organizational justice
has only been studied for approximately 20 years, my study responded to the call by Cropanzano
(2001) for researchers to examine how all four of the dimensions of organizational justice:
outcome, informational procedural and interpersonal fairness related to organizational justice
intersect. As recently as 2005, Hubbell and Chory-Assad (2005) identified the paucity of
research on all four of the fairness dimensions. Second, it takes up Page’s (2003) call to action
by attempting to “fill a gap in the educational knowledge base with the ways that culture, race,
ethnicity, class, language, and other forms of diversity affect the process of supervision” (p. 161).

Finally, in terms of my contribution to the literature on critical theory, my sharing of
teachers’ perceptions about and experiences with TPA gave them voices. In Foucault’s (1976)
words, the objective of my thesis was:

> to understand power by looking at its extremities, at its outer limits at the point
where it becomes capillary; in other words, to understand power in its most
regional forms and institutions, and especially at the points where this power
transgresses the rules of right that organize and delineate it, oversteps those rules
and is invested in institutions, is embodied in techniques and acquires the material
means to intervene, sometimes in violent ways. (pp. 27-28)

For me, it allowed me the opportunity to look at the interplay between the terms of power
relationships. In my study, the power transgresses the aforementioned legislation and policies
designed to protect these teachers from the very types of discrimination as manifestations of
forms of oppression such as racism, sexism and homophobia they endured. However, laws in
themselves do not represent power. As Foucault (1976) puts it:

> Power is exercised through networks, and individuals do not simply circulate in
those networks; they are in a position to both submit to and exercise this power.
They are never the inert or consenting targets of power; they are always its relays.
In other words, power passes through individuals. It is not applied to them. (p. 29)
My study provides an opportunity to share my findings with these teachers and if read by others, perhaps my study will allow other people interested in disrupting the cycle of oppression to talk either about the ways they want to submit to this power or to discuss, identify and act upon strategies they can use resist the domination, seen as the technique of discrimination and disrupt the cycle of oppression. I hope that in the course of these discussions my study inspires people at all levels to recognize that just as power relations are open-textured so too are the reasons for resistance or submission to them.

**Recommendations**

This study is a first attempt to understand three minoritized teacher’s experiences with TPA. As I suggested, the time has come for all educators to think seriously about the ways in which power operates through the various forms of oppressions in schools as microcosms of society. Educators ought to look at how the various forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, homophobia and ableism impact everyone. In addition, due attention should be given to how manifestations of the “isms” such as bias, prejudices, stereotypes and bigotry work and how they impact all people. In keeping with critical theory, as the theory used to underpin this study, my submission of this thesis should be considered as one technique of resisting the oppression experienced by the discrimination the minoritized teachers in my sample endured during their experiences with TPA. After all, this study is at least an attempt to hold “up the systems we believe in and are somewhat attached to and [to say], consider this more fully” (Foster, 1986, p. 72). The quality of teachers’ appraisals is critical to the success or failure of any educational system and this is the system, as dysfunctional as it has always seemed to be that we are attached to and that I believe needs to be considered even more fully.
It would be arrogant of me, and I believe disrespectful to the subjects concerned – the teachers – for me to list a number of resistance strategies in which they could engage to disrupt the oppression they experienced as the forms of discrimination. However, it would irresponsible of me to offer no suggestions at all. As mentioned in Chapter Two, my goal is to proffer a way of thinking about employing strategies that “show people the way to ‘short circuit’ the mechanisms through which they subordinate both themselves and others in the process of being themselves” (Ryan, 1998, p. 275). “These activities should (1) reveal potential strategies, (2) act as examples, or (3) provide opportunities for members to become involved in political action” (Ryan, 1998, p. 275), (4) should act as valuable learning experiences for everyone. Therefore, I recommend that people, and especially those subjects directly involved, find some ways to resist the domination they experience. By finding like-minded others, including other administrators, government policy makers, teacher federation executive members, other teachers, parents/guardians and students they might consider focusing their initial efforts on:

1. Helping administrators to recognize their own subjectivity and taking steps to ensure that rewards are delivered in as fair a manner as possible by engaging in open and frank discussions about their perceptions about and experiences how the power of mainstream groups operates through forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, homophobia, and/or ableism and how manifestations of these forms of oppression such as biases, prejudices, stereotypical views and attitudes and bigotry impact people;

2. Developing minoritized sensitivity training programs to give administrators effect- and bias-free tools to better evaluate teachers’ performance; and
3. Encouraging administrators to include minoritized teachers in their informal job-related and non-job related social interactions to help sensitize them to the experiences of minoritized people.

Having made such statements, my other recommendation is a call to action for other researchers to present further evidence about this and to involve the subject of the TPA-the teacher- to discuss, identify and engage in resistance strategies to disrupt the cycle oppression which clearly continues to be played out for some minoritized teachers.

As the history of performance appraisal shows and my study confirms, there is a great difference between the assumptions of the ideal scientifically oriented, objective performance appraisals and how appraisals actually are done or how employees perceive they are done (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). The scientific approach involves offering a supposed valid and accurate representation of a teacher. This perspective is based on three assumptions:

1. that work arrangements allow for a reliable and valid performance appraisal,
2. that administrators can assess performance accurately, and
3. that a rational, unitary criterion for appraisal exists.

From their experiences with appraisals however, my participants challenged these assumptions. The data I analyzed from the experiences of three teachers who belong to the mainstream group and three teachers who belong to minoritized groups raise questions about how these assumptions play out in their experiences. One of the most frequent observations from both groups of teachers is that the administrators simply do not have enough opportunities to observe them, basing most, if not all, of their views on a 40 minute observation period. Next, teachers empathized with both the number of appraisals administrators are expected to conduct and the time allowed for collecting the necessary data. Taken together, this prevents administrators from
collecting enough data to develop an accurate picture of what teachers are doing regularly. In addition, even if ‘appropriate’ criteria can be used, the participants in my study suggested that these criteria can be interpreted in many different ways depending on the interpreter and the administrator’s values, biases and standards.

Folger and Cropanzano (1998) suggest that, instead of reaching only for the ‘scientific truth’ (a position espoused by proponents of the dominant ‘managerial’ stream of educational administration), we should also understand the impact of the procedures used and the social contexts of appraisals. My reflections upon the interviews I conducted allowed me to see clearly that teachers are concerned not only with the outcome of the appraisal, or, in other words, issues of outcome fairness, but also with the process through which decisions about their performance were made, or procedural fairness. In addition, they are also concerned with what information was used to explain the outcome or the processes used (informational fairness), and how they were treated in the process (interpersonal fairness). Although I developed a clear conceptual framework including outcome, informational, procedural and interpersonal fairness, by conducting analyses of interviews for both each individual participant and each group of participants, I realized that teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with performance appraisals could not easily be categorized or presented in mutually exclusive categories. Instead, one striking observation was that as teachers discussed their perceptions they often spoke of their experiences from the outcome, informational, procedural and interpersonal fairness perspectives simultaneously.

Finally, from a policy perspective my recommendation is best expressed in the words of John Rawls, the moral philosopher who wrote, “Justice is the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is of systems of thought: A theory however elegant and economical must be rejected or
revised if it is untrue; likewise laws and institutions no matter how efficient and well-arranged
must be reformed or abolished if they are unjust” (as cited in Deutsch, 1985, p. 1).


Appendix A

Ontario Teacher Performance Appraisal 2002

Due to the large number of pages (71 pages) of this document, the reader may access the TPA document at: https://ospace.scholarsportal.info/bitstream/1873/3964/1/10303870.pdf
Appendix B

Questionnaire

For: Elementary Teachers in (Name of School Board)

As a doctoral candidate in OISE/UT’s Theory and Policy Studies Department, I am conducting this questionnaire to be used to write a doctoral thesis.

I am inquiring about your views related to your experience with Ontario’s Teacher Performance Appraisal System, 2002 (TPA). Its declared purposes are: to ensure that students receive the benefit of an education system staffed by teachers who are performing their duties satisfactorily; to provide for fair, effective, and consistent teacher evaluation in every school; and to promote professional growth (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 3).

Your responses will be strictly confidential and the data from this research will be reported only in the aggregate. Your information will be coded and will remain confidential.

Although your email address is requested to complete the questionnaire, and this survey software automatically generates an email which acknowledges your completion of the survey, unless you specifically offer your email address in the "Interest in Future Follow-up Sessions", your email address is not available to anyone.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and, if you feel uncomfortable answering any questions, you can withdraw from the survey at any point, or skip any questions.

Although some of these questions may be sensitive, the responses to the demographic questions become the data sets and are used as the basis upon which to conduct analyses. In some cases, options “No opinion”, “Don’t / Not sure” are provided. Responding to questions in these ways allows this researcher to understand your position as you declare it as opposed to the researcher’s interpretation that you simply missed responding to the question(s).

This survey is designed to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. The final section of the survey invites you to voluntarily declare an interest in participating in follow-up sessions. In keeping with ethical protocols, should you choose to want to continue to participate in a follow-up interview, you will be asked to read and sign an informed consent form.

Please be advised that once reported all data in paper form will be shredded and all electronic data will be deleted and removed completely from any hard drive or any other electronic storage instrument.

If you have questions at any time about the survey or the procedures used, contact Tom Miller, doctoral candidate OISE/UT, at 416 222 8143 or via e-mail at tommiller@sympatico.ca. You are also invited to contact my supervisor, Dr. Sharon Lapkin at slapkin@oise.utoronto.ca.

Thank you very much for your time and willingness to share your information.
QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT YOUR EXPERIENCE AS A TEACHER WITH ONTARIO’S TEACHER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM-Elementary Teachers of (Name Local)

PART I
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. I was born in Canada.
   ☐ Yes (If yes, continue to question #4)
   ☐ No (If not, then answer questions #2 and #3)

2. I have lived in Canada for (specify from options below)
   ☐ Less than 6 months
   ☐ 7 months to 1 year
   ☐ More than 1 year but less than 3 years
   ☐ More than 3 years but less than 7 years
   ☐ More than 7 years but less than 10 years
   ☐ More than 10 years

3. What is your country of origin?

4. What is or are your primary language(s) (i.e. the one(s) you use now most of the time)?
   (Check as many as applicable).
   ☐ English
   ☐ French
   ☐ Chinese
   ☐ Spanish
   ☐ German
   ☐ Greek
   ☐ Japanese
   ☐ Polish
   ☐ Italian
   ☐ Portuguese
   ☐ Punjabi
   ☐ Ukrainian

Other (specify below)
5. What is your gender?
   ☐ Female
   ☐ Male

6. What is your sexual orientation? (Check one)
   ☐ Lesbian
   ☐ Gay male
   ☐ Bisexual
   ☐ Two-spirited
   ☐ Asexual
   ☐ Transgender
   ☐ Heterosexual
   Other (specify below)

7. Are you a member of a visible minority?
   ☐ Yes (If yes, continue to answer question # 8)
   ☐ No (If not, continue to question # 9)

8. Using the terms related to ethnic origin used in Statistics Canada’s census surveys, how would you classify yourself?
   ☐ Black
   ☐ South Asian
   ☐ Chinese
   ☐ Korean
   ☐ Southeast Asian
   ☐ Arab/West Asian
   ☐ Filipino
   ☐ Latin American
   ☐ Japanese
   Other (specify below)

9. Do you consider yourself in any way disabled?
   ☐ Yes (If yes, answer question #10)
   ☐ No (If not, continue to question #11)
10. Check the box(es) describing your form(s) of disability. (Check all that apply)

- [ ] Blind or Visually Impaired
- [ ] D/deaf or Hard-of-Hearing
- [ ] Learning Disabled
- [ ] I live with a mental illness
- [ ] Physically challenged

Other (specify below)

PART II

Thinking about your most recent performance appraisal process, check ( √ ) the box which answers the questions below.

11. Has your teaching been appraised using Ontario's Teacher Performance Appraisal System, (TPA) between September 2003 and June 2006?

- [ ] Yes (If yes, continue to answer the remaining questions)
- [ ] No (If not, thank you. You have now completed this questionnaire)

12. What overall rating did you receive?

- [ ] Exemplary
- [ ] Good
- [ ] Satisfactory
- [ ] Unsatisfactory

13. To what extent do you agree with the rating this administrator assigned you?

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT THE PURPOSES OF TPA

Legend
SA=Strongly Agree  A=Agree  D=Disagree  SD=Strongly Disagree  N/N=Not Sure/No Opinion

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Some form of teacher performance appraisal should exist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In its current form, the TPA allows for a fair appraisal of teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In its current form, the TPA allows for an effective appraisal of teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. In its current form, the TPA allows for a consistent appraisal of teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. In its present form the TPA provides opportunities to promote professional growth of teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The TPA process helped me to identify areas of focus which promoted professional growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT THE TPA PROCEDURE

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. I received notification within 20 school days after I began teaching in my evaluation year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I had a fair pre-observation meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I had a fair classroom observation session.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I had a fair post-observation meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I had a fair summative report process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I had a fair review of my Annual Learning Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The observation debriefing with me was detailed and comprehensive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. The observation debriefing reflected a use of multiple data sources in conducting my appraisal.
28. The feedback I received was specific.
29. The feedback I received was constructive.
30. I was involved in a dialogue about my performance.
31. I believe that no singular weakness or flaw unduly influenced my overall rating.
32. I believe that regardless of the day I was appraised, the outcome would have been the same.
33. My appraisal experience was consistent with how this administrator conducted it with other members of the teaching staff.
PART III

YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT INTERPERSONAL DYNAMICS

The following questions allow you to characterize various aspects of the interpersonal dynamics between you and the administrator who conducted your TPA.

33. Overall, I characterize the relationship between this administrator and me as “trusting.”

34. This administrator was motivated to protect our relationship.

35. This administrator was motivated to nurture our relationship.

36. I could express my opinions and feelings with respect to professional practice openly and honestly with this administrator.

37. This administrator and I worked together to identify problems.

38. This administrator and I worked together to solve problems.

39. This administrator and I strove to understand each other regardless any differences between us.

40. Overall, I was comfortable disclosing most issues to this administrator.

41. I was comfortable disclosing my opinions and feelings related to my professional practice as a teacher (e.g. effective professional development sessions, program issues, interactions with parents/guardians related to student achievement and/or behaviour, etc.) to this administrator.

42. I was comfortable disclosing personal information such as where I take a vacation, a movie I saw, a book I read, etc. to this administrator.

43. I was comfortable disclosing personal information such as my marital status, my sexual orientation, any non-visible disabilities I have, etc. to this administrator.

YOUR COMMENTS ABOUT YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH TPA

44. In the space provided below, please feel free to make any comments about your experience with TPA.

PART VI

INTEREST IN FUTURE FOLLOW-UP SESSIONS

45. This section of this survey invites you to consider participating in further follow-up studies. Please check the box which best reflects your interest in future participation. Note: In the event that more volunteers agree to participate
than can be successfully managed by the researcher, a random sample of participants will be selected and this researcher will communicate this protocol to unselected individuals who provide email contact information.

☐ I would not be willing to participate in any further discussion of this. I would not like to be contacted under any circumstances as a follow-up to this questionnaire.

☐ I would be willing to participate in an email follow-up to this questionnaire, with the understanding that this would allow me to conceal my anonymity. However, I would not be willing to participate in a face-to-face interview session (email address required).

☐ I would like to receive a copy of the summary of results (email mandatory).

If applicable given the responses provided in Part VI, what is your name (always optional)

If applicable for the responses provided in Part VI, what is your email address?

NOTE: Providing your email address at the beginning of this survey only allowed you to open the survey. If you wish to continue with a follow-up study or wish to receive a copy of the summary of results you must provide your correct address in the space below.
46. If applicable, check the box which indicates the most convenient time(s) you would be available to meet for a face-to-face, one-on-one follow-up interview. (Check all that apply).

- Monday 6:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.
- Monday 7:15 p.m. - 8:15 p.m.
- Tuesday 6:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.
- Tuesday 7:15 p.m. - 8:15 p.m.
- Wednesday 6:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.
- Wednesday 7:15 p.m. - 8:15 p.m.
- Thursday 6:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.
- Thursday 7:15 p.m. - 8:15 p.m.
- Friday 6:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.
- Friday 7:15 p.m. - 8:15 p.m.
- Saturday 10:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.
- Saturday 11:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.
- Saturday 1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.
- Saturday 2:15 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.
- Saturday 3:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
- Saturday 4:45 p.m. - 5:45 p.m.
- Sunday 10:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.
- Sunday 11:15 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.
- Sunday 1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.
- Sunday 2:15 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.
- Sunday 3:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
- Sunday 4:45 p.m. - 5:45 p.m.

Other (specify below)

You have now completed this questionnaire. Thank you for your time and contribution to this research study.
Appendix C
Interview Script

INTRODUCTION
1. Thank you for agreeing to participate in this follow-up interview. Would you please tell me why you agreed to participate?

A. PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE PURPOSES OF THE TPA

1. Please tell me how you feel generally about any form of teacher performance appraisal process.

2. What would you like to say about the intended purposes of TPA.

3. Now tell me about how you felt about your experience related to how the TPA process provided opportunities to promote your professional growth as a teacher.

4. Now how, if at all, did this process help you identify areas of focus for your professional growth?

5. Do you believe that any aspect of your identity influenced your feelings related to the intended purposes of TPA? If so, please explain.

6. What would need to happen for you to have a more positive or negative attitude concerning the purposes of the teacher performance appraisal processes?

B. YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH TPA

1. I'm interested in exploring how you feel about the issue of outcome fairness. Please tell me about how you felt about the outcome, in terms of rating you received.

2. What rating did you receive?

3. Can you help me understand if and how you believe any aspect of your identity influenced this rating?

4. Did you agree with the rating you received? Why or why not?

5. What changes would you make to TPA fairer in terms of outcome?
C. YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH THE INTENDED TPA PROCEDURE

1. Now, I'd like us to focus on the issue of procedural fairness. As I see it procedural fairness relates to considering if the procedures used to determine the outcome were fair. With this in mind, reflecting back to the procedures, not the person, but the process, how fair would you describe this process to have been?

2. I am wondering if you believe that any aspect of your identity influenced your perception about your experience with the procedures involved in TPA. Why or why not?

3. What changes would you make to the procedures of TPA to make it fairer?

4. Now, I'd like to focus on the issue of interpersonal fairness. Here, I would like to focus on the things the person who conducted the performance appraisal did. In your view, was this person fair? Why or why not?

5. Help me understand if and how any aspect of your identity influenced how the person who conducted this performance appraisal. Please explain your answer.

6. Now I would like to ask you a few specific questions related to issues of fairness. In my view, one aspect of fairness relates to consistency. In this way no singular weakness or flaw unduly influences the outcome, the procedures used or the person doing the appraising. Tell me a little about how you felt this played out in your experience.

7. Another important aspect related to fairness relates to time. In this case, do you believe that regardless of the day you were appraised, the outcome, procedure or person doing the appraisal the result would been the same. What do you have to say about this?

8. Finally, another issue I identify as important with respect to fairness concerns that the person who appraised you would do so in ways which would be consistent with how he/she would do this for other members of the teaching staff. What would you like to say about this?

9. What changes would you make to TPA fairer in terms of the procedures used?
D. YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH THE INFORMATION PROVIDED TO YOU ABOUT YOUR TPA

1. What sources of information were used to explain your appraisal rating? What sources of information were used to explain the process?

2. Can you tell me specifically about how you felt about the:
   - pre-observation meeting as a source of information
   - the observation debriefing session,
   - how about the information used to determine the rating you received?
   - now what about your involvement in a dialogue about your performance?
   - now I think you talked about this before, but how about the feedback you received?
   - and your summative report
   - and finally about the review of your annual learning plan

3. Do you believe that any aspect of your identity in any way influenced the information used to determine your rating? Please explain.

4. What changes would you make to the information used or how it was collected to improve the TPA process?

E. YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH THIS ADMINISTRATOR

The next series of questions focuses specifically on the relationship between you and the administrator who conducted your most recent performance appraisal but you have referred to both administrators throughout the interview, so I'm going to encourage you to keep doing that

1. In terms of trust, what would you like to say about the relationship that existed between you and the administrator who conducted your last performance appraisal?

2. Do you believe that any aspect of your identity in any way influenced this relationship? Please explain.

3. What changes would have been necessary to have made the relationship between you and the administrator better?
F. YOUR COMFORT LEVEL WITH THIS ADMINISTRATOR

This next series of questions allows you to tell me more about your comfort level in disclosing issues with the administrator who conducted your most recent performance appraisal.

1. Tell me how comfortable you felt disclosing information about your professional practice or personal life with the administrator.

2. Would you say that any aspect of your identity in any way influenced your comfort level disclosing information to this administrator? Tell me more about this.

3. What changes would you have made to create a more comfortable relationship between you?

G. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

At this time, I would simply like to ask you to talk about any issues related to your experience with the TPA policy that you feel were not covered during this interview and that you would like to share with me at this time.
Appendix D
Information Letter / Consent Form

September 15, 2006

Information/Permission Letter to Federation Local Presidents

From: (Researcher) Thomas J. Miller

Dear (Name of Federation Local President)

Thank you for giving me permission in principle to conduct my research project with members of your organization. As I noted in our first contact, I am currently enrolled in the Theory and Policy Studies Department of OISE/UT. I am doing this research as part of the requirement for the completion of my thesis as one component of the doctoral program under the supervision of Dr. Sharon Lapkin, slapkin@oise.utoronto.ca. The purpose of this letter is to provide you with information that you will need to understand what I am doing, and to decide whether to give permission for me to conduct my research project with members of your organization. If you agree, participation of your members will be completely voluntary, and participants will be free to withdraw at any time.
This letter, as well as the informed consent form attached will be provided to participants who agree to participate in this study. In addition to writing their name in the first sentence, participants will find a place to indicate whether or not they wish to give their permission. They will be asked to check the appropriate box, sign, and provide the date. They will return one signed copy to me and keep the other for their reference.

The name of this research project is:

Investigating Minority Elementary Teacher’s Perceptions of their Experiences with Ontario’s Teacher Performance Appraisal System (TPA)

The nature and purpose of the research is to investigate teachers’ perceptions of their experiences with their most recent teacher performance appraisal as outlined in the Ontario Government’s TPA.

I wish to survey elementary school teachers in two local associations in order to document teachers’ perceptions about

- the current teacher performance appraisal
- the current structure and procedures outlined in the TPA policy as a way of providing for fair performance appraisals of teachers employed in Ontario’s publicly funded school systems
- their experiences with the TPA policy as indicated by:
  - The various required components outlined in the policy
  - The fairness of the process involved in conducting this appraisal with respect to the following; observational skills, use of multiple data sources, feedback, involvement of the teacher in dialogue, and interpersonal skills.
  - The participants’ opinions about trust and their comfort levels disclosing information about themselves to the administrator who conducted this appraisal.
The results of the study will be published as a thesis and I may present the study findings at educational conferences. In these cases, I will not disclose the names of the participants, their schools nor the district school boards in which they work.

Participants’ part in the research, if they agree, is answering those questions on the web-based questionnaire with which they feel comfortable. Although the responses of all teachers who complete the questionnaire will be analyzed, I anticipate a sample size of 150 respondents. For those who volunteer to be interviewed subsequently, the researcher will advise that participation during any aspect of this interview is completely voluntary and participants reserve the right to decline responding to any question or to withdraw from this study at any time. I hope that an equal balance of at least 5 volunteers in each of the six identified categories will agree to follow-up interviews. In the unlikely event that more participants agree to be interviewed than my supervisor and I believe is reasonable for this study, respondents will be selected randomly using the lottery method. In this instance, respondents who were not selected will receive an email communication which thanks them for their willingness to participate and will outline the rationale used upon which this decision was based.

Potential limitations in my ability to guarantee anonymity are that participants’ name, the name of their school boards, or school could be identified. However, these will be replaced pseudonyms that participants choose prior to the recording of this session and will be reported in the thesis or conference presentations as participants indicate.
Potential benefits your organization might derive from participating include participants reflecting upon their most recent experiences with TPA. Information from the questionnaire and interviews could be used to provide recommendations to improve the TPA process.

In order to minimize any undue influence upon participants, apart from a light snack and bottled water to be offered during the interview session, no compensation or reimbursements will be offered for volunteers who participate in this study. The interview session will take no longer than one hour to complete, the session will be tape-recorded, transcribed, kept in a locked filing cabinet in the researchers’ home and all data, electronic or otherwise will be destroyed not more than one year following this study.

Should you have any questions about this study, please contact me using the contact information provided below, or my supervisor, Dr. Sharon Lapkin at 416 923 6641 ext. 2645 or via email at slapkin@oise.utoronto.ca

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Miller

Phone: 416 222-8143

Email: tommiller@sympatico.ca
To Be Completed by the Federation Local Presidents

I have read the letter outlining the study proposed by Tom Miller. I understand what is being asked and the accompanying conditions and promises. I understand the nature and limitations of the research.

☐ I have authority to, and give my permission to conduct the research with members of this organization.

If I am making any exceptions or stipulations, these are (please specify):

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

______________________________ (Signature)
______________________________ (Printed Name)
______________________________ (Date)

☐ I would like to receive a copy of the results of this study when completed.

My email address is: _________________________________
Appendix E
Invitations Distributed to Members by Presidents

ETFO-(NAME OF LOCAL) has agreed to allow Tom Miller, a doctoral candidate at OISE/UT to invite its members to voluntarily participate in completing a web-based questionnaire concerning your experiences with Ontario's Teacher Performance Appraisal System, conducted between September 2003 and September 2005.

This questionnaire requires approximately 30-45 minutes to complete.

Should you agree, you will notice that to complete the questionnaire you are asked to provide an email address. This allows the system to generate an electronic response once you have completed the questionnaire and this email provides you with a personalized address which would allow you to modify your survey at anytime until Monday, October 9, 2006 at 12:01 a.m. The initial email you provide is unavailable to anyone unless you provide it in Part IV of the questionnaire.

Please be advised that occasionally, the server at OISE/UT is busy. Should you be unable to access the questionnaire at anytime, please persist. In the event that you have any unique problems or questions, please contact Tom directly using the email address provided below.

You might notice that some minor formatting anomalies, especially with respect to font style and font size are still present. At this time this cannot be resolved.

Should you have any questions, comments, or suggestions for ways to improve the questionnaire, I would ask that you email Tom directly at tommiller@sympatico.ca

To access the questionnaire go to:

Sincerely,
NAME OF PRESIDENT
President, ETFO – NAME OF LOCAL
A week ago, we distributed an invitation for our members to volunteer to participate in completing a web-based survey related to your experience with Ontario's Teacher Performance Appraisal System.

This message reminds you that should be interested in participating the deadline is Monday, October 9 at 12:01 a.m. To access the questionnaire go to:


Sincerely,

NAME OF PRESIDENT
President, ETFO – NAME OF LOCAL