



## Opinions of School Administrators on the Performance Appraisal System in Education

Tarık Soydan\* Hüseyin Gürkan Abalı\*\* Cemal Kalsen\*\*\*

### ABSTRACT

The performance evaluation system is one of the elements of the New Public Administration approach which is put forward to make valid the principals of business management in the public sector. Based on the literature and the opinions of the school administrators, the operability of the performance evaluation system is reviewed and discussed in this study. With the survey made within the study, the school administrators', worked in the common public schools in the 2012-2013 school year in Afyonkarahisar city of Turkey, on the performance evaluation system are tried to be determined, taking into consideration the teacher evaluation and the operation of the performance system aspects of it. According to the results deduced from the findings of the survey, the school administrators partly agree with the opinions that the division of teachers to the career stages provokes them to improve their abilities and increases their motivation for work. The gender and status at work parameters significantly change the opinions. The women administrators, compared to the men and the administrators who are master teachers, compared to the ones who are just teachers, have more positive opinions about the division of teachers to the career stages. The surveyed administrators agree positively above the mean with the statements that constitutes the factor of performance system operation in education, those state the idea that the performance evaluation can be applied objectively, justly, and to increase productivity of workers. When the scale used in the survey is taken into consideration, the school administrators agree positively at mean with the performance evaluation system in the area of education. There is a significant difference between the opinions of the school administrators about the performance system according to their teachership status. The school administrators who are master teachers have more positive opinions about this issue, compared to the ones who are just teachers. According to the qualitative data reached by the survey, most of the people who have declared their opinions written (14 ones) doubt whether or not the performance evaluation system can be applied justly, objectively and sufficiently.

**Keywords:** Performance appraisal system, education, educational administration, efficiency in education.

---

\* Assist. Prof. Dr., Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Educational Administration and Policy Department, Ankara, Turkey. E-mail: soydantarik@yahoo.com

\*\* Dr., Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Educational Administration and Policy Department, Ankara, Turkey. E-mail: gabalius@yahoo.com

\*\*\* PhD. Student, Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Educational Administration and Policy Department, Ankara, Turkey. E-mail: cemalkalsen@mynet.com

## Eğitim Alanında Performans Değerlendirme Sistemine İlişkin Okul Yöneticilerinin Görüşleri

### ÖZ

Performans değerlendirme sistemi, kamu alanında işletme yönetimi ilkelerinin geçerliğini sağlamaya yönelik olarak gündeme getirilen Yeni Kamu Yönetimi yaklaşımının önemli öğelerinden birini oluşturmaktadır. Yeni liberal devlet ve toplum yaklaşımı çerçevesinde gündeme getirilen Yeni Kamu Yönetimi yaklaşımı, kamu alanında etkinliği ve verimliliği artırmayı hedeflerken bunun için öngördüğü önemli mekanizmalardan biri etkili bir performans değerlendirme sisteminin oluşturulmasıdır. Bu çalışmada eğitim alanında performans değerlendirme sistemi genel planda, ilgili literatür ve okul yöneticilerinin görüşleri üzerinden ele alınmış ve değerlendirilmiştir. Çalışma kapsamında gerçekleştirilen araştırma ile, Afyonkarahisar kentinde, 2012-2013 eğitim öğretim yılında genel kamu okullarında görev yapan okul yöneticilerinin eğitim alanında performans değerlendirme sistemine yönelik görüşleri, öğretmenlerin kariyer basamaklarına ayrılması ve performans sisteminin işleyişi boyutları ile, belirlenmeye çalışılmıştır.

Araştırmadan elde edilen bulgulara dayalı olarak ulaşılan sonuçlara göre, okul yöneticileri öğretmenleri kariyer basamaklarına ayırmanın onları kendilerini geliştirmeye teşvik edeceği ve onların iş motivasyonu artıracığı yönündeki düşüncelere kısmen katılmışlardır. Bu görüşler arasında cinsiyete ve öğretmenlik statüsüne göre anlamlı bir farklılık bulunmuştur. Kadın yöneticiler erkek yöneticilere ve uzman öğretmen statüsündeki yöneticiler öğretmen statüsündeki yöneticilere göre öğretmenlerin kariyer basamaklarına ayrılmasına daha olumlu yönde yaklaşmışlardır. Araştırma kapsamında okul yöneticileri, eğitimde performans sisteminin işleyişi faktörünü oluşturan, performans değerlendirmenin objektif, hakkaniyetli ve çalışanların verimliliğini artıracak şekilde uygulanabileceğine dair ifadelerle ortanın üstünde düzeyde olumlu yönde yaklaşmışlardır. Bu konuda okul yöneticilerinin görüşleri arasında çeşitli değişkenlere göre anlamlı bir farklılık bulunamamıştır. Araştırmada kullanılan ölçek bütün olarak ele alındığında, okul yöneticilerinin eğitim alanında genel olarak performans değerlendirme sistemine orta düzeyde olumlu yönde katıldıkları sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Bu konuda uzman öğretmen statüsündeki okul yöneticileri öğretmen statüsündeki okul yöneticilerine göre daha olumlu görüşlere sahiptirler. Araştırma kapsamında ulaşılan nitel verilere dayalı sonuçlara göre, yazılı görüş belirten katılımcıların çoğunluğu (14 kişi) performans değerlendirme sisteminin işletilmesinde yeterince hakkaniyetli, objektif ve yeterli olunup olunamayacağı konusunda tereddütler taşımaktadır.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** Performans değerlendirme sistemi, eğitim, eğitim yönetimi, eğitimde verimlilik.

## **INTRODUCTION**

While since 1980's the sphere of public services have been being restructured in accordance with the New Public Management approach in Turkey, the aims, structure and operation of the field of education has also been changing significantly. The performance appraisal system in the field of education which for a while has been occupying an important place in the agenda and the object of some efforts can also be regarded as one of the abovementioned changes.

In performance appraisal process, a set of values based on performance is tried to be established in the organization and the measurement and augmentation of each employees contribution to the organizational goals are the basic objectives of this system. While implementing the performance appraisal system, a set of standards based on the combined evaluation of work analysis, organizational unit analysis, job descriptions and qualifications is established in order to use these criteria systematically in the working life as tools of measuring and evaluating the performances of the employees (Palmer & Winters, 1993, 43; Canman, 1995:121).

It can be assumed that the most important component of the performance appraisal system is the performance-based wages and salaries. Hence, the most controversial topic of the relevant arguments is on how to establish the relation between the performances and wages/salaries which became the most important and debated issue (De Silva, 1998). Most generally, performance-based wage/salary system can be defined as a system based on the relation between the performances and wages/salaries. In performance-based wage/salary system, bonuses and the amount of wages/salaries are determined via the evaluation of the performance with respect to previously set goals/objectives (Kestane, 2003). It can be claimed that performance-based wage/salary system is also one of the most important components of strategic human resource management. In strategic human resource management approach, perceiving the employees as "the most valuable assets of the organization" rather than dealing only with personnel affairs and rather than seeing them as mere cost items is defended as an important strategic perspective which should be acquired by the organization (Adigüzel & Yüksel, 2010).

Various steps were taken in Turkey to develop the performance appraisal system. As an example; 2003 dated and 5018 numbered Public Finance Management and Control Law includes the issues such as organization-based cost-effectiveness, productivity, efficiency and regulates the measurement of these factors in their relations to the budget. However, this Law did not mention a performance control at the individual employee level and did not propose the establishment of a salary-performance relation regarding the public employees. Nevertheless, it can be claimed that the natural consequence of institutional performance system is the inevitable development of a performance system based on individual employee.

Some evaluations and targets pertaining to the development of performance system in the public sphere took place also in the national development plans in Turkey. According to the Long Term Strategy and 8th 5-Year Development Plan which had been prepared to be implemented in 2001-2005 period, one of the fundamental principles would be the creation of a system for measuring the performances of the employees effectively in order to augment productivity, efficiency and sparingness, that is, to develop performance (DPT, 2000:237). 9th National Development Plan that was implemented in 2007-2013 period included proposals for the augmentation of the education institutions' legal authorities and capacities, for the development of a model based on performance measurements at schools, for the revision of the personnel appraisal system and for the development and application of standards in order to measure the personnel performance objectively and transparently (2006:51, 96). According to latest Plan (2014-2018 10th National Development Plan), an ongoing need in the field of education is to develop a career system and a performance appraisal system (DPT, 2013:32, 34). Teacher training and development system will be restructured as a new structure that emphasizes the teacher and student competencies as main objectives, promotes the personal and professional development and is based on career development and performance.

For making the performance appraisal system functional and operational in public sphere in Turkey, various legal step has also been taken. In the 46th Article of the 5227 numbered Law on the Fundamental Principles and Restructuring of Public Administration which was accepted by the National Assembly in 2004 but not enforced, such statements as "civil servants and other public employees are appraised and rewarded via performance criteria" took place. In addition to this, "Public Personnel Draft Law" which was prepared as a draft text in 2005 but enactment process of which was frozen later on also included statements about performance payment within the definition of financial rights of the employees (Eraslan & Tozlu, 2011:39).

Concerning the appraisal system in the public sphere in Turkey, it is seen that the public employees had been being appraised through a personnel record system until the enactment of 2011 dated and 6111 numbered Law. In personnel record system, public employees were being appraised by their chiefs and no connection was being established between the performance and salary/wage of the employee. Personnel record system was abolished via the regulation of the 109th Article of the 657 numbered Civil Servant Law after the enactment of 6111 numbered Law. With the same regulation, employee information and personnel affairs file systems replaced the personnel record system. However this new system did not either establish a link between the appraisal of the personnel performances and the salaries/wages.

It can be claimed that for now in Turkey, there is a fragmented system of performance appraisal system concerning the public personnel. The performance-based practices in the public personnel system are functional for the supplementary payments rather than for the basic salaries/wages. For this issue, "contractual personnel" practice can be given as an example. While the

working conditions and personnel affairs of these type of employees are being regulated by the Council of Ministers, the chiefs of the contractual personnel were given the authority to grant performance-based promotional bonuses for the employees working in contractual status (Eraslan & Tozlu, 2011:39).

Looking at the field of education, it can be observed that National Education Ministry is the center of efforts for making the performance-based system operational and functional. A guiding report named as "Performance Appraisal System at School" and prepared by National Education Ministry Directorate of the Department for Researching and Developing of Education (MEB EARGED) in 2006 sets the framework of the ongoing efforts. However it should also be mentioned that these efforts are mainly related to the institution-based performance and development.

In the field of education, regulation of the teachers' career steps may be a good example for the performance appraisal practices. The 5204 numbered Law on Amendments in the National Education Basic Law and Civil Servants Law (which was published in 08.07.2004 dated Official Newspaper) regulated the separation of teachers into different career stages. The Regulation of Promotion in Teacher Career Stages was put into effect after being published 07.01.2006 dated and 26046 numbered Official Newspaper. According to the Article 5th of the Regulation, in the process of promotion along the teacher career stages, basic principle which will be adapted is "the development of the professional knowledge and of the skills of the teachers, equality in opportunities and facilities and obeying the criteria of generality, equality, validity, reliability, impartiality and clarity".

According to the Article 7th of the same Regulation, after the internship, the teaching profession is separated into 3 career stages as teacher, expert teacher and headmaster statuses. In the Education Ministry's educational-instructional services payroll, expert teachers's portion is 20% while the headmasters' portion is 10 % of the total number of teachers. These ratios may change (and the changes will be reflected on the numbers of expert teachers and headmasters) in case the Council of Ministers decides to modify the numbers. Supreme Court announced that the "teaching career stages regulation" is problematic as it makes on-the-job training as a requisite of success and as the regulation dictates proportional limitations for different types of teaching career stages. From 2006 to 2014, only a single examination was organized for the promotion of teachers and winners were appointed to the proposed career stages. For the coming times ahead, a new regulation is expected to be enacted in order to remove the problems pointed out by the Supreme Court so that the career stages policy can be perpetuated.

Various studies were done and numerous positive and negative approaches and arguments were developed pertaining to the implementation and utilization of the performance appraisal system both at the macrolevel of public sphere and the microlevel of the school system.

According to an approach defending the necessity of performance appraisal system in the public sphere, performance appraisal system is necessary because the public budget is quite limited and so inadequate for the

satisfaction of ever increasing needs of the people. Therefore, in order to be able to do more work by using less resource, performance appraisal system should be implemented. Furthermore, performance measurement would bring clarity (transparency) right into the organization, be a motivator for increasing the output and organizational responsibilities will acquire their forms via autonomy and accountability (Öztürk, 2006).

According to another approach which points the handicaps of performance system, it is extremely difficult to determine (measure) performance in public services and so to reflect the units' earnings to the wages/salaries which may also be unjust. Furthermore it may cause disputes among the employees competing with each other. This situation in turn may negatively affect the harmony, speed and productivity in tasks requiring team-work (Kestane, 2003).

Specification of the criteria in performance appraisal system is a quite controversial issue. Deficient, not easily comprehensible, verbally explainable and collectively agreeable criteria would probably disrupt the operation of the system. There may also be other negative factors such as the incompatibility between objectives and the performance appraisal system being utilized, the absence of regular feedback mechanisms, incompatibilities between reward system and the goals of the system, lack of a proper combination of internal and external positive reinforcement, insufficiency of the amounts of the payments and absence of a periodic appraisal plan (De Silva, 1998).

Propper and Wilson (2003) tried to find useful evidences for the implementation and benefits of the performance system in public health and public education in USA and England. Some findings obtained by the researchers in the field supported the view that performance system increases productivity, while other findings indicated the opposite thesis stating that it is not useful in public field. As a result, findings were not sufficient to support the idea that performance appraisal results in higher quality public services.

Lemieux and Macleod in their 2007 study claimed that in labour market in USA, 24 % of the wage increases of the male workers realized between the end of 1970's and the early 1990's can be explained by performance payments. According to the researchers, performance-based payment application leads to wage/salary increases but also results in increases in wage/salary inequalities among the employees.

There's a widespread recognition that points a close link between the performance-based wage/salary and the work motivation. According to this perspective, while the performance appraisal is a psychological need at the individual level, it is an instrument used to increase motivation at the institutional level. At the places where performance appraisal system is being implemented, employees perceive their deficiencies and head toward renewing themselves. Improving the performances of employees one by one at the individual level contribute the improvement of the institution as a whole (MEB EARGED, 2006:13). Similarly, according to Atamtürk's study (2011), performance appraisal system is a powerful instrument for determining the weaknesses and strengths of employees. Employees would be aware of what the organization expects from them and more importantly if they become part

of the "organizational objective determination process", they would be motivated and make their maximal contribution.

On the other hand new motivation theories claim that performance criteria negatively affect the employee's creativity. According to these theories, monitoring and controlling the performance very tightly evoke in employees negative emotions and this process reflects negatively on their motivation. According to these kinds of studies, when the performance-based wage/salary system is applied for the employees whose qualities and competencies are low, it may increase motivation levels and performance. However when the system is applied for high quality and more competent employees, motivation and therefore performance deteriorate. (Kestane, 2003).

Many performance appraisal studies were carried out in school system. In Boyacı's doctorate thesis (2003) under the title "Assessment of the Primary School Organizations in terms of the Processes of Performance Management System ", a questionnaire was given to primary school administrators and inspectors and it was found that the participants had negative opinions about the functioning and outcomes of the planning, implementation and assessment sub-processes of the performance management system. According to the study of Tunç and *et al* (2013) on multicomponent appraisal, though the participants declared that the performance appraisal system might improve the school productivity, they also expressed their anxiety about its proper application at schools.

The OECD document (2012) -in which the performance appraisal system for the teachers is discussed- mentions that positive judgements favoring the performance system can be as follows: "A juster wage/salary system would emerge as the result of performance-based payment". "Teachers with high performance would be paid what they deserve". "Teachers' motivation would increase". According to the same document, the negative judgements may be as follows: "It is impossible to set up and operate a clear and objective performance system". "Performance system is harmful for the cooperation among the teachers". "Through the implementation of performance system, instruction may be focused only on the criteria which might have been specified by a narrow perspective". Moreover, there are many controversial issues such as how the performance will be determined and measured; what kind of a reward scale will be established; whether the rewards will be considered at the personal level or the school level.

According to the 2006 dated study of Akşit, teachers have indecisive opinions about the goals of performance appraisal. Teachers do not have too much knowledge about the appraisal criteria and express the opinion that these criteria are relative and can be evaluated differently by different inspectors. Regarding the same topic, Goldhaber's claim (2009) is that performance system can be used as an effective instrument to develop teacher quality. For the author, teachers have positive attitudes towards financial incentives. By the use of these incentives, it is possible to improve their teaching competencies and so to increase academic successes of the students.

The 2009 data of OECD (OECD 2012) indicates that there's no observable relation between the average student performance and the existence or absence of performance-based wage/salary payment in the school system. However, regarding the variable "the share of the teachers' income in the national income", it is being observed that in countries where the teachers' wages/salaries are relatively higher, there's a negative relation between performance-based wage/salary payment and the student performance; on the other hand in countries where the teachers' wages/salaries are relatively lower, the above mentioned relation is said to be positive. Hence, OECD suggests performance-based wage/salary system for the countries which do not have sufficient resources to provide higher wages/salaries for the teachers.

When the abovementioned studies are evaluated together, it can be claimed that the approaches, arguments and research results on the utilization of performance appraisal systems in the public sphere generally and in the field of education specifically are quite different from each other.

On the basis of the theoretical framework related to the performance appraisal system, the general aim of this study is to reveal and evaluate broadly the school administrators' opinions about the utilization of performance appraisal system in the school system. The questions related to the subgoals of this study are as follows:

- What are the opinions of school administrators on the segmentation of teaching statuses into career stages as an important dimension of the performance appraisal system in education? Regarding the mentioned question, are there statistically significant differences among the opinions of school administrators with respect to the levels of education they are working at, their sexes, administrative positions, working experiences, teaching statuses, family incomes and union membership?
- What are the opinions of school administrators on the operation of the performance appraisal system in the field of education? Concerning this question, are there statistically significant differences among the opinions of school administrators with respect to the levels of education they are working at, their sexes, administrative positions, working experiences, teaching statuses, family incomes and union membership?

## **METHOD**

Under this title, methodological topics such as the research model, research population, sampling and sample, how the data gathering instrument was developed and how the data was analyzed are presented for the reader.

### **Research Model**

This study which was done to examine and evaluate the functionality of the performance appraisal system in education via the opinions of school



administrators is a general descriptive survey research. General descriptive survey research model is a research approach which is designed to report a past or present situation as much objectively as it is (Karasar, 2000).

**Population and Sample**

Population of this research is the school administrators who are working in the primary and secondary educational levels in general state schools in the city center of Afyonkarahisar (a county in western Turkey) in 2012-2013 academic year. All school principals and deputy principals who constitute the research population were tried to be included in the sample. In 2012-2013 academic year, there were 143 school administrators working in the primary and secondary educational levels in general state schools in the city center of Afyonkarahisar. Among these, 84 administrators has replied the survey, therefore the response rate is 58,74 %.

**Table 1.** Variable values in numbers (n) and percentages (%) related to the administrators who has participated in the research

Variable	Subvariables	n	%
Level of Education	Primary Education	55	65,5
	Secondary Education	29	34,5
	Sum Total	84	100,0
Sex	Female	6	7,1
	Male	78	92,9
	Sum Total	84	100,0
Administrative Position	Principal	27	32,1
	Deputy Principal	57	67,9
	Sum Total	84	100,0
Experience	1-5 years	10	11,9
	6-15 years	34	40,5
	16 years and more	40	47,6
	Sum Total	84	100,0
Teaching Status	Teacher	56	66,7
	Expert Teacher	28	33,3
	Sum Total	84	100,0
Family Income (TL)	2000 – 3000 TL	37	44,0
	3001 – 5000 TL	43	51,2
	5001 and more	4	4,8
	Sum Total	84	100,0
Union Membership	Not Member	14	16,7
	Member	65	77,4
	Resigned	5	6,0
	Sum Total	84	100,0

As shown in the Table 1., 55 (65,5 % of) participant school administrators are working in primary education level schools while 29 (34,5 %) of them are working in secondary education level schools. 6 (7,1 %) of the participants are woman and 78 (92,9 %) of them are male. There are 27 (32,1 % of the

participants) school principals and 57 (67,9 %) of the participants) deputy principals. 10 (11,9 %) of the school administrators have professional experiences within the interval of 1 to 5 years; 34 (40,5 %) have 6 to 15 years of experience; 40 (47,6 %) of them 16 years and more. When participants are categorized with respect to teaching status, it's observed that 56 (66,7 %) of them are in teacher category while 28 (33,3 %) of them are expert teachers. Looking at the family incomes of the participant administrators indicates that 37 (44%) of them have incomes within the interval of 2000-3000 TL, 43 (51,2 %) have incomes between 3001-5000 TL, 4 (4,8%) of them earns incomes of 5001 TL or more. Finally, while 65 (77,4%) of them have a union membership, 14 (16,7%) of them are not member of a union. 5 (6%) of the participants mentioned that they have resigned from the union.

### **Developing the Data Gathering Instrument**

A scale was developed for this research. The scale is composed of two sections: The first section is devised to gather personal information while the second part includes statements related to performance appraisal system in education. The first stage in the development of this scale was to establish a pool of opinions/statements which were produced in accordance with the questions of subgoals of this research. During this stage, various data gathering instruments that were used in similar or related studies were examined and a set of variables reflecting the problem and aim of this study were specified. Next, the statements in the above mentioned pool were categorized so that these categories match the potential answers of subgoal questions.

Content validity is the main indicator of whether the test items are qualitatively and quantitatively sufficient to measure the features which are targeted to be measured (Büyüköztürk, 2009, 167, 168). Draft form of the survey was sent to experts for their opinions in order to determine its content validity. Later on, a series of interviews were conducted with a group of teachers in order to test how much and how well the expressions in the data gathering instrument (revised and restructured due to the expert opinions) will be able to be understood by the school administrators who are the target group of the study.

Data gathering instrument which was developed in accordance with the expert opinions and comprehensibility tests is composed of two factors. The answers were positioned on the two edges of a likert scale including 5 points arranged in way that (1) indicates the lowest score and (5) the highest. Accordingly, (1) refers to the expression "completely disagree", (2) to "barely agree", (3) refers to "partially agree", (4) to "agree to a large extent", and (5) refers to "completely agree".

In order to test the construct validity of the test factor analysis was conducted and factor loading values were calculated. Factor loading values are the coefficients displaying the relation between the expressions and the factors. Furthermore, in order to test the compatibility of the data matrix with the factor analysis, KMO test was carried out and the KMO coefficient was calculated as

0,883 which is greater than 0,60, therefore, indicating that the data set can be factorized. Next, Bartlett Sphericity Test was applied to determine the existence or absence of the relation among the variables and the  $\chi^2$  (chi square) value was calculated as 740,26 ( $p < .01$ ) which is statistically significant and can be regarded as the proof of the normality of the scores (Büyüköztürk, 2009).

The scale used in this study is 2 factored. The first factor explains the 37,22 % of the total variance and the second factor the 34,72 % of it. The two factor together explains the 71,94% of the total variance. The covariances of the two factor in different test items ranges from 51% to 83%.

### **Analysis of the Data**

SPSS 13.0 statistics software was used to analyze the data gathered in this study. First of all the opinions of the school administrators on the performance appraisal system were described and the means and standard deviations were calculated. Regarding the variables of the study (level of education, sex, administrative position, experience, family income level, teaching status and union membership), tests for determining the existence or absence of the statistically significant differences among school administrators' opinions and the direction of these differences were carried out. For the variables of education level, sex, administrative position and teaching status, t-test and for work experience, family income and union membership variables, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were applied.

### **FINDINGS**

In this section, data relevant findings reached in this study is presented. While interpreting the data, first of all each factor composing the scale and is composed of expressions was evaluated with respect to the scores of these expressions; secondly an evaluation based on the overall scale scores was made. While both the two factors were being separately evaluated and the overall scale was being examined, the absence or existence of statistically significant differences among the opinions of the school administrators with respect to the levels of education they are working at, their sexes, administrative positions, work experiences, teaching statuses, family incomes and union membership were also examined.

At the end of the scale, a blank space was reserved for the participants' potential written opinions about the performance appraisal system. The written opinions of the participants in this part of the scale were also described, analyzed and evaluated qualitatively.

### **Findings Related to the Teaching Career Stages**

In the following table (Table 3), average score values corresponding to the school administrators' opinions on the teaching career stages are given.

**Table 3.** Score values corresponding to the opinions of school administrators on the teaching career stages

	N	X	S
Factor of Teaching Career Stages	84	3,375	1,195

Table 3 indicates that school administrators' opinions about the teaching career stages concentrated around "partially agree" choice. In other words school administrators affirm at an "average level" the statements expressing the ideas that career stages regulation increase work motivation and encourages the personnel for self development.

Table 4 below displays the score values corresponding to the absence or existence of statistically significant differences among the opinions of the school administrators about teaching career stages regarding the levels of education they are working at, their sexes, administrative positions, teaching statuses and union membership.

**Table 4.** Differences among the opinions of school administrators about the teaching creer stages

	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Level of Education	55	13,8000	4,81279	82	,744	,459
	29	12,9310	5,59292			
Sex	6	16,6667	1,63299	15,128	3,842	,002
	78	13,2564	5,17596			
Administrative Position	27	12,8148	5,06145	82	-,850	,398
	57	13,8246	5,09945			
Teaching Status	56	12,2321	5,17684	70,070	-3,797	,000
	28	16,0357	3,83437			
Union Membership	14	13,8571	4,81755	77	,485	,629
	65	13,1231	5,19768			

As seen in the Table 4, there's "no" statistically significant differences among the school administrators' opinions on teaching career stages with respect to the level of education they're working at ( $t(82) = ,744$ ;  $p > .05$ ), to their administrative position ( $t(82) = ,850$ ;  $p > .05$ ) and to union membership ( $t(82) = ,485$ ;  $p > .05$ ).

According to the above table, school administrators' opinions on teaching career stages differ significantly with respect to sex ( $t(15,128) = 3,842$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The score values of woman administrators ( $x = 16,67$ ) are higher than of the male administrators ( $x = 13,26$ ). It can be claimed that woman administrators have more affirmative opinions on teaching career stages than male administrators. School administrators' opinions on teaching career stages differ significantly also due to the teaching status ( $t(70,070) = -3,797$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The

score values of school administrators who have the expert teacher status ( $x=16,0357$ ) are higher than the score values of school administrators who carry only teacher status ( $x=12,2321$ ). Therefore, it can be claimed that school administrators who themselves are also at the expert teacher status have more affirmative opinions on teaching career stages than school administrators who carry only teacher status.

Table 5 below shows the score values related to the absence or existence of statistically significant differences among the opinions of the school administrators about teaching career stages with respect to work experience.

**Table 5.** State of the school administrators' opinions on teaching career stages regarding the work experience variable

Source of the Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Average of Squares	F	p
Inter-groups	51,596	2	25,798	1,000	,372
Intra-groups	2089,404	81	25,795		
Total	2141,000	83			

As seen in Table 5, there's "no" statistically significant difference among the school administrators' opinions on teaching career stages with respect to the work experience ( $F(2,81)= 1,000, p>.05$ ).

Table 6 below displays the score values related to the absence or existence of statistically significant differences among the opinions of the school administrators on teaching career stages with respect to the income variable.

**Table 6.** State of the school administrators' opinions on teaching career stages regarding the income variable

Source of the Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Average of Squares	F	p
Inter-groups	14,206	2	7,103	,271	,764
Intra-groups	2126,794	81	26,257		
Total	2141,000	83			

Table 6 indicates that there's "no" statistically significant difference among the school administrators' opinions on teaching career stages with respect to the income variable ( $F(2,81)= ,271, p>.05$ ).

The following table (Table 7) displays the average score values corresponding to the school administrators' opinions about the operation of the performance appraisal system.

**Table 7.** School administrators' opinions about the operation of the performance appraisal system

	N	X	S
Factor of the Operation of the Performance System	84	3,469	0,845

Table 7 indicates that school administrators' opinions about the operation of the performance appraisal system concentrated around the "agree to a large extent" choice. In other words school administrators affirm at an "above average level" the statements expressing the ideas that performance appraisal which constitutes the operational factor of the performance system is objective, just and can be applied in a way that would increase the employees' productivities.

Table 8 below displays the score values corresponding to the absence or existence of statistically significant differences among the opinions of the school administrators on the operation of the performance appraisal system with respect to the levels of education they are working at, their sexes, administrative positions, teaching statuses and union membership.

**Table 8.** Differences among the opinions of school administrators on the operation of performance appraisal system

	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Level of Education	55	24,6727	6,56888	82	,736	,464
	29	23,5517	6,76433			
Sex	6	27,3333	5,60952	82	1,173	,244
	78	24,0513	6,66235			
Administrative Position	27	23,7407	6,57848	82	-,517	,606
	57	24,5439	6,67905			
Teaching Status	56	23,6250	6,76774	82	-1,299	,197
	28	25,6071	6,21432			
Union Membership	14	24,4286	6,66465	77	,312	,756
	65	23,8154	6,67058			

As seen in the Table 8, there's "no" statistically significant differences among the school administrators' opinions on the operation of performance appraisal system with respect to the level of education they're working at ( $t(82) = ,736$ ;  $p > .05$ ), to sex ( $t(82) = 1,173$ ;  $p > .05$ ), to their administrative position ( $t(82) = -,517$ ;  $p > .05$ ), to teaching status ( $t(82) = -1,299$ ;  $p > .05$ ) and to union membership ( $t(82) = ,312$ ;  $p > .05$ ).

Table 9 below shows the score values related to the absence or existence of statistically significant differences among the opinions of the school

administrators about the operation of performance appraisal system with respect to work experience.

**Table 9.** State of the school administrators' opinions on the operation of the performance appraisal system regarding the work experience variable

Source of the Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Average of Squares	F	p
Intergroups	85,408	2	42,704	,974	,382
Intragroups	3549,735	81	43,824		
Total	3635,143	83			

As seen in Table 9, there's "no" statistically significant difference among the school administrators' opinions on the operation of the performance appraisal system with respect to the work experience ( $F(2,81) = ,974, p > .05$ ).

Table 10 below displays the score values related to the absence or existence of statistically significant differences among the opinions of the school administrators about the operation of the performance appraisal system stages with respect to the income variable.

**Table 10.** State of the school administrators' opinions on the operation of the performance appraisal system regarding the income variable

Source of the Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Average of Squares	F	p
Intergroups	1,328	2	,664	,015	,985
Intragroups	3633,815	81	44,862		
Total	3635,143	83			

Table 10 indicates that there's "no" statistically significant difference among the school administrators' opinions on the operation of the performance appraisal system with respect to the income variable ( $F(2,81) = ,015; p > .05$ ).

Table 11 below displays the average score values corresponding to opinions of the school administrators about the performance appraisal system in general.

**Table 11.** Overall score values corresponding to the opinions of the school administrators about the performance appraisal system in education in general

	N	X	S
Scale Score in Total	84	3,435	0.963

Table 11 indicates that school administrators' opinions about the performance appraisal system in the field of education concentrated around "partially agree" choice. In other words, school administrators affirm at an "average level" the statements comprising the scale of the performance appraisal system.

Table 12 below displays the score values corresponding to the absence or existence of statistically significant differences among the opinions of the school administrators about the performance appraisal system in general regarding the levels of education they are working at, their sexes, administrative positions, teaching statuses and union membership.

**Table 12.** Differences among the opinions of school administrators about the performance system in general

	N	X	S	sd	t	p
Level of Education	55	38,4727	10,41874	82	,797	,428
	29	36,4828	11,73097			
Sex	6	44,0000	7,07107	82	1,464	,147
	78	37,3077	10,98441			
Administrative Position	27	36,5556	10,87811	82	-,712	,478
	57	38,3684	10,89992			
Teaching Status	56	35,8571	10,98168	82	-2,364	,020
	28	41,6429	9,68471			
Union Membership	14	38,2857	10,79479	77	,419	,676
	65	36,9385	10,93715			

As seen in the Table 12, there's "no" statistically significant differences among the school administrators' opinions on performance system in general with respect to the level of education they're working at ( $t(82) = ,797$ ;  $p > .05$ ), to sex ( $t(82) = 1,464$ ;  $p > .05$ ), to their administrative position ( $t(82) = -,712$ ;  $p > .05$ ) and to union membership ( $t(82) = ,419$ ;  $p > .05$ ).

According to the above table, school administrators' opinions on performance system in general differ significantly with respect to teaching status ( $t(82) = -2,364$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The score values of school administrators having expert teacher status ( $x = 41,6429$ ) are higher than of the administrators who carry only teacher status ( $x = 35,8571$ ). Therefore, it can be claimed that school administrators having expert teacher status have more affirmative opinions on performance system than the administrators who carry only teacher status.

Table 13 below shows the score values related to the absence or existence of statistically significant differences among the opinions of the school administrators about the performance system in general with respect to work experience.

**Table 13.** State of the school administrators' opinions on performance system in general regarding the work experience variable

Source of the Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Average of Squares	F	p
Intergroups	263,409	2	131,705	1,120	,331
Intragroups	9526,734	81	117,614		
Total	9790,143	83			



As seen in Table 13, there's "no" statistically significant difference among the school administrators' opinions on performance system in general with respect to the work experience ( $F(2,81)= 1,120, p>.05$ ).

Table 14 below displays the score values related to the absence or existence of statistically significant differences among the opinions of the school administrators on performance system in general with respect to the income variable.

**Table 14.** State of the school administrators' opinions on performance system in general regarding the income variable

Source of the Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Average of Squares	F	p
Intergroups	10,312	2	5,156	,043	,958
Intragroups	9779,831	81	120,739		
Total	9790,143	83			

Table 14 indicates that there's "no" statistically significant difference among the school administrators' opinions on performance system in general with respect to the income variable ( $F(2,81)=,043; p>.05$ ).

### Qualitative Findings

21 of 84 participants expressed their written ideas in the blank section of the data gathering instrument allocated for their opinions and suggestions about the research topic. When the participants' opinions are categorized into themes, it is seen that the major theme is the hesitations regarding the operation of the performance system. 14 participants expressed various hesitations related to the performance appraisal system. Some of these views are as follows:

*“Having high-quality performance criteria and the impartiality of the evaluator would yield more proper results.”*

*“The ones who would conduct performance appraisal should be knowledgeable about the qualities, criteria, processes of education and should not be ill-minded.”*

*“Whom and with which criteria will you be able to assess? As the school and classroom situations are different from each other. Maybe, the groups (should) conduct performance appraisal within themselves.”*

*“In performance appraisal, the closeness level between the evaluator and the evaluated should be paid attention.”*

*“Only if the ponderability of the performance is achieved, then the subsequent payments would be meaningful. The main problem is to be able to measure the performance correctly and fairly.”*

*“In performance appraisal, the evaluators' objectivities and competencies are too important. Anxieties about this issue should be removed.”*

As clearly obvious in the above-mentioned statements, objectivity and competence in the operation of the performance appraisal system constitute a major concern of hesitation.

The second theme category is composed of opinions claiming that performance appraisal system will only be beneficial if and when the education employees problems are solved. Participants expressed 7 opinions under this theme category. Some of these opinions are as follows:

*“Economic conditions of education employees should be improved so that the employees will be able to devote themselves fully to the education and instruction.”*

*“Teachers' salaries are low; living and working conditions of the teachers are bad. These should be improved so that the performance can be improved.”*

*“Spare time should be given and various motivations should be created in order to increase the teacher performance. Professional courses should be open in recreational sites in the summer season. Teachers should be motivated for the profession at schools.”*

The third theme category brings together the opinions about the teacher career stages which is one of the most important dimensions of the performance appraisal system. In this context, 5 participant administrator supported the teacher career stages and put forward affirmative arguments. Some of these ideas are as follows:

*“Career stages examination is necessary. (Via this examination) the teacher will complete his/her deficiencies and this will contribute to the development. It would not be true for the working and lazy to be equal in the same situation. Promotion and performance increase should be realized.”*

*“While establishing the career stages, classification should be performed. Regular examination and evaluation should be carried out.”*

*“Implementation of career stages would motivate teachers. As a result, there would be higher quality teachers and administrators at the school.”*

There are other minor opinions apart from the above-mentioned 3 main categories. For instance a participant referred to the role of students in performance appraisal by saying;

*“Teacher performance can/should be measured not by examination but through the students he/she raised.”*

However, emphasizing the educational activities of the teachers other than the ones targeting the student success, another opinion defends just the opposite position with the following words;

*"Performance should not be measured via the student success. Other activities which the teacher carried out should be taken into account."*

## **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

Performance appraisal system constitutes one of the most important components of the New Public Management Approach which has been proposed to realize the principles of management science in the public sphere. New Public Management Approach based on the "state crisis" discourse and which has been brought into the agenda of the discussions within the framework of "the neo-liberal state and society paradigm" offers an effective performance appraisal system as an important mechanism for improving the efficiency and productivity in the public sphere.

In the vast majority of western countries, performance appraisal systems have been implemented in the public sphere and various studies have been conducted on this issue. However the evidences supporting the idea that the performance appraisal system results in a more effective public service production are few in number and how beneficial the performance system is for reaching a more efficient and productive public administration system could not be determined precisely. Nevertheless, discussions and uncertain attitudes about such issues as how and with which principles the performance appraisal system in public sphere should be installed; which criteria it should incorporate in it and who should evaluate these criteria are going on.

As in the other fields of public services in Turkey, also in the field of education a comprehensive restructuring process has been taking place and in this process, a great deal of efforts are being dedicated to develop the performance appraisal system at the institutional level and within the domain of personnel policies in the public education system. Although these efforts are at their initial and/or preparation stages, a set of relevant practices were carried out and various arguments for and against the performance system were produced.

The studies defending the necessity of performance appraisal system and pointing the benefits of it generally propose at the paradigmatic level the typical arguments of the New Public Management Approach, namely, the changing conditions, scientific and technological developments, ever-increasing and diversifying qualitative and quantitative needs and demands of the society. As a solution these studies suggest "public reform" including the policies of elastic organization and personnel. On the other hand, other studies negating the performance system generally make -at the paradigmatic level- the New Public Management Approach a part of a broader social criticism within the context of class relations and criticize the performance appraisal system by claiming that it will make the elastic organization and personnel policies

widespread in the public sphere; remove the secured rights which the status law provide for the public employees and therefore harm the requirement which stipulates the public services to be provided in accordance with the public methods and principles. A more practical criticism of performance appraisal system argues the suspicions about how the system will be structured and operated; who will structure and operate it and which criteria will be made operative.

This study was done to investigate the school administrators' opinions on the performance appraisal system in education along the dimensions of teaching career stages and the operation of the system. The results obtained in this study indicates that, on the average, school administrators "partially agreed" the expressions defending the ideas that separating teachers on the basis of career stages will encourage the teachers to develop themselves and increase their work motivation. There's "no" statistically significant differences among the school administrators' opinions on teaching career stages with respect to the level of education they're working at, their work experiences, administrative positions, incomes and union memberships. On the other hand, school administrators' opinions on teaching career stages differ significantly with respect to sex and teaching status. Woman and expert teacher administrators have more affirmative opinions on teaching career stages than male and teacher administrators. While the results obtained in this study are similar to the ones in Canpolat's study (2011), they're in different directions than the results of Taşkaya's study (2007). Canpolat (2011) reached a result indicating that teaching career stages were moderately affirmed in their relation to the variables like work motivation and employee encouragement which were also examined in our study. Taşkaya (2007) however obtained a different result indicating that teaching career stages were affirmed at a very low level by the education employees.

In this study, it was also found that school administrators affirm at an "above average level" the statements expressing the ideas that performance appraisal which constitutes the operational factor of the performance system is objective, just and can be applied in a way that would increase the employees' productivities. It was also seen that there's "no" statistically significant differences among the school administrators' opinions on the operation of performance appraisal system with respect to the level of education they're working at, their sexes, administrative positions, teaching statuses, work experiences, incomes and union memberships.

When the scale is evaluated in general, school administrators' opinions about the performance appraisal system in the field of education concentrated around "partially agree" choice. In other words, school administrators affirm at an "average level" the statements comprising the scale of the performance appraisal system. Furthermore, there's "no" statistically significant differences among the school administrators' opinions on performance system in general with respect to the level of education they're working at, sex, work experience, administrative position, income and union membership. On the other hand school administrators' opinions on performance system in general differ

significantly with respect to teaching status. Hence, it can be claimed that school administrators having expert teacher status have more affirmative opinions on performance system in general than the administrators who carry only teacher status. This result seems natural as the teaching status which was established within the performance appraisal processes and practices provide advantages for the ones having higher statuses.

According to the qualitative results obtained in this study, majority of the participants (14 administrators) expressed various hesitations about whether or not justice, objectivity and competence can be achieved during the operation of the performance appraisal system. This finding has also been reached by other studies. In this context, Boyacı's (2003) and Bolat's (2012) studies on performance appraisal systems in the fields of health and education can be given as examples. In these studies, similar hesitations were expressed by the participants. In Akşit's study (2006), some of the participants were reported to be hesitant about the performance appraisal criteria and about the ones who are assigned the authority to appraise the employees.

Some of the participants (7 administrators) expressed opinions claiming that performance appraisal system will only be beneficial if and when the education employees problems are solved. Some others (5 participant administrators) supported the teacher career stages regulation and put forward affirmative arguments.

As observed in this study, school administrators's opinions are not sharply clear cut. However, it is still significant that 14 of 21 participants who gave written comments have hesitations about the operation of performance appraisal system. It is also noteworthy that these results had also been obtained by other studies such as the study of Tunç *et al* (2013).

Efforts and arguments related to the performance appraisal system is relatively a new phenomenon for Turkey. Announcements made by the state authorities and amendments in the existing laws and enactment of new laws and regulations indicate that there will be fresh efforts in order to launch and operate the performance appraisal system in Turkey. Therefore the arguments and studies on what the performance system will bring in and take away from the field of education will accompany these efforts and so the results obtained in this study which examined the opinions of the school administrators who are / will be one of the first groups being affected by the performance system may also change in the future.

## REFERENCES

- 657 Sayılı Devlet Memurları Kanunu, R.G.23.07. 1965 [657 Numbered Civil Servants Law, 23.07.1965 Dated Official Newspaper].
- 5018 Sayılı Kamu Mali Yönetimi ve Kontrol Kanunu, R.G.10. 12. 2003 [5018 Numbered Law on Public Financial Administration and Control, 10.12.2003 Dated Official Newspaper].
- 5204 Sayılı Milli Eğitim Temel Kanunu ve Devlet Memurları Kanununda Değişiklik Yapılmasına İlişkin Kanun, R.G. 08.07.2004 [5204 Numbered National Education Basic Law and Law on Amendments in Civil Servants Law, 08.07.2004 Dated Official Newspaper ].
- Adıgüzel, Orhan ; Yüksel, Hasan ; Tekin, Pervin (2010). "In Terms of Strategic Human Resources, The Importance of Individual Performance Related Pay System", *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Vol.15, No.2, pp.283-296, Isparta.
- Akşit, Fisun (2006). Performans Değerlendirmeye İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşleri (Bigadiç İlköğretim Öğretmenleri Örneği) [Teacher Opinions on Performance Appraisal" (Bigadiç Primary School Teachers Case)], *Gazi Osman Paşa Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, No: 2, pp. 76-101, Tokat.
- Atamtürk, Hakan et al (2011). Evaluation of Performance Management in State Schools: A Case of North Cyprus, *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 40, pp.33-43, Ankara.
- Bolat, Gülşen (2012). Performansa Dayalı Ücret Sisteminin İşgören Motivasyonuna Etkisi, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi [The Effect of Performance-based Salary System on Employee Motivation, Unpublished Masters Thesis], Atılım Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Boyacı, Adnan (2003). İlköğretim Örgütlerinin Performans Yönetim Sistemi Süreçleri Açısından Değerlendirilmesi, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi [Evaluation of the Primary School Organizations in terms of Management System Processes, Unpublished Doctorate Thesis], Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Büyüköztürk, Şener (2009). *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El kitabı [Data Analysis Handbook for Social Sciences]*, Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Canman, Doğan (1993). *Personelin Değerlendirilmesinde Çağdaş Yaklaşımlar ve Türkiye’de Kamu Personelinin Değerlendirilmesi [Modern Approaches in Personnel Appraisal and Appraisal of Public Personnel in Turkey]*, Ankara: TODAİE Yayınları.
- Canpolat, Cevdet (2011). Öğretmen Kariyer Basamakları Uygulaması İle Öğretmen Motivasyonu ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkiler, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi [The Relations Between Teaching Career Stages Implementation and Teacher Motivation and Organizational Attachment, Unpublished Masters Thesis],Fırat Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Eğitim Yönetimi, Teftişi, Planlaması ve Ekonomisi Anabilim Dalı, Elazığ.
- De Silva, Sriyan (1998). An Introduction to Performance and Skill-based Pay Systems, International Labour Organisation.
- DPT (2000) Uzun Vadeli Strateji ve Sekizinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı [DPT - State Planning Agency (2000) Long Term Strategy and 8th 5-year Development Plan], [http://www.goc.gov.tr/ortak\\_icerik/gib/plan8.pdf](http://www.goc.gov.tr/ortak_icerik/gib/plan8.pdf), downloaded on 12.02.2014.

- DPT (2006) Dokuzuncu Kalkınma Planı [DPT - State Planning Agency (2006) 9th 5-year Development Plan], [http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/26167\\_0.html](http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/26167_0.html), downloaded on 12.02.2014.
- DPT (2013) Onuncu Kalkınma Planı [DPT - State Planning Agency (2006) Tenth 5-year Development Plan], <http://www.onuncuplan.gov.tr/SitePages/plan10.aspx>, downloaded on 12.02.2014.
- Eraslan, Tarık. M ; Tozlu, Ahmet (2011). Kamu Yönetiminde Performansa Dayalı Ücret Sistemi [Performance Based Salary System in Public Administration], *Sayıştay Dergisi*, Sayı 81, pp.33-61, Ankara.
- Goldhaber, Dan (2009). *Teacher Pay Reforms – The Political Implications of Recent Research*, Center for American Progress.
- Karasar, Niyazi (2002). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi: Kavramlar – İlkeler - Teknikler [Scientific Research Method: Concepts - Principles - Techniques]*, Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Kestane, Doğan (2003). Performansa Dayalı Ücret Sistemi ve Kamu Kesiminde Uygulanabilirliği [Performance-based Salary System and Its Feasibility in Public Sector], *Maliye Dergisi*, Ocak-Nisan Sayısı, 142.
- Lemieux, Thomas ; MacLeod, W. Bentley and Parent, Daniel (2007). Performance Pay and Wage Inequality, *Discussion Paper*, No: 2850, Germany.
- MEB (2006). *Okulda Performans Değerlendirme Modeli* [MEB-National Education Ministry (2006) Performance Appraisal Model at School], Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayını.
- OECD (2012) *Does Performance-based Pay Improve Teaching?*, Pisa in Focus.
- Öğretmenlik Kariyer Basamaklarında Yükselme Yönetmeliği, R.G. 07.01.2006 [Regulation on Promotion along the Teaching Career Stages, published in 07.01.2006 Dated Official Newspaper].
- Öztürk, Namık Kemal (2006). Kamu Sektöründe Performans Ölçümü ve Karşılaşılan Sorunlar [Performance Measurement in Public Sector and the Encountered Problems], *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, Cilt 39, Sayı 1, pp.81-99, Ankara.
- Palmer, Margaret ve Winters, Kenneth T. (1993) *İnsan Kaynakları [Human Resources]*, İstanbul: Rota Yayın Yapım Tanıtım.
- Propper, Carol and Wilson, Deborah (2003). The Use and Usefulness of Performance Measures in the Public Sector, *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol.19, No.2, pp.250-267.
- Taşkaya, Serdarhan Musa (2007). *Eğitimde Niteliğin Artırılması ve Öğretmenlerin Statüsünün İyileştirilmesinde Kariyer Basamaklarının Değerlendirilmesi (Konya İli Örneği)*, Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi [Evaluation of the Teaching Career Stages' Role in Increasing the Education Quality and Improving the Statuses of Teachers (Case of Konya Province) Unpublished Doctorate Thesis], Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü İlköğretim Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.
- Tunç, Binali et al (2013) Eğitimde Çok Bileşenli Değerlendirme: Velilerin Okul Yöneticilerinin Performans Değerlendirmesine Katılımı [Multicomponent Evaluation in Education: Inclusion of Parents into the Process of Appraising the School Administrators' Performances], *Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Cilt 3, Sayı 1, 90-99, Edirne.

