iojes
www.iojes.net
International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 2010, 2 (2), 378-402

Opinions of Teachers and Administrators Towards The Implementation of Teacher Performance Management Applications at Public and Private High Schools (Ankara Sample)

Aynur BOZKURT BOSTANCI[1], Hüseyin YOLCU[2] and Hatice ŞAP[3]

Abstract

This research has been conducted to detect the opinions of teachers and administrators towards the implementations of teacher performance management applications at public and private high schools. In the study, it has been examined that whether opinions of teachers and administrators towards the implementation of teacher performance management applications at public and private high schools differ according to school type, title and of teachers at each school and education level. 74 administrators and 423 teachers working at either public or private schools in Ankara participated in the research. Arithmetical average, t test and two-factor variance analysis techniques have been used in data analyzing. According to results of the study, opinions of teachers and administrators towards the implementation of teacher performance management applications at public and private high schools differ according to school type and task. When the mutual effect of school type and task variables are examined together, it has been viewed that the mutual effect has not is not meaningful about the perceptions of implementation level. Whilst perceptions of public high school teachers' of performance management applications change within their own school types, it does not differ in view of private high schools.

Key Words: Performance, performance management, performance evaluation.

.

Introduction

The existence and development of organization depends on the exploitation of potential by the worker at utmost level. It is clear that for potential exploitation of the worker at the highest level, traditional performance evaluations with only control purposes shall not be sufficient. According to Erdil (1998), organizations know that worker performance which is inevitable for their success is required to be made efficient by handling within the frame

[1] Sakarya University, abostanci@sakarya.edu.tr
[2] Kastamonu University, hyolcu@kastamonu.edu.tr
[3] Branch Manager Of The Ministry Of National Education ardahatice@hotmail.com

* This study presented EDULEARN09 the International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies. Barcelona (SPAIN) 6th - 8th July 2009

of changing conditions and administration types. And this case forces organizations to performance management from the point of performance evaluation (Bozkurt Bostancı, 2004).

Performance management which is regarded as a vehicle for developing organizations and workers, different from traditional performance evaluation processes, enable determining, arranging and applying targets and enterprises directed towards performance development, viewing performance development plans continuously by inspecting, evaluating and directing performance, consulting and assistance services to workers for performance development, growth opportunities, periodical performance supervisions and performance awards to improve worker performance in accordance to specified objectives of organization and workers (Lawyer, 1994; Armstrong, 1996).

The aim of performance management application is to enable a transition to annual teacher evaluation, bringing forth a payment and rewarding system depending upon occupational development and performance of teachers, locating teachers and also providing hierarchical progress of teachers Teacher performance management at schools include increasing student success, helping teacher development, measuring the level of achieving goals, increase in profession satisfaction depending on professional development, interviews about career paths and other plans of teachers, creating a new culture at school and participation of teachers in decisions(Mohony and Hextall, 2001; Trethowan, 1991).

Along with the fact that definitions of performance management in different perspectives are encountered in the field; Bozkurt Bostancı (2004) defines teacher performance management as a process of initializing necessary applications consisting of determining the targets teachers should fulfill, viewing performances teachers show to achieve these goals, improving teachers to make them increase performance, evaluating their performances, rewarding and directing teachers as a consequence of the evaluation in conformance with school objectives at school for the success of teachers and of continuing. In reference to this definition, it is possible to differentiate the applications required to be applied at schools to manage teacher performances as specifying performance goals and

criteria, performance monitoring, performance improving, performance evaluating, using performance evaluation results and the structure and records of performance management. Applications which schools need to fulfill shall be put forth once the dimensions of this performance management are known. Because the implementation of these dimensions is important for teacher performance (Bozkurt Bostancı, 2004).

Specifying a target for the teacher is enabling the acknowledgment of strong and weak sides and necessities of the teacher. In addition, specifying a target enables showing the actual performance of teacher, praising teacher performance and thereby increasing the performance, criticizing teacher performance, recognizing the reasons for low performance, teachers' knowing school targets and school administrations' knowing individual aims of teachers and also exhibiting high performance by teachers for vocation security, promotion and career development of teachers (Bozkurt Bostancı, 2004). The organization should monitor its workers by making necessary arrangements and fulfilling its own responsibilities during workers' achieving set targets for the fulfillment of individual and organizational aims making development plans and acting as performance guides to improve worker performance, making workers learn are performance management applications conducted in organizations to increase worker performance Likewise; organizations can take administrative decisions regarding payment, promotion, dismissal from work, improving the business, worker planning and developing by being informed of worker performance, making performance evaluations to detect the degree the workers contribute to organizational targets and using evaluation results (Mendonca and Kanungo, 1996; Trethowan, 1991; Marşap, 2000; Barutçugil, 2002; Palmer, 1993). The essential aim in using evaluation results should be providing some information to organization about rewarding workers, and also improving workers. Besides, providing career development and advancement opportunities for workers in respect to performance evaluation results can also motivate workers in an efficient way (Tomlinson, 2000; Edwards and Ewen, 1996; Hume, 1995; Armstrong, 1996; Hume, 1995).

As it can be comprehended, performance- developing support structures should be established within organizations by way of various applications for worker performance.

However; it is observed in Turkey that teachers working at public and private high schools are evaluated by school administrators only once a year. School administrators evaluate teachers according to personal features criteria in Article 27 under the Civil Service Registry Regulation. Moreover, secrecy of valuation results is mentioned in Article 27 of the regulation mentioned. As consequence of this secrecy, teachers have almost no feedback about the evaluations of school administrators. On the other hand; it is clear that teacher performance can not be increased or they can not show the performance demanded by evaluating previous performances of teachers once a year. As for directing and supporting teachers about improvement, it shall be possible with performance management also including performance evaluation. Only in this way, performance of high school teachers who are the most effective workers within institutional performance shall be managed and they shall be made to show performance at utmost level. Therefore; evaluating the implementation level of current teacher performance management applications at high schools in view of teacher performance management magnitude has been regarded by researchers as a problem requiring being resolved. Recognizing the current situation by way of the study shall lead to new arrangements on this issue.

In the study, has been aimed to detect the opinions of teachers and administrators towards the implementations of teacher performance management applications at public and private high schools. Right in this direction of basic purpose, answers to questions below have been searched for in the research.

1) What are the opinions of teachers and administrators towards the implementations of teacher performance management applications at public and private high schools?

2) Do the opinions of teachers and administrators towards the implementations of teacher performance management applications at public and private high schools differ in; school type, task, title and education level of teachers within each school type in dimensions of specifying performance targets and criteria, performance monitoring, performance improving, performance evaluating, using performance evaluation results?

Methods

Research Method

The research is in scanning model. It is a scanning model of causal comparison. Opinions of teachers and administrators towards the implementations of teacher performance management applications at public and private high schools in central districts of Ankara were scanned.

Population and Sample

4916 public and 1860 private high school teachers, 107 public and 67 private high school administrators in Ankara comprise the population of the study. Theoretical sampling magnitude chart was benefited in the study to detect sample magnitude. In sample selection, two criteria (analysis unit) were grounded; school type (public high school and private high school) and districts where schools are located. While sample was being selected, representing sub-populations in sampling via stratified sampling method was assured. 356 public high school teachers and 277 private high school teachers constituted the research sample. No sample was taken from administrators.

74 school administrators, 40 from public high schools and 34 from private high schools, and 423 teachers, 241 from public high schools and 182 from private high schools participated in the study. In view of seniority, 121 (28,7%) of teachers were in-between 1-7 years, 141 (33,3%) of them were in-between 8-14 years, 83 (20,1%) of them were in-between 15-21 years, 76 (17,9%) of them were 22 and over. 333 of teachers had bachelor's degree (78.7%) and 90 had master's degree (21.3%).

Developing Data-Gathering Means

"Teacher Performance Management" scale developed by Bozkurt Bostancı (2004) has been used in the study to specify the implementation level of teacher performance management applications at public and private high schools. The scale consists of five independent dimensions; "Specifying Performance Target and Criterion", "Monitoring Performance", "Developing Performance", "Performance Evaluation" and "Using Performance

Evaluation Results" The scale has been prepared in the form of five point likert scale; (1) Never (2) Less (3) Medium (4) More (5) Fully, to specify the implementation level of teacher performance management at schools. Factor analysis (Basic Components Analysis) has been used for sub-scale structure validity of the scale. Basic Components Analysis is a frequently used method along with factor analysis, in comparing theoretical structures of concepts; and a way of detecting structural validity of measuring tools (Balcı, 1995). In this technique, it has been viewed whether each scale measures one or more them one structure, in other words, whether it is single-dimension or not. Internal consistency approach Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient has been used in reliability studies. Moreover, distinctiveness of each item has been viewed by calculating item – total correlations (Balcı, 1995). Reliability and validity analyses of the scale were performed at public and private primary schools. Reliability and validity results of sub-scales are as follows.

When Table 1 is examined, each dimension is viewed to be single-factor in itself according to the results of sub-scale analyses. Moreover, no item is removed from the scale since factor load of all items are seen to be over .40. It is apprehended that total variations which single factor of one sub-dimension explained, is in demanded level. Similarly, it is accepted that each sub-scale has an internal consistency when inner consistency coefficients calculated for the reliability of each sub-scale are viewed. Item- Total correlations also show that distinctive power of items was high.

Table 1. Factor and item analyses results of teacher performance management sub-scales

Dimension no	Dimensions	Item number	Factor Load Values Interval (low - high)	Item – Total Correlation Interval (low - high)	Explained Total Variance	Alpha
1	**Specifying Performance Target and Criterion**	9	.48 - .69	.35 - .54	%34	.75
2	**Monitoring Performance**	8	.50- .75	.39 - .61	%42	.79
3	**Developing Performance**	13	.51 - .75	.50 - .69	%46	.90
4	**Performance Evaluation**	14	.48 - .75	.41 - .67	%37	.87
5	**Using Performance Evaluation Results**	4	.74- .78	.53 - .58	%58	.75

Data Analysis

SPSS package program was used in statistical data analysis. Arithmetical average was used in the research in detection of perception levels about teacher performance management applications at public and private high schools. Two-factor ANOVA test was applied to detect whether perceptions of teachers and school administrators regarding the implementation of teacher performance management applications at public and private high schools differed in school type, t test was used whether it showed any difference in gender and education level of teachers, one-side Variance Analysis was applied to specify if it differed according to seniority and LSD multiple comparison test was used in case the difference occurred to be meaningful. α=.05 meaningfulness level was taken as a grounding in testing the difference among group means. 4.20 - 5.00 (fully), 3.40 - 4.19 (more), 2.60 - 3.39 (medium), 1.80 – 2.59 (less), 1.00 - 1.79 (never) intervals were used to grade and comment on weighted mean points obtained in conformance with grading scale.

Findings, Results and Comments

Results and comments obtained as a consequence of analyses of data gathered via "Teacher Performance Management Scale" from public and private high school teachers and school administrators in this section are in the in the form of results and comments pertaining to teachers' and school administrators' perceptions regarding the fulfillment of regarding dimension according to task within school, seniority and education levels of teachers within school type under headings of "Specifying Performance Target and Criterion", "Performance Monitoring", "Performance Developing", "Performance Evaluating" and "Using Performance Evaluation Results".

Results and Comments on Specifying Performance Target and Criterion

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and two-factor ANOVA results pertaining to public and private high school teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the fulfillment level of specifying performance target and criterion at schools

	Teacher			Administrator			Total		
School type	**N**	$\bar{X}$	**S**	**N**	$\bar{X}$	**S**	**N**	$\bar{X}$	**S**
Public	241	3.47	0.83	40	3.68	0.79	281	3.51	0.83
Private	182	4.07	0.77	34	4.45	0.43	216	4.13	0.74
Total	423	3.73	0.85	74	4.04	0.75	497	3.78	0.85

Variance Source	**KT**	**Sd**	**KO**	**F**	**p**
School type	29.134	1	29.134	47.632	0.000
Task	5.432	1	5.432	8.882	0.000
School type * Task	0.482	1	0.482	0.788	0.375
Error	301.542	493	0.612		
Total	7448.049	497			

As it can be understood from Table-2, a meaningful difference [F (1,493)= 47.63; $p<0.05$] is found between public high school teachers' and school administrators' average perceptions of the implementation level of performance target and criterion specifying at public and private high schools ($\bar{X}$=3.51) and that of private school teachers' and administrators' ($\bar{X}$=4.13). School type occurs to be effective in perceptions regarding the implementation level of target and criterion specifying dimension. Perception levels of private high school teachers and administrators regarding the level of fulfillment are higher than those of public high school teachers' and administrators'.

On the other hand, when observed in view of task, a meaningful difference is also found between the perceptions of teachers and administrators upon the implementation level of this dimension at schools [F (1,493)= 8.88; $p<0.05$]. That is, task variable became effective on perceptions of the implementation level of this dimension. Administrators' mean perceptions ($\bar{X}$=4.04) of the implementation level of performance target and criterion specifying dimension is higher than those of teachers' ($\bar{X}$=3.73). When the mutual effect of school type and task variables are examined, the mutual effect is not found to be meaningful F (1,493)= 0.79; $p>0.05$]. In this occasion, private high school teachers' and administrators' perceptions of implementation level of performance target and criterion

specifying dimension are higher compared to those of public high school teachers' and administrators'; and perceptions of all administrators occur to be higher than perceptions of all teachers.

Table 3: Descriptive statistics and one-side variance results pertaining to public and private high school teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the fulfillment level of specifying performance target and criterion according to seniority of teachers within school type

School type	Task	N	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	F	p	Difference Among Groups (LSD)
Public	1-7 years	78	3.52	0.78	3,	1.22	.304	-
	8- 14 years	80	3.56	0.93	237			
	15- 21 years	47	3.41	0.81				
	22 and over	36	3.27	0.67				
	Total	241	3.48	0.83				
Private	1-7 years	43	3.97	0.70	3,	0.451	.717	-
	8- 14 years	61	4.06	0.78	178			
	15- 21 years	38	4.12	0.96				
	22 and over	40	4.15	0.60				
	Total	182	4.07	0.77				

According to Table 3, when the perceptions of public high school teachers on the implementation level of performance target and criterion specifying dimension are compared in view of seniority, the difference among seniority groups does not occur to be meaningful [F(3,237)= 1.22; p>0.05]. Similarly; it can be seen that no meaningful difference is found between the perceptions of private high school teachers on the implementation level of this dimension at schools [F(3,178)= 0.45; p>0.05].

Table 4: Unrelated t-test results about perceptions of implementation level of performance target and criterion specifying dimension in view of education levels of teachers within school type

School type	Education level	N	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	t	p
Public high school	**Bachelor's degree**	199	3.54	0.85	239	2,44	0.02
	Master's degree	42	3.20	0.67			
Private high school	**Bachelor's degree**	134	4.08	0.73	180	0,19	0.85
	Master's degree	48	4.05	0.87			

As understood from Table 4, there is a meaningful difference between perceptions of public high school teachers on the implementation level of performance target and criterion specifying dimension [t (239) =2.44; p<0.05]. Public high school teachers having

a bachelor's degree ($\bar{x}$=3.54) think that this dimension is fulfilled in their schools at a higher level compared to teachers having a master's degree ($\bar{x}$=3.20). This results from the fact that expectations of teachers with a post graduate education are higher. While teachers with bachelor's degrees at public schools state that performance target and criterion specifying dimension is fulfilled "more", teachers with master's degree regard it to be at "medium" level. A meaningful difference is not found between private high school teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of performance target and criterion specifying dimension [t (180) =0.19; p>0.05]. Private high school teachers think similarly about the implementation level of this dimension at their own schools, regardless of education levels.

Results and Comments on Performance Monitoring Dimension

The following Table 5 is examined, it is comprehended that the difference between mean perceptions ($\bar{x}$=3.48) of public high school teachers and administrators on the implementation level of performance monitoring and those of private high school teachers' and administrators' ($\bar{x}$=3.94) is meaningful [F (1,493)= 23.14; p<0.05]. School type is effective in teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the implementation level of this dimension. Perceptions of private high school teachers and administrators on the implementation level are higher than public high school teachers' and administrators' perceptions. When examined in view of task, a meaningful difference is found between teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the level of implementation of this dimension at public and private high schools [F (1,493)= 12.51; p<0.05]. In other words, task variable has been effective on perceptions of the implementation level of performance monitoring dimension. Administrators ($\bar{x}$=4.03) state that fulfillment level of performance monitoring at schools is higher compared to teachers ($\bar{x}$=3.62). The mutual effect is not observed to be meaningful when mutual effect of school type and task variable is examined [F (1,493)= 1.432; p>0.05].

Table 5. Descriptive statistics and two-factor ANOVA results pertaining to public and private high school teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the fulfillment level of performance monitoring dimension at schools

School type	Teacher			Administrator			Total		
	N	$\bar{X}$	S	N	$\bar{X}$	S	N	$\bar{X}$	S
Public	241	3.44	0.92	40	3.71	0.88	281	3.48	0.92
Private	182	3.85	0.94	34	4.40	0.55	216	3.94	0.91
Total	423	3.62	0.95	74	4.03	0.82	497	3.68	0.94

Variance source	KT	Sd	KO	F	p
School type	18.967	1	18.967	23.144	0.000
Task	10.248	1	10.248	12.505	0.000
School type * Task	1.174	1	1.174	1.432	0.232
Error	404.036	493	0.820		
Total	7182.813	497			

Regarding the implementation level of performance monitoring dimension, perceptions of private high school teachers and administrators on the implementation level of this dimension are higher compared to those of public high school teachers and administrators; and perceptions of all administrators are higher than all teachers' perceptions. It is known in literature of this field that organizational performance can be reached via worker performance (Boudreaux, 1994; Antonioni,1994; Mwita, 2000). Survival of private high schools depends upon organizational performance. Because their lives are not under warranty as public high schools. Thus, higher level application of performance criteria in performance monitoring dimension can be expected from private high schools which are forced to avoid any decrease in organizational performance by monitoring performances compared to public schools.

Table 6: Descriptive statistics and one-side variance results pertaining to perceptions of the fulfillment level of performance monitoring dimension according to seniority of teachers within school type

School type	Task	N	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	F	p	Difference among Groups (LSD)
Public	1-7 Years	78	3.51	0.94	3,	3.19	.024	1-4, 2-4
	8- 14 Years	80	3.62	0.87	237			
	15- 21 Years	47	3.37	0.98				
	22 and over	36	3.12	0.84				
	Total	241	3.44	0.93				
Private	1-7 Years	43	3.79	0.99	3,	1.913	.129	-
	8- 14 Years	61	3.80	1.06	178			
	15- 21 Years	38	3.70	0.94				
	22 and over	40	4.16	0.55				
	Total	182	3.86	0.94				

According to Table 6, it is viewed that the difference among seniority groups is meaningful [F(3,237)= 3.19; p<0.05] when public high school teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of performance monitoring dimension is observed in view of seniority. When the results of LSD multiple comparison test performed to detect among which groups the difference exists are viewed, teachers with seniority of 22 years and over ($\bar{X}$=3.12) state that applications of performance monitoring at their schools are fulfilled at lower levels compared to teachers with seniority of 1-7 years ($\bar{X}$=3.51) and 8-14 years ($\bar{X}$=3.62). Developing teacher performances prior to evaluation include activities like performing continuous performance interviews, revealing their strong and weak sides etc (Bozkurt Bostancı, 2004).

Accordingly; public and private high school administrators may be performing applications aim at monitoring performances of teachers with high seniority at a lower level thinking that their performances are higher due to seniority. Also according to Robertson (1996) the communication between the administrator and the worker is of great importance to increase worker performance and also for performance efficiency. According to a research conducted by Ovando (2001), teachers state that supervisor, administrator, teacher relationship and communication are significant for their own development, as well. Any meaningful difference is not observed among the perceptions of private high school teachers about the implementation level of this dimension at their schools in view of seniority [F(3,178)= 1.91; p<0.05].

Table 7: Unrelated t-test results about perceptions of implementation level of performance monitoring dimension at schools in view of education levels of teachers within school type

School type	Education level	N	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	t	p
Public high school	**Bachelor's degree**	199	3.51	0.92	239	2,47	0.14
	Master's degree	42	3.13	0.89			
Private high school	**Bachelor's degree**	134	3.95	0.90	180	0,81	0.42
	Master's degree	48	3.82	0.95			

As it can be acknowledged from Table 7, there is not any meaningful difference among the perceptions of public high school teachers on the implementation level of performance monitoring dimension [$t_{(239)}$ =2.47; p>0.05]. Also, there is no meaningful difference among private high school teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of performance monitoring dimension at their schools in respect to education levels [$t_{(180)}$ =0.81; p>0.05]. It is understood that both public and private school teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of this dimension is identical in view of education levels.

Results and Comments on Performance Developing Dimension

Table 8. Descriptive statistics and two-factor ANOVA results pertaining to public and private high school teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the fulfillment level of performance developing dimension at schools

School type	Teacher			Administrator			Total		
	N	$\bar{X}$	S	N	$\bar{X}$	S	N	$\bar{X}$	S
Public	241	3.29	0.92	40	3.68	0.74	281	3.35	0.91
Private	182	3.74	0.97	34	4.42	0.46	216	3.85	0.94
Total	423	3.49	0.97	74	4.02	0.73	497	357	0.95

Variance source	KT	Sd	KO	F	p
School type	21.456	1	21.456	26.191	0.000
Task	17.929	1	17.929	21.886	0.000
School type * Task	1.253	1	1.253	1.530	0.217
Error	403.872	493	0.819		
Total	6770.704	497			

According to Table 8, a meaningful difference is found [F (1,493)= 26.191; p<0.05] among mean perceptions of public high school teachers and school administrators ($\bar{X}$=3.35), and those of private high school teachers and administrators ($\bar{X}$=3.85) on the implementation level of performance developing dimension at public and private high schools. School type is observed to be effective on perceptions of the implementation level of performance developing dimension at schools. In other words; public high school teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the implementation level of performance developing dimension at schools are higher compared to perceptions of private school teachers and administrators. When observed in view of task, a meaningful difference is also found between teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the implementation level [F (1,493)= 21.886; p<0.05]. That is, task variable has also been effective on the perception of

implementation level. Administrators' mean perception is ($\bar{X}$=4.02) and teachers' mean perception is ($\bar{X}$=3.49). Administrators think that implementation level of performance developing dimension at school is higher compared to teachers. When the mutual effect of school type and task variable is examined, the mutual effect is not observed to be meaningful [F (1,493)= 1.530; p>0.05].

In such a case, perceptions of administrators from both school types are higher about the implementation level of performance developing at schools compared to teachers; and perceptions of ones at private high schools are higher than those at public high schools. Researches conducted have also the qualification of supporting it. The culture aimed at self-realization Terzi (1999) and supporting culture İpek (1999) have been detected to be at a higher level at private high schools.

Table 9: Descriptive statistics and one-side variance results pertaining to perceptions of the fulfillment level of performance developing dimension according to seniority of teachers within school type

School type	Task	N	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	F	p	Difference among Groups (LSD)
Public	1-7 Years	78	3.33	0.92	3,	5.73	.001	1-4, 2-3, 2-4
	8- 14 Years	80	3.56	0.82	237			
	15- 21 Years	47	3.08	0.95				
	22 and over	36	2.89	0.93				
	Total	241	3.29	0.92				
Private	1-7 Years	43	3.89	1.03	3,	1.35	.259	-
	8- 14 Years	61	3.56	0.99	178			
	15- 21 Years	38	3.71	1.03				
	22 and over	40	3.88	0.82				
	Total	182	3.74	0.97				

As seen in Table 9, it is viewed that the difference among seniority groups is meaningful when public high school teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of performance developing dimension in view of seniority [F(3,237)= 5.73; p<0.05]. According to the results of LSD multiple comparison test, the difference occurs to be between teachers with seniority of 22 years and over ($\bar{X}$=2.89) and teachers with seniority of 1-7 years ($\bar{X}$=3.33); and also between teachers with seniority of 8-14 years ($\bar{X}$=3.56) and 15-21 years ($\bar{X}$=3.08).

That is, senior teachers state that applications of performance developing dimension are performed at a lower level. This occasion may result from the fact that administrators may be performing such sort of applications on new teachers predominantly as they see teachers with high seniority more experienced than teachers with less seniority. Any meaningful difference is not observed among the perceptions of private high school teachers about the implementation level of this dimension at their schools in view of seniority [F(3,178)= 1.35; p>0.05].

Table 10: Unrelated t-test results about perceptions of implementation level of performance developing dimension at schools in view of education levels of teachers within school type

School type	Education level	N	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	t	p
Public high school	**Bachelor's degree**	199	3.40	0.92	239	2.90	0.00
	Master's degree	42	2.92	0.86			
Private high school	**Bachelor's degree**	134	3.69	1.07	180	0.33	0.74
	Master's degree	48	3.75	0.94			

According to Table 10, perceptions of public high school teachers on the implementation level of performance developing dimension differ meaningfully [t (239) =2.90; p<0.05]. Only university- graduate teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.40 state that the implementation level of performance developing dimension at schools is fulfilled at "more" level compared to teachers taking post-graduate education ($\bar{X}$=2.92). Whilst teachers having bachelor's degree state that performance developing dimension is at "more" level, teachers having master's degree remarked it is at level "less". Since teachers taking post graduate education are regarded as specialists on their fields, they consider things aimed at developing performance as insufficient. There is not any meaningful difference in private high school teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of performance developing dimension according to education level [t (180) =0.33; p>0.05]. It is understood that according to both public and private high school teachers' education level, the implementation level of this dimension is identical.

Results and Comments on Performance Evaluating Dimension

Table 11. Descriptive statistics and two-factor ANOVA results pertaining to public and private high school teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the fulfillment level of performance evaluation dimension at schools

School type	Teacher			Administrator			Total		
	N	$\bar{X}$	S	N	$\bar{X}$	S	N	$\bar{X}$	S
Public	241	3.27	0.91	40	3.59	0.85	281	3.31	0.90
Private	182	3.80	0.98	34	4.47	0.45	216	3.91	0.95
Total	423	3.50	0.98	74	3.99	0.82	497	3.57	0.97

Variance source	KT	Sd	KO	F	p
School type	31.591	1	31.591	38.337	0.000
Task	15.484	1	15.484	18.791	0.000
School type * Task	1.896	1	1.896	2.301	0.130
Error	406.250	493	0.824		
Total	6804.036	497			

As understood from Table 11, a meaningful difference [F (1,493)= 38.337; p<0.05] is found between mean perceptions ($\bar{X}$=3.31) of public high school teachers and administrators on the implementation level of performance evaluating dimension and those of private high school teachers' and administrators' ($\bar{X}$=3.91). It is observed that school type is effective in teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the implementation level of performance evaluating dimension. In other words; perceptions of private high school teachers and administrators on the implementation level of performance evaluating dimension are determined to be higher than public high school teachers' and administrators' perceptions. When examined in view of task, a meaningful difference is found between teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the level of implementation of performance evaluating dimension at public and private high schools [F (1,493)= 18.791; p<0.05]. That is, task variable has been effective on perceptions of the implementation level of this dimension. Administrators' mean perceptions are ($\bar{X}$=3.99) higher than teachers' mean perceptions ($\bar{X}$=3.50). The mutual effect is not observed to be meaningful when mutual effect of school type and task variable is examined [F (1,493)= 2.301; p>0.05].

In this case, according to Table 11, private high school teachers and administrators state that performance levels are fulfilled at a higher level compared to public high school teachers and administrators; and school administrators from both school types report it to

be higher compared to teachers. Taylor and Pierce's (1999) mention of the importance by stating that there is a regular payment system at public schools but performance is evaluated in private sector as payment is arranged according to performance, support this result.

Table 12: Descriptive statistics and one-side variance results pertaining to perceptions of the fulfillment level of performance evaluating dimension according to seniority of teachers within school type

School type	Task	N	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	F	p	Difference Among Groups (LSD)
Public	1-7 Years	78	3.30	0.86	3, 237	4.20	.006	1-4, 2-3, 2-4,
	8- 14 Years	80	3.49	0.82				
	15- 21 Years	47	3.06	0.99				
	22 and over	36	2.94	0.96				
	Total	241	3.27	0.91				
Private	1-7 Years	43	3.98	0.88	3, 178	1.19	.315	-
	8- 14 Years	61	3.63	1.06				
	15- 21 Years	38	3.79	1.14				
	22 and over	40	3.89	0.75				
	Total	182	3.80	0.98				

When Table 12 is examined,, it is viewed that the difference among seniority groups is meaningful when public high school teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of performance evaluating dimension are compared in view of seniority [$F(3,237)= 4.20$; $p<0.05$]. On viewing the results of LSD multiple comparison test performed to detect among which groups the difference exists, teachers with seniority of 22 years and over ($\bar{X}=3.12$), state that the implementation level of performance evaluation applications are performed at lower level compared to teachers with seniority of 1-7 years ($\bar{X}=3.51$) and of 8-14 years; ($\bar{X}=3.62$) and teachers with seniority of 15-21 years report the same compared to teachers with seniority of 8-14 years ($\bar{X}=3.62$). As seen, senior teachers have lower- level perception than teachers with less seniority. Similarly, the underlying reason may be thought to be administrators' applying evaluation applications less to senior teachers as they regard them to be at demanded level.Any meaningful difference is not observed among the perceptions of private high school teachers about the implementation level of this dimension at their schools in view of seniority [$F(3,178)=1.19$; $p>0.05$].

Table 13: Unrelated t-test results about perceptions of implementation level of performance evaluating dimension at schools in view of education levels of teachers within school type

School type	Education level	N	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	t	p
Public high school	**Bachelor's degree**	199	3.34	0.88	239	3.00	0.00
	Master's degree	42	2.89	0.95			
Private high school	**Bachelor's degree**	134	3.90	0.99	180	0.83	0.40
	Master's degree	48	3.76	0.98			

As seen in Table 13, there is a meaningful difference in perceptions of public high school teachers about the implementation level of performance evaluation dimension [t (239) =3.00; p<0.05]. Teachers having only bachelor's degree at public school state that ($\bar{x}$=3.34) they think the implementation level of this dimension is performed at higher levels at schools compared to teachers having master's degree ($\bar{x}$=2.89). Since teachers taking post-graduate education are expected to be more sufficient in their fields, the fact that they do not consider the applications as adequate may be understood. Any meaningful difference is not observed in private high school teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of performance evaluating dimension [t (180) =0.83; p>0.05]. Whatever the education level of private high school teachers is, they think the same about the implementation level of this dimension.

Results and Comments on Using the Results of Performance Evaluation Dimension

Table 14. Descriptive statistics and two-factor ANOVA results pertaining to public and private high school teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the fulfillment level of using performance evaluation results dimension at schools

	Teacher			Administrator			Total		
School type	**N**	$\bar{X}$	**S**	**N**	$\bar{X}$	**S**	**N**	$\bar{X}$	**S**
Public	241	3.25	1.05	40	3.66	1.04	281	3.30	1.06
Private	182	3.70	1.24	34	4.52	0.53	216	3.83	1.19
Total	423	3.44	1.16	74	4.05	0.94	497	3.53	1.15

Variance source	KT	Sd	KO	F	p
School type	27.053	1	27.053	22.465	0.000
Task	23.851	1	23.851	19.806	0.000
School type * Task	2.692	1	2.692	2.235	0.136
Error	593.668	493	1.204		
Total	6849.500	497			

According to Table 14, a meaningful difference [F (1,493)= 22.465; p<0.05] is found between mean perceptions ($\bar{X}$=3.31) of public high school teachers and administrators ($\bar{X}$=3.30) on the implementation level of using performance evaluation results dimension and those of private high school teachers' and administrators' ($\bar{X}$=3.83) It is observed that school type is effective in teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the implementation level of using performance evaluation results dimension. Perceptions of private high school teachers and administrators on the implementation level of using performance evaluation results dimension are higher than public high school teachers' and administrators' perceptions. When examined in view of task, a meaningful difference is found between teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the level of implementation of this dimension at public and private high schools [F (1,493)= 19.806; p<0.05]. That is, task variable has been effective on perceptions of the implementation level of this dimension. Administrators' mean perceptions is ($\bar{X}$=4.05), and teachers' mean perceptions is ($\bar{X}$=3.44). That is, administrators think that the implementation level of performance evaluating dimension is higher at schools compared to teachers.

The mutual effect is not observed to be meaningful when mutual effect of school type and task variable is examined [F (1,493)= 2.235; p>0.05].

In this case, according to Table 14, perceptions of private high school teachers and administrators about the implementation level of using performance evaluation results dimension are higher compared to public high school teachers and administrators; and perceptions of school administrators from both school types are higher compared to teachers. According to Maorice and Murray (2003) studies regarding recognition, rewarding system, morale broadcast, and teacher quality are non-existent at many public schools and teachers get low payment. In a study conducted by Mwita (2000), perceptions of opinions of public sector workers, teachers and university students were demanded to be detected about rewarding based on performance at public school, as in private sector. In the research it was reached that rewarding at public schools based upon teacher performance was not sufficient. Odden and Carolyn also proved that there was a difference between public and private school both in view of payment and rewarding and

therefore only half of the capacity of many administrators and teachers could be used at public schools (Tomlinson, 2002).

Table 15: Descriptive statistics and one-side variance results pertaining to perceptions of the fulfillment level of using performance evaluation results dimension at schools according to seniority of teachers within school type

School type	Task	N	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	F	p	Difference Among Group (LSD)
Public	1-7 Years	78	3.29	1.05	3,	4.03	.008	2-4, 2-3
	8- 14 Years	80	3.51	0.97	237			
	15- 21 Years	47	2.95	1.02				
	22 and over	36	2.95	1.15				
	Total	241	3.25	1.05				
	1-7 Years	43	3.90	1.20	3,	0.99	.398	-
Private	8- 14 Years	61	3.49	1.30	178			
	15- 21 Years	38	3.72	1.31				
	22 and over	40	3.76	1.09				
	Total	182	3.69	1.24				

As seen in Table 15, a meaningful difference is observed among seniority groups when public high school teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of using performance evaluation results dimension are compared in view of seniority [$F(3,237)=4.03$; $p<0.05$]. According to the results of LSD comparison test, the difference occurs to be between teachers with seniority of 22 years and over ($\bar{X}=2.95$) and teachers with seniority of 15-21 years ($\bar{X}=2.95$) and 8-14 years ($\bar{X}=3.51$). That is, senior teachers state that using performance evaluation results dimension is performed at a lower level. Any meaningful difference is not observed among the perceptions of private high school teachers about the implementation level of this dimension at their schools in view of seniority [$F(3,178)= 0.99$; $p>0.05$].

Table 16: Unrelated t-test results about perceptions of implementation level of using performance evaluation results dimension at schools in view of education levels of teachers within school type

School type	Education level	N	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	t	p
Public high school	**Bachelor's degree**	199	3.31	1.04	239	2.00	0.04
	Master's degree	42	2.95	1.09			
Private high school	**Bachelor's degree**	134	3.82	1.25	180	0.82	0.41
	Master's degree	48	3.65	1.23			

According to Table 16, perceptions of public high school teachers on the implementation level of using performance evaluation results dimension differ meaningfully [t (239) =2.00; p<0.05]. University- graduate teachers ($\bar{X}$=3.31) state that the implementation level of using performance evaluation results dimension at schools is fulfilled at "more" level compared to teachers with master's degree ($\bar{X}$=2.95). There is not any meaningful difference in private high school teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of using performance evaluation results dimension according to education level [t (180) =0.82; p>0.05].

Consequences

"Consequences regarding public and private high school teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the implementation level of performance management applications in view of school type and task";

School type and task have been effective on public and private high school teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the implementation level of teacher performance management application dimensions. Private high school teachers and administrators state that performance management applications in all dimensions are fulfilled at a higher level compared to public high school teachers and administrators. Likewise; administrators from both school types think that performance management applications at schools are performed at a higher level compared to teachers. When the mutual effect of school type and task variables are examined, it is not found to be meaningful.

"Consequences regarding perceptions of the implementation level of performance management dimensions in view of teachers' seniority within school types";

While public high school teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of performance target and criterion specifying dimension applications do not change according to seniority groups, opinions about the implementation levels of performance monitoring, performance developing, performance evaluating and using performance evaluation results. It is observed that the difference generally occurs among teachers with seniority of 22 years and over and teachers with seniority of 1-7 years and 8-14 years. Teachers with seniority of 22 years and over state that performance management applications are performed at a lower level at their schools compared to teachers with less seniority.

As for the perceptions of private high school teachers, they do not differ in the implementation level of each dimension in performance management.

"Consequences regarding teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of performance management dimensions in view of teachers' education levels";

Whilst public high school teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of performance management applications do not differ in dimensions of performance monitoring they show difference in dimensions of performance target and criterion specifying, performance developing, performance evaluating and using performance evaluation results. In dimensions where differences are observed, teachers having only bachelor's degree report that performance management application at schools are fulfilled at a higher level compared to teachers with master's degree.

Private high school teachers' perceptions of the implementation level of performance management dimensions do not differ in view of education levels.

Suggestions

*Private high school teachers and administrators state that performance management applications are conducted at schools at a higher level when compared to public high school teachers and administrators. Reasons behind the fact that performance applications

are fulfilled at lower level at public high schools should be researched and necessary arrangements should be done to conduct necessary applications.

*Administrators report that, compared to teachers, performance management applications at schools are conducted at a higher level. The reason for this difference in perceptions of administrators and teachers should be investigated.

*Teachers with seniority of 22 years and over state that performance management applications occur at a lower level at their schools compared to teachers with less seniority. The reason for this difference in perception should be surveyed.

*Teachers having only bachelor's degree at public high schools report that performance management applications are conducted at a higher level compared to teachers taking post graduate education. Since teachers with master degrees are regarded as specialists in their fields, they may consider that there are some deficiencies in teacher performance management applications at public high schools. In order to increase teacher performance, necessary performance- developing support structures should be established at these schools.

References

Antonioni, D. (1994). Improve the performance management process before discontinuing performance appraisals. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 26(3), 29-38.

Armstrong, M. (1996). *Employee reward***.** London: Institute of Personnel and Development (IPD) House.

Armstrong, M. (1998). *Managing people***.** London: Kogan Page Limited. 120 Pentonville Road NI 9JN.

Balcı, A. (1995). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma*. Ankara: 72 TDFO Bilgisayar Yayın. L.t.d.

Barutçugil, İ. (2002). *Performans yönetimi.* İstanbul: Kariyer Yayıncılık İletişim Eğitim Hizmetleri Ldt. Şti.

Bostancı, A.B. (2004). *Türkiye'deki resmi ve özel ilköğretim okullarında öğretmen performans yönetimi.* Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Ankara.

Boudreaux, G. (1994). What TOQ says about performance appraisal? *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 26.

Cummings, T. G. & Worley C.G. (1997). *Organization development and change*. Shouth Western College Publishing.

Edwards, MR. & Ewen, A. J. (1996). How to manage performance and pay with 360 degree feedback. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 28(3), 41.

Hume, D. A. (1995). *Reward management*. (Employee Performance, Motivation and Pay). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers

İpek, C. (1999). *Resmi ve özel liselerde örgütsel kültür ve öğretmen öğrenci ilişkisi*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Ankara

Lawyer, E. (1994). Performance management: The next generation. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 26(3), 16.

Marşap, A. (2000). *Yönetsel sistem*. Ankara: Öncü Basımevi.

Maorice, L. C.J. & Murray, E. (2003). Compensation and teacher retention: A success story. *Educational Leadership*, 8, 40-43.

Mendonca, M. & Kanungo R.N. (1996). Impact of culture on performance management in developing countries. *International Journal Of Mainpower*, 17(4/5), 65.

Mohony P. & Hextall L**.** (2001). Modernizing teacher. *Inclusive Education,* 5(2/3), 133-149.

Mwita J. İ. (2000). Performance management model: A systems-based approach to public service quality. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*,13(1), 19-37.

Ovando, M.N. (2001). Teachers' perceptions of a learner- centered teacher evaluation system. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 15(3), 213-231.

Palmer M.j. (1993). *Performans değerlendirmeleri.* (Çev. Doğan Şahiner). İstanbul: Rota Yayıncılık Ltd.

Robertson, R.F. (1996). Develop a performance-focused organization. *Hydrocarbon Processing*, 75(12), 81.

Spangenberg, H. H. & Theron, C.C. (1997). Developing a performance management audit questionnaire . *South African Journal of Psychology*, 27(3), 147.

Taylor, P.J. & Pierce, J. L. (1999). Effects of introducing a performance management system employees' subsequent attitudes and effort. *Public Personnel Management*, 28(3), 423.

Terzi, A.R. (1999). *Özel ve devlet liselerinde örgüt kültürü (Ankara ili örneği)*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Tomlinson H. (2000). Proposals for performance related pay for teachers in english schools. *School Leadership Management*. 20 (3), 281-298.

Tomlinson, H., (2002). Performance management : Pay and the headteacher professional associations, *Management in Education*, 16 (1), 6 – 4.

Trethowan, D. M. (1991). Managing with appraisal achieving quality schools through performance management. Management Education. Paul Chapman Publishing