



TEACHER PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN TURKEY: AN ALTERNATE MODEL

Özlem Yeşim Özbekⁱ,

Pervin Oya Taneri

Çankırı Karatekin University,
Çankırı, Turkey

Abstract:

This research is trying to answer the question of what should be the multi-stakeholder performance system sensitive to the Turkish education system in line with the attitudes and opinions of the teacher, school principal and teacher candidates towards the multi-stakeholder teacher performance evaluation system. A total of 304 teachers, principals, teacher candidates, trainee teachers, and contracted teachers were participated in the study. A mixed methods research was used in this study. Content analysis, factor analysis, frequency analysis and non-parametric analysis methods were used to analyze the data. According to the findings, the majority of the participants stated that teacher performance evaluation could be done through class observation. The findings also revealed that the majority of the participants did not feel discomfort from the involvement of school administrators, parents and students in the teacher performance evaluation.

Keywords: teacher appraisal, teacher evaluation, performance evaluation, multi-criteria assessment, multi-stakeholder assessment

1. Introduction

In today's world where knowledge is more important than anything else and education is seen as the most important source of investment, the education of the teacher and the measurement of teacher quality have gained a special importance at the international level. Today, many countries have revised teacher competencies to meet the requirements of the 21st century in order to not fall behind in the era of education, and have initiated comprehensive studies that measure teachers' competences and performances. Already many international studies have shown that if teacher appraisal are well-designed with constructive feedback and rich learning opportunities and based

ⁱ Correspondence: email ozacik@yahoo.com

on multiple indications of teaching practice, teacher effectiveness can be measured and increased (Centre for Development and Enterprise (CDE), 2015; OECD, 2013).

2013 International Summit on the Teaching Profession emphasized that in 21st century “...knowledge has become the highest-value commodity in any country, and a high-quality education is a necessity for everyone” (Teaching Summit Report, p.4 2013). There is no doubt that the quality of the teacher is the most important factor affecting student achievement and education quality (CDE, 2015; Wright, Horn & Sanders, 1997).

The studies on the evaluation of teachers / teacher performance appraisal have gained a great acceleration in the last ten years and the number of scientific studies on this subject has increased with the support given in this regard. International studies on teacher evaluation and the different practices of countries on this issue have already produced important findings for the countries that have recently started working on teacher performance evaluation. Turkey is also one of the countries not yet included in the performance evaluation system. Therefore, international experience and findings are extremely important in terms of the shaping of this system.

According to the OECD (2013) report, some countries have a relatively poor evaluation structure and cannot sufficiently benefit from school assessments, teacher assessments and feedback. For example, one third or more of teachers in European countries, such as Ireland, Portugal and Austria, have not been assessed in the last five years. Similarly, most teachers in Italy, Spain, and Portugal have failed to benefit from teacher evaluation and feedback. According to the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS-2013) report, in terms of teacher performance evaluation and feedback situation Turkey is not capable. Just as in European countries, the vast majority of teachers in Turkey have not given feedback or appraisal yet in the last five years (e.g. less than one-tenth of the teachers have received evaluation and feedback).

In this current study, based on international experiences and the views of teachers, prospective teachers, and contracted teachers, the Teacher Performance Evaluation System in Turkey was discussed how it should be organized in a way that will make the greatest contribution teacher development.

2. Performance Standards of Teaching Profession and Teacher Evaluation

Existing approaches to the evaluating teachers' performance through reference standards generally based on well-defined expectations of teaching profession. Performance standards of teaching profession defined as “commonly premised on a shared understanding of the professional responsibilities of a teacher, the required competency profile of a teacher, and a working definition of what constitutes effective, high quality teaching” (CDE, p. 6, 2015) is a significant reference for measuring the performance of teachers. Thus, it is essential to reassess teacher competencies according to the 21st century conditions before performance evaluation begins. Reference standards are needed to evaluate the performance of teachers, in a fair and reliable teacher appraisal model (CDE, 2015).

Despite the differences in each country, the main purpose of teacher evaluation is to ensure the teacher's accountability and professional development of the teacher. In

addition, it is also used for recruitment, promotion, appointment, salary increase, position change and dismissal (OECD, 2013; CDE, 2015). Teacher appraisal can serve teacher's job satisfaction and commitment; increase his / her self-awareness about himself / herself and to develop himself / herself by recognizing his / her educational needs. The importance of teacher evaluation in the OECD report emphasizes:

“Developing teacher-appraisal systems may be costly and challenging to implement, but it is critical to reconcile the demands for educational quality, the enhancement of teaching practices through professional development, and the recognition of teacher knowledge, skills and competencies. The expectation is that engaging in reflective practice, studying his or her own teaching methods, and sharing experience with peers in schools become a routine part of a teacher's professional life” (OECD, 2013).

Among the OECD countries, the most frequently used data sources during the evaluation of teacher performance are listed as teacher portfolios, teacher interviews, classroom observation, self-assessment, peer assessment, student achievement scores, student and parent surveys. Since each has its own advantages and disadvantages, it is suggested to use a combination of methods instead of using one of these methods. Recently, it has been emphasized that many methods should be used together to evaluate teacher performance in order to improve the reliability and validity of the results (OECD, 2013; Kennedy, 2010). The CDE report highlights the importance and necessity of using multiple indicators as follows:

“The key finding is that well-designed performance-based assessments, which assess on-the-job teaching based on multiple measures of teaching practice and student learning, can measure teacher effectiveness. An integrated teacher evaluation model which combines these assessments with productive feedback and professional learning opportunities can increase teacher effectiveness and so raise student achievement” (CDE, p.1, 2015).

3. Teacher Appraisal System in Turkey

In the 10th Development Plan published in the Official Gazette on July 6, 2013, in line with the objective of performing performance evaluation in public institutions, regulation of the performance of teachers was introduced in Article 54 of the Ministry of National Education Regulation on Teacher Assignment and Relocation published on 17 April 2015. In this context, in the 2015-2016 academic year, it is stated that teachers are subjected to performance evaluation by school principals. Evaluation of teachers, e.g. guidance, on-the-job training, supervision, audit, examination, research and investigations were carried out by provincial supervisors (Official Gazette, 2011), formerly called education inspectors (MoNE, 2010). In line with the feedback obtained from the institutions following the performance evaluation, it was stated that the

studies were started to switch to a performance evaluation system based on multiple data sources instead of the single assessment of the director.

The process of emergence of the teacher performance evaluation system can be summarized as follows. First, in 2017, the Ministry of National Education revised the General Qualifications of Teaching Profession in line with the Teacher Strategy Paper published in the Official Gazette. 'General Competencies of Teaching Profession' have been shown as the main source for teacher performance evaluation system, teacher training, teacher candidacy and cultivation processes and teacher self-evaluation. Then in February 2018, MoNE sent a draft of the teacher performance evaluation regulation to external stakeholders for review (memurlar.net, 2018). This draft regulation contains comprehensive changes to the teacher evaluation system. According to this draft regulation, *"the performance of the teacher will be evaluated by parents, students, school principals, teachers from different branches and the same branch, and the teacher herself/himself every year. In addition, all teachers will take the Teaching Profession Qualification Exam every four years. Then, the scores obtained from both applications will combined and teachers will be classified in performance levels A, B, C and D. Beginning with D-level teachers, teachers in groups C and B will be taken face-to-face or distant in-service training, and then they will re-subject to the exam. During the appointment of teachers, in addition to the Public Personnel Selection Examination (KPSS), the scores from internship and interview scores will be taken into consideration. The appointment of principals and contracted teachers will also be conducted according to the results of the performance evaluation. At the end of the performance evaluation process, according to teachers' length of service and performance scores, additional service scores (i.e. the score is given to teachers in return for one year of work) or achievement certificates will be given."*

After the announcement of the draft regulation, the evaluation questions about the teacher performance evaluation system, which has been discussed for a long time and has been neglected by almost all educational community, have been uploaded to the system. Explicitly, the Performance Management System Module was activated on May 7, 2018 in Ministry of National Education Information Systems (MEBBİS, 2018). The performance evaluation module consists of three parts: the staff evaluation, parent / student evaluation, and the evaluation of the branch teachers. The staff evaluation module will be completed by the school administrator and consist of 60 questions; each question can be evaluated with a scale of 6 (starting with no idea, 5 to 1). Some of the evaluation criteria in this scale are: to be fair, to support moral development, to use academic potential, to cooperate with the environment, to prepare training plans. Some of the performance evaluation questions are expressed as follows: *"To be able to make an effective vocational orientation, to make effective group meetings, to develop human resources, to develop resources, to develop skills related to life, to manage human resources effectively."* Parent / student evaluation module includes 48 questions such as 'developing reading skills, developing professional skills, developing skills related to life, and improving mathematical literacy.' Similarly, branch teachers' evaluation module consists of 124 questions (MEBBİS, 2018). The pilot implementation of this system was carried out in 12 provinces (i.e. Ankara, Antalya, Balıkesir, Erzurum, Eskisehir, Istanbul, Izmir, Kayseri,

Malatya, Mardin, Samsun and Trabzon). Finally, on July 20, 2018, the Minister of National Education declared that the teacher performance evaluation system would not be implemented due to the disturbance of the system in almost all educational communities. That is, the new performance evaluation system has been removed, especially because of concerns and resistance expressed by teachers and teachers' associations.

Unfortunately, the withdrawal of the teacher appraisal system from practice without relying on the results of the research on the performance evaluation system indicates that political concerns are prioritized from scientific evidence. In accordance with these facts, nor how to evaluate the performance of teachers in Turkey it has not yet been fully resolved and standardized, and still remains intense debate on this issue. There are a number of studies showing that creating a multi-stakeholder sustainable policy to assess teachers' performance will improve student success and teacher effectiveness, and ultimately lead to teacher professional development (CDE, 2015). In this context, the number of studies on the evaluation of teacher performance in Turkey has increased rapidly in recent years (Bozan & Ekinci, 2018; Çelebi, Babaoğlu, Selçuk, & Peker, 2018; Dilbaz-Sayın & Arslan, 2017; Karakuş & Öztürk, 2016, Maya & Kaçar, 2018). When the relevant literature is examined, it is seen that most of the studies on this subject are based on qualitative research methods (Bozan & Ekinci, 2018; Çelebi, et al.; Çelikten & Özkan, 2018; Sezgin, Tınmaz & Tetik, 2017; Tunç, İnandı, Öksüz & Çal, 2013). As is known, both quantitative and qualitative researches have weaknesses. Qualitative research may include some prejudices in the context of the number of participants, the nature of the participant and the context in which the research is conducted, and does not allow for statistical analysis and generalization. Similarly, quantitative research is poor in understanding the context or environment in which data is collected. In this study, it was tried to obtain in-depth information by using mixed method which combines inductive and deductive thinking and reasoning, and it was taken into consideration that the results could be generalized by statistical analysis (Cresswell, 2015; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010).

The purpose of this study was two-fold: (a) to critically analyze the multi-stakeholder performance system, and understand the perceptions, opinions, attitudes, and suggestions of teachers, prospective teachers, and school principals on performance evaluation system, and (b) to suggest an alternative teacher performance evaluation system.

In the literature on performance evaluation, it has been noticed that studies have generally examined the views of teachers and principals (Çelikten & Özkan, 2018; Sezgin, Tınmaz & Tetik, 2017; Tunç et al., 2013). Although it is stated in the performance evaluation draft that teacher and school principal appointments, and appointment decisions of contracted teachers will be made according to the results of performance evaluation, most of the researches about performance evaluation do not include the opinions of prospective teachers. It is a significant shortcoming that the opinions of prospective teachers who are considered to be subject to performance evaluation are not included in the literature. Therefore, it is not only important but also

necessary for the prospective teachers to participate in the researches related to the teacher evaluation system in order to develop a conscious awareness about which criteria will be used to assess their performance during their candidate teaching process and after their appointment. In this respect, what distinguishes this study from other researches is that opinions of prospective teachers and contracted teachers, as well as, regular teachers and school administrators have been included.

When a new educational policy is implemented, one way of understanding whether this practice is working is its credibility among educators. Individuals affected by the teacher appraisal system might not participate in the assessment process effectively if they do not believe in the validity and reliability of the performance evaluation system. The attitudes of teachers and school principals to the performance system of multiple stakeholders were also examined in this study. Although the scales that measure teachers' attitudes towards performance evaluation was found in the literature (Farah, 2018; Saljooghi & Salehi, 2016), there is still a need for an attitude scale that directly focuses on measuring attitudes towards current multi-stakeholder performance evaluation system in Turkey. Another characteristic that differentiates this study from other studies is using an attitude scale as a data collection tool.

4. Material and Methods

Using the mixed approach, researchers can analyze quantitative and qualitative data together. Cresswell (2015) defined the mixed model as *"...the investigator gathers both quantitative (closed-ended) and qualitative (open-ended) data, integrates the two, and then draws interpretations based on the combined strengths of both sets of data to understand research problem."* (p.2) Therefore, the use of mixed methods has become increasingly accepted in educational researches (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010) With the mixed methods research, the weaknesses of both methods can be eliminated. Therefore, as mentioned above, mixed methods research was used in this study.

4.1 Participants

Of the 304 participants, 16,6% were teachers, 2,6% were school administrators, 19,4% were intern teachers and 7% were contracted teachers. 69,9 % of the participants were female and the rest were male 31,1%. The ages of the participants were between 19 and 54 years, and the age range of 19-25 was 79% of the sample. 21% of the participants stated that they work in an educational institution. 84% of them are working in public sector and 16% of them in private sector. 79% of the participants stated that they could not be appointed to the teaching profession yet. In terms of marital status, 12,9% of the participants were married, 84,7% were single, and 2,3% were selected as the other option. The educational level of the participants was: 2,2% associate degree, 72,8% undergraduate, 6,5% graduate degree, 0,9% doctorate, and 17,7% other. The seniority year ranged from 26 years to a year. The distribution of the participants according to the level of education is as follows: 17,4% in primary school, 13,9% in secondary school and 68,7% in high school. The distribution of teachers according to branch showed diversity

and most of them were in history and philosophy groups. The distribution of the participants by the place of residence of the school was 3,8% village, 31,3% district, 59,5% city and 5,3% other settlements. The distribution of the participants by geographical regions was 3,2% Marmara, 6,3% Black Sea, 4,8% Mediterranean, 8,7% Aegean, 7,9% Southeast Anatolia, 69% Central Anatolia. 24,7% of the participants stated that they had no knowledge about performance evaluation, 56,1% had insufficient knowledge and 19,2% had sufficient knowledge. When asked how they found the performance evaluation system already applied, 22,5% of the participants found the system to be adequate and 77,5% was inadequate.

When asked to what extent the problems related to the quality and outputs of education originate from the deficiencies in the qualifications and performances of the teachers, 5,6% of the participants stated that they were never teacher-driven, and 2,3% stated that they were always teacher-driven. When asked how often they think about equal opportunities in education, 5,5% of the participants stated that they never thought and 16,1 were always thinking about it. When the participants were asked how democratic education is necessary, 1,4% said it was never necessary and 70,5% said it was always necessary.

4.2 Data collection tools

Data were collected through both online and paper surveys. Three different data collection tools prepared by the researchers were used in the study. First, the questionnaire called as 'Multi-stakeholder Opinion Survey on Teacher Performance Evaluation System' (MOSTPES) consisting of 40 items 5-point Likert questions is used to reveal teachers' views on multi-stakeholder performance evaluation. Second, '*Teachers' Attitude Scale towards Teacher Performance Evaluation*' (TASTPES) developed by the researchers of this study also consists of 40 items on a 5-point Likert scale. Finally, qualitative data of the study were collected by asking three open-ended questions. Three open-ended questions asked to get in-depth information from the participants were formulated as follows: (1) what are three aspects of the performance evaluation system that can cause the most problems? (2) what are the three aspects of the evaluation system that you like the most? and (3) what is your suggestion on teacher performance evaluation?

4.2.1 Teachers' Attitude Scale towards Teacher Performance Evaluation

40 questions prepared to reveal the attitudes of teachers towards teacher performance evaluation system were subjected to principal factor analysis. Before starting the factor analysis, the correlation matrix was examined and the items with a correlation above .80 were excluded from the analysis. Also, items with item-total correlation under .40 were excluded. The 32 items entering the principal factor analysis showed a model with 4 factors explaining 63% of the total variance. Checking through Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (0,943) and Barlett's Test (0,000), it was confirmed that data was appropriate for factor analyze. The Scree plot indicated that 2 factors are sufficient to explain the data. Factors 1 and 2 explain 55% of the total variance.

Oblimum rotation showed a correlation of more than .30 between factors. 2-factor model with Oblimum rotation on data revealed a simple structure. The first factor measures the positive aspects of multi-stakeholder performance evaluation, and the second factor measures negative aspects. The first factor was named as the positive aspects of multi-stakeholder performance evaluation and the second factor was named as negative aspects multi-stakeholder performance evaluation. The first factor consisted of 18 items and the reliability index was ,952. The second factor was composed of 12 items and the reliability index was ,906. The correlation between factors 1 and 2 was .492. The lowest score in the 1st factor can be 18, and the highest can be 90. In the second factor, the lowest score can be 12 and the highest can be 60.

4.3 Data analyses

In this study, since the purpose of using mixed methods is triangulation, qualitative and quantitative data were collected and analyzed at the same time. After analyzing the data obtained from the qualitative and quantitative parts of the study, the data were combined according to the purpose of the study to reveal the strengths of each approach and to minimize the weaknesses.

Factor analysis, descriptive statistics, frequencies and nonparametric statistics were used to analyze quantitative data. The analyzes were performed with the help of SPSS program. In this study, content analysis which is one of the research methods at the intersection of qualitative and quantitative traditions was used in the analysis of qualitative data (Duriau, Reger & Pfarrer, 2007). Specifically, the qualitative data was interpreted and coded and used to systematically evaluate and interpret the views of the participants. The data embedded design was used to combine the data. In other words, the qualitative data were evaluated according to the quantitative data and the qualitative data were embedded in the quantitative data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

5. Results

5.1 Result for Quantitative data

Table 1 gives descriptive statistics on the sub-dimensions of the Attitude Scale for Multi-Stakeholder Performance Evaluation. The minimum score for the first sub-dimensions of attitude scale for multi-stakeholder performance evaluation is 18, the maximum score is 88, the average is 44,59 and the standard deviation is 17,65. For the negative aspects which are the second dimension of the scale, the minimum score is 12, the maximum score is 60, the mean is 29,93 and the standard deviation is 11,83. Research has shown that the attitudes towards the positive aspects and negative aspects of the multi-stakeholder performance evaluation system are moderate.

The Kruskal Wallis-H test was used to determine whether the attitude scores of the participants regarding the multi-stakeholder performance evaluation differ according to the participant's status. Table 2 shows that participants' positive aspect ($\chi^2 = 71,852, df = 4, p = ,000$) and negative aspect attitudes ($\chi^2 = 31,308, df = 4, p =$

,000) towards multi-stakeholder performance evaluation differ according to status variable.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics on Sub-dimensions of Attitude Scale for Multi-Stakeholder Performance Assessment

	N	\bar{x}	s	Min	Max
Positive Aspects	249	44,59	17,65	18	88
Negative Aspects	269	29,93	11,83	12	60

Table 2: Result of Kruskal Wallis-H for Attitude Scale for Multi-Stakeholder Performance Assessment across Status Variable

	Groups	N	Mean Rank	χ^2	df	p
Positive Aspects	Teacher	48	49,08	71,852	4	,000
	School Principal	6	59,17			
	Prospective Teachers	137	136,68			
	Trainee Teacher	44	148,56			
	Contracted Teacher	2	115,00			
	Total	237				
Negative Aspect	Teacher	48	85,05	31,308	4	,000
	School Principal	7	66,29			
	Prospective Teachers	153	145,67			
	Trainee Teacher	44	122,50			
	Contracted Teacher	2	80,50			
	Total	254				

The Mann Whithney U test was used to find out which groups differed significantly. When the Mann Whitney-U test results were examined for positive aspects of multi-stakeholder performance evaluation, a significant difference was found between teacher and teacher candidates ($U=824,00$, $z=-7,722$) and teachers and trainee teachers ($U=681,000$, $z=-2,936$). There is also a difference in this dimension between school principals and prospective teachers ($U = 143,000$, $z = -2,699$) and between school principals and trainee teachers ($U = 45,500$, $z = -2,58$). The scores of prospective teachers and trainee teachers about the positive aspects of multi-stakeholder performance evaluation are higher than teachers and school principals. The scores related to the negative aspects of multi-stakeholder performance assessment differ significantly between teacher and teacher candidates ($U = 1988.00$, $z = -4.793$). In this dimension, there was a significant difference between school principals and prospective teachers ($U = 219,500$, $z = -2,638$). The trainee teachers' scores regarding the negative aspects of multi-stakeholder performance evaluation are higher than those of teachers and school principals.

When participants were asked about students' participation in performance evaluation, (Table 3): 46,1% stated that the students were not sufficient to evaluate the teachers and 40,1% said that the students could not be scientific, evidence-based and impartial during teacher evaluation. However, 42,1% think that students' comments and opinions can be used to score teacher performance. 52% of the participants think that the attitudes of the students towards the teacher will affect the evaluation. 41,8%

did not find any accountability problem for directly converting the data, obtained from parents and student surveys, into points.

Regarding the involvement of parents in teacher appraisal, 54,9% of the participants thought that they do not have the competence for teacher evaluation. 42,8% said that parents could not act independently, scientifically, and evidence-based during teacher evaluation. However, 52,3% think that the views and opinions of the parents can be used directly by converting them into points during the evaluation of teachers.

When participants were asked about their views on school principal's contribution to teacher appraisal: 17,4% stated that they did not find them sufficient for teacher evaluation and 18,4% stated that they could not be scientific, evidence-based and independent in this respect. Nevertheless, the participants think that the performance of teachers should be evaluated by managers to increase their motivation and success. 8,9% of the participants think that the managers have knowledge about the criteria included in the performance evaluation form.

The participants' opinions on involvement of teachers from other branches in performance evaluation are as follows: 44,1% think that teachers from other branches do not have the competence to evaluate the teacher, and 19,7% think they cannot act impartially, scientifically and data-based during teacher appraisal. Nevertheless, 34,5% stated that teachers' opinions from other branches were necessary during performance evaluation. 35,9% have the opinion that the evaluation of teachers by other branches will not contribute to the personal development of the teacher.

Regarding the involvement of teachers from same branch in performance evaluation, 20,4% of the participants think that they do not have competence in performance evaluation. 18,4% think that they cannot behave scientifically, impartially and data-based during performance evaluation. 11,2% think that teachers should be evaluated by teachers from the same branch in order to increase their motivation and success. 6,9% think that the subject teachers have sufficient knowledge about the criterion used in the performance evaluation form. 40,9% of the participants think that solidarity between teachers won't prevent realistic evaluations.

The 3 remaining items are general and intended for all evaluators. 46,1% of the participants think that the performance evaluation based on stakeholders who has no responsibility, competence, accountability on performance assessment won't create unfair results. 51,3 think that teacher won't give low grades because of personal reasons. 53,3% think that different perspectives and disagreements in the school will affect the valuation of teachers.

When the participants were asked about their views on the General Proficiency Exam of Teaching Profession (Table 4): 23% of the participants said that the exam will not reveal the needs of the teachers. 24,3% believes that the exam will decrease teachers' performance. 26% of the respondents don't think the exam will be fair. 36% do not believe that the exam will lead to making someone happy rather than the professional development of teachers.

Table 3: Percentages for Students, Parents, School Principals, Teacher from other Branches and Teacher from same Branch as Assessors

	Scale Point				
	1	2	3	4	5
Students have the competence to evaluate teachers.	46,1	18,1	18,4	8,6	8,9
Students can be neutral, scientific and evidence-based when evaluating teachers.	40,1	14,8	13,2	12,1	18,4
Students' comments and opinions should not be used to score teacher performance.	42,8	11,8	16,4	13,5	13,8
The weighting of the data obtained from parents and student surveys by direct converting to points is a problematic practice in terms of the accountability of the assessors.	41,8	18,8	19,4	12,8	5,3
Students' attitude towards the teacher will affect the assessment.	3,6	5,9	15,1	21,4	52
Parents have the competence to evaluate the teacher.	54,9	20,1	14,5	6,9	3,6
Parents can be neutral, scientific and evidence-based when evaluating teachers.	42,8	17,1	10,2	11,8	15,5
Parents' views and opinions should not be used to calculate teacher performance points by converting them directly to a score.	52,3	16,1	10,9	11,8	8,2
School administrators have the competence to evaluate the teacher.	17,4	17,1	24,7	24,3	15,5
School administrators can be neutral, scientific and evidence-based when evaluating teachers.	18,4	17,1	22,7	18,4	22
In order to increase the motivation and success of the teacher, school principals should evaluate the teacher's performance.	13,5	14,8	27,6	23	20,4
School principals are familiar with the criteria included in the performance evaluation form.	14,1	22,7	33,2	19,7	8,9
Teachers of other branches have the competence to evaluate the teacher.	44,1	21,4	20,1	10,2	3
Teachers of other branches can be neutral, scientific and evidence-based when evaluating teachers.	19,7	17,1	23,7	18,8	19,1
The views and opinions of the teachers of other branches should not be used as a judgment about the teacher's performance.	34,5	21,1	16,1	13,2	9,9
The evaluation of a teacher by another teacher from another branch does not contribute to the professional development of the teacher.	15,1	12,8	16,4	19,4	35,9
Teachers from the same branch have the competence to evaluate the teacher.	20,4	24,3	20,7	21,7	11,2
Teachers from the same branch can be neutral, scientific and evidence-based when evaluating teachers	18,4	14,5	22	21,4	19,1
In order to increase the motivation and success of the teacher, teachers from the same branch should evaluate the teacher's performance	19,4	19,4	29,3	20,7	11,2
Teachers from the same branch have sufficient knowledge of the criteria included in the performance evaluation form.	15,1	24,3	34,2	17,4	6,9
Realistic evaluations cannot be made because of the evaluation of teachers by each other, by peer solidarity	40,8	27	15,5	11,2	4,9
Assessment of teachers by education stakeholders (student, parent, colleague, school principal, etc.) who do not have competence, accountability and responsibility on teacher evaluation will have unfair results.	46,1	18,4	19,4	10,5	5,6
Assessors who perform performance evaluations may give low scores to teachers due to a personal reason.	51,3	14,8	14,8	8,2	9,54
Different perspectives and disagreements at school will affect teachers' evaluation of each other.	3,3	7,9	11,8	20,4	53,3

Note. 1= I totally disagree, 2= Partially disagree, 3= Moderately agree, 4= Mostly agree, 5= I totally agree.

Table 4: Percentages for the General Proficiency Exam of Teaching Profession

	Scale Points				
	1	2	3	4	5
The Exam for Proficiency in Teaching Profession will not reveal the professional needs of teachers.	23	16,4	23,7	14,8	20,1
The examination of the General Proficiency of Teaching Profession will lead to a decrease in the teacher's performance.	18,1	12,5	22,4	21,4	24,3
The General Proficiency Exam of Teaching Profession will be fair.	26	18,4	24,3	13,5	13,8
The Teaching Profession General Qualifications Exam will cause the teacher to engage in a study focusing on satisfying someone (student, parent, colleague, school principal, etc.) rather than professional development.	36,8	19,4	20,7	10,5	11,5

Note. 1= I totally disagree, 2= Partially disagree, 3= Moderately agree, 4= Mostly agree, 5= I totally agree.

Table 5: Percentages for remaining items

	Scale Point				
	1	2	3	4	5
I doubt the measurability of the criteria to be used in teacher performance evaluation	29,6	25,7	22,7	13,5	5,6
Assessment of teacher performance is only possible with observations in the classroom.	9,2	5,9	19,4	24,7	39,8
The legal infrastructure of the draft performance evaluation system is problematic.	24	15,1	32,6	16,8	6,9
I believe that forms that will be used for performance evaluation will provide an objective assessment.	25	16,8	29,9	14,8	9,2
I think people who prepare the performance evaluation draft are professionals in the subject area.	22,7	20,1	28,9	18,4	7,2
Appointments and displacements based on the performance evaluation draft will have great injustices.	39,1	18,8	19,4	11,2	10,5
Face-to-face or remote in-service training will be perceived as punishment by teachers who got low scores in performance evaluation.	12,2	14,8	18,1	22	32,6
As the scores obtained from the performance evaluation will be effective in the renewal of the teachers' contracts, they will threaten the personal rights of the teachers, especially the job security.	44,7	18,4	20,4	8,2	6,6
It is not fair to use interview results during teacher assignment.	44,4	15,1	16,1	10,5	11,8
The use of the internship experience during the assignment the teacher is the right decision.	13,5	14,1	14,8	19,4	36,8
It is not appropriate for school principals to be evaluated by teachers.	16,8	10,5	27,3	22,4	21,7
It is not fair to undertake performance evaluation of contracted teachers.	24	8,9	22,4	19,7	24,3

Note. 1= I totally disagree, 2= Partially disagree, 3= Moderately agree, 4= Mostly agree, 5= I totally agree.

Table 5 reflects the general opinions of participants about performance evaluation. 39,8% of the participants think that the performance evaluation of the teachers is only possible in-class observation. 29,6% have no doubt about the measurability of the criteria to be used in performance evaluation. 24% do not see any problems in the legal infrastructure of the draft performance evaluation system. 25% believe that the forms to be used in performance evaluation will not provide an objective assessment. 22,7% do not think that people who prepare the performance evaluation draft are professional in performance evaluation. 39,1% do not think that assignments and displacements based

on by performance evaluation will lead to great injustices. 32,6% of the participants think that at the end of the performance evaluation face-to-face or remote in-service training will be perceived as punishment. 44,7% think that performance evaluation will be effective in the renewal of teachers' contracts and that teachers will threaten their personal rights, especially job security. 44,4% did not agree with the opinion that the use of interview results during the appointment of the teacher is not fair. 36,8% think that using teacher internship experiences during their appointments is a right decision. 21,7% of participants do not approve of assessment of school principals by the teachers. 24,3% stated that evaluating the performance of contracted teachers is not fair.

5.2 Results for Content Analysis

Participants' answers to open-ended questions were analyzed by content analysis. As a result, 41 codes and 7 sub-codes have emerged. The data was classified under the following two main themes: the quality of performance appraisal and the effects of performance appraisal.

Most participants think that the teacher performance appraisal system will not be scientific, fair, equitable, valid and reliable. The following excerpts illustrate the participants' views in this respect (Table 6):

"It will not be equal, will be biased, not a fair assessment."

"It makes me think that whether the distribution of scores (taken by the appraisal) is fair or not."

"The principal is a single person and it is not possible in some cases to make an impartial and fair evaluation of the teacher he / she is evaluating. Evaluation should be made by a board. In this process, I think that the teacher should be evaluated in many respects, not only the lessons, but also the general performance, communication with the students, communication with the parents and the success of the students."

Participants think that the system will damage the reputation of the teacher, create psychological pressure and harm the student teacher relationship (Table 7). Some of the participants' views on this issue are as follows:

"A system that can be exploited by students."

Participants frequently stated that misconduct, distrust, and loss of integrity among the disadvantages of performance appraisal. Below are some quotations from the participants' views:

"Precarious work, nepotism, disinformation (are the possible negative effects)."

Table 6: Participants' views on Quality of Performance Appraisal

Theme	Codes	Sub-codes	f
Quality of Performance Appraisal	Impartiality	Possibility of not being neutral	70
		Sided	12
		Biased	14
		Impartial	2
		Nepotism	10
	Objectivity	Not objective	67
		Subjective	3
	Scientific	Not scientific	16
		Unreliable	5
		Invalid	4
		Not concrete / not observable	4
		Suspicious	5
		Unsound	4
	Fairness	It's not fair	95
		Unjust	39
		Injustice	11
	Applicability	Not qualified/ incapable	10
		Not equality	5
		Not just	1
Not applicable		17	
Not enough time		19	

"The elimination of job security, the disreputable of the teaching profession, the lack of an impartial assessment."

"This appraisal) may become a tool of psychological violence towards the teacher. The reputation of the teachers will be hurt. It will cause the teachers feel precarious and worthless."

"It won't be neutral. Nepotism will come to the fore. No performance score is given to any profession; teacher performance evaluation will damage the reputation of teachers."

"Personal interest relations will emerge, an unfair assessment will be made, and the result: discredit the teacher."

In particular, the participants working as contract teachers feel deprived of job security. According to them, the appointment of the contract teachers according to the performance score is a threatening factor in terms of job security.

"It is unfair to assign the teachers according to the performance score."

The participants stated that it is not appropriate to evaluate teachers' performances by students and parents. According to the participants, neither the students nor the parents have the competence to assess teachers' performance.

"Students and parents cannot make an objective and scientific evaluation."

Participants are also concerned that the assessment can be used as a threat by the school principals, students and parents. According to the participants, teachers may be forced to obey the school principal to get good scores from the assessment. The participants' concerns can be better understood in the following quotations:

"...obedience, adulatory, psychological problems will arise."

"Since teachers know that close relationship will affect the outcome of the performance, they will try to look different than they are; teachers will obey administrators completely."

"Teachers' obedience to those in upper management will increase."

As the following quote suggests, participants indicate that the current performance evaluation system is more objective than the system presented as a draft in 2018.

"Until they have found an evaluation that is more objective and would improve the quality of education, I think the current performance assessment is much better than the evaluation system presented in the draft."

On the other hand, as detailed in the following excerpts, some of the prospective teachers think that performance evaluation can provide a framework for teachers to strengthen their classroom practices and to improve their teaching styles.

"(This assessment) indicates whether a teacher has sufficient knowledge in the education field."

"(This assessment) contribute to the professional development of the prospective teacher."

"These assessments may be encouraging for personal development."

"With this evaluation draft, teachers can better assess themselves and realize their deficiencies and determine their productivity and achievements."

"I think the benefits of this assessment can be to improve the quality of education, to provide public accountability, and to identify training needs."

Table 7: Participants' views on Effects of Performance Appraisal

Theme	Codes	Sub-codes	f
Effects of Performance Appraisal	Pros	Increase the quality of education	19
		Promotes professional development	15
		Encouraging	5
		Determination of the needs	13
		Determines successes	24
	Cons	Create oppression	74
		Trust / assurance / insecurity	53
		Interest relation	28
		Causes stress	19
		Reduces efficiency	16
		Concern	14
		Feel threatened	13
		Anxiety	11
		Tension	11
		No contribution	23
		Qualifications	59
		Insufficiency	40
Reduces quality	19		
It hurts (self, honesty, respect)	11		
Subordination /obedience	6		

6. Discussion and Conclusion

In the 21st century, many countries set ambitious targets for education and tried to find the most effective policies to achieve these goals. Teacher quality has been the subject of many studies as the most important factor affecting education (CDE, 2015; Wright, Horn & Sanders, 1997). Evaluation of teacher performance was seen as a way to improve the quality of the teacher by seeing the teacher's shortcomings and improving himself / herself (Milanowski, 2004, OECD, 2013, Taylor & Tyler, 2012).

In many studies, it is emphasized that evaluating teachers has a strong positive effect on both teachers and their work because it provides feedback to the teacher. Teachers report that when they are evaluated and received feedback, their job satisfaction, job security and professional development have increased significantly. As the importance given to teacher evaluation and feedback increases, efforts of teachers to improve their teaching are also increasing (OECD, 2013). In accordance with the literature, the positive aspects of the teacher evaluation system emerged as a contribution of teachers' professional development, determination of training needs and the qualifications of teachers in this study.

Based on the findings of this study, it would not be wrong to say that the teacher evaluation system is not only important but also necessary. Explicitly, this study reveals that teacher appraisal will be beneficial if done properly, fairly and scientifically. The teacher appraisal system can increase the quality of both teachers and education if it is fair, objective and impartial, and if the evaluators are competent in the standards of performance. Danielson and McGreal (2000) support this result. For their study the evaluation procedures provide both high quality teaching and support for vocational

learning by teachers. Similarly, Danielson (2008) claimed clear definitions components of professional practice can allow teachers to take their teachings into account. In fact, expressions encourage teachers to act as successful teachers, especially when accompanied by definitions of performance levels. In addition, framework for teaching performance allows teachers to question their behavior by reading clear explanations about what teachers do and how these actions occur when done well.

Moreover, the prospective teachers in this study stated that the teacher appraisal system would able to distinguish between successful and unsuccessful teachers, to inform teachers about their own performances, and to contribute to personal development. This finding is consistent with the finding of Elliott (2015). As previously stated by Elliott, performance appraisal includes both formative elements focusing on performance improvement, such as career development, professional learning and feedback, and summative elements such as career advancement, potential promotion or demotion and dismissal.

The study also showed that the participants' attitudes towards the positive aspects and negative aspects of the multi-stakeholder performance evaluation system were moderate. There are studies supporting this finding in the literature. Huang and Shih (2017) found that primary school teachers' attitudes towards teacher appraisal for professional development were above average and the most positive attitudes towards evaluation outcome application. They also found that primary school teachers' attitudes towards teacher evaluation for professional development show a low positive correlation with teaching effectiveness. In a similar study, Farah (2018) found that teachers' perceptions of the performance assessment tool were positive, they were satisfied with the effectiveness of the system and were very effective in achieving the goal, but had no effect on productivity.

On the other hand, the qualitative findings of this study indicated a more negative view of multi-stakeholder performance evaluation among participants. Findings revealed that the performance appraisal system leads to restlessness in participants. The findings show that participants doubt the validity and reliability of the evaluation system and therefore they do not trust the evaluation system to increase the quality of teachers and education. To be more specific, participants are concerned that the performance evaluation system will negatively affect the respectability of the teacher in the community, as students and parents will reduce their respect for the teacher. Therefore, it was found that the attitudes of the participants towards the performance evaluation system were quite negative. In the literature, there are studies that show that teachers often have negative attitudes towards performance evaluation (Konan & Yılmaz, 2018; Saljooghi & Salehi, 2016).

Another finding of the study is that school principals have more positive attitudes towards multi-stakeholder performance evaluation than teachers. A similar finding was found in Peel and Inkson (1993); in their study, they stated that there is a strong consensus among school principals about evaluating teachers' performances. Consistently, Maya and Kaçar (2018) found that school principals generally have a positive approach to performance evaluation.

One of the remarkable findings of this study is that school principals and teachers' attitudes towards the positive aspects of the multi-stakeholder performance evaluation system are lower than those of teacher candidates and teacher candidates. Furthermore, pre-service teachers', prospective teachers', and trainee teachers' attitudes towards multi-stakeholder performance evaluation system are higher than those of teachers and school principals. In other words, young and less experienced teachers have a more positive attitude to the teacher appraisal system than experienced teachers. This finding can be interpreted that young teachers who are new to or are not yet appointed to the profession are more open to professional development. The literature also supports this finding. Hürsen (2012) found teachers who younger and less service time has more positive attitudes towards professional development activities. In the similar way, according to the OECD (2009) report, the amount of professional development that teachers receive depends on the age of teachers. On average in all countries, less experienced teachers under 30 years of age are more likely to participate in professional development than in more experienced professionals.

As mentioned earlier, multi-stakeholder performance evaluation it was not implemented due to negative reactions arising from the public opinion. However, this research has revealed that generally teachers, school principals and teacher candidates have more positive opinions than expected about the performance evaluation system. This finding points to the need for continued efforts to achieve reliable and robust findings on multi-stakeholder performance evaluation. When teachers understand the necessity of an evaluation process and are allowed to participate in the design and evaluation of assessments, their attitudes and perceptions can be very positive. As long as, teachers show a positive attitude towards evaluations, their performance scores tend to be better. Teachers with positive attitudes are willing to accept constructive criticism to create teaching that will increase student achievement (Nelson, 2012). Tziner and Murphy (2001) reported that attitudes and beliefs about the institution and the evaluation system affect ratings and how feedback is handled. Therefore, it is important to conduct activities to increase the attitudes and perceptions of teachers and principals towards performance evaluation.

In the study, the participants think that the views and opinions of the students are important in the evaluation of teacher performance, however, they also stated that students do not have the competence and knowledge to evaluate the teacher, and therefore they think that they cannot be scientific, evidence-based and impartial during the evaluation. In parallel with this finding, there are many studies in the literature that show the necessity of using student views in the evaluation of the teacher. The Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project, carried out for revealing and testing how best to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching, found that student surveys produced more consistent results than that of class observations or student achievement gain measures (Kane & Staiger, 2012). Currently, student assessment is used in countries such as China, South Korea, Sweden (OECD, 2013). Likewise, Peterson (2006) stated that the realistic data can be provided through students who can directly observe teacher's classroom management, the ability to organize the activities and the relations

with the students. In addition, more than half of the participants in this study, think that students' attitudes towards teachers will affect the assessment. It is suggested that student views should be used to inform the teacher about their teaching skills and knowledge, but this should not be taken as a score in evaluating the teacher's performance (TEDMEM, 2018).

In this study, participants stated that parents do not have the competence and knowledge to evaluate the teacher and that they cannot be scientific, objective and evidence-based during evaluation. Nevertheless, participants did not express a negative opinion on the use of parents' views and opinions from the teacher's performance evaluation. As it is known, parents are important components that have effects on the success and effectiveness of the teacher's teaching. Parents are partners in the work of teachers in some cases and they have unique personal knowledge about student learning and can report on teachers' duties (Peterson, Wahlquist, Brown & Mukhopadhyay. 2003). Inspections by individuals who are directly or indirectly affected by teaching (e.g. students and parents) may provide useful feedback if surveys are well designed (Teaching Summit Report, 2013). However, as Peterson (2006) states, although interacting with parents is one of the tasks of the teachers, the professional performance of the teacher cannot be evaluated only by the positive or negative reactions of the parents. Based on these findings, it is thought that views of parents play a special role in evaluating the performance of the teachers, but given the lack of competence and knowledge in the performance evaluation of parents, it would be appropriate to use parents' comments and interpretations as an additional source of information about the teacher's performance without being converted into a performance score.

Similarly, participants stated that school principals do not have the competence to evaluate teacher performance and cannot behave scientifically and clearly during the evaluation. Though, participants think that the assessment of teacher performance by school principals is important to increase teacher performance, motivation and success. As stated in the related literature, the main duties of the school principals are management, organization, leadership, communication, management of group processes, as well as feedback, supervision and evaluation (Arar, 2014; Cosner, 2012; Downey & Kelly, 2013). Since teachers need to receive constructive feedback from skilled practitioners to improve their teaching (Donaldson & Donaldson, 2012), it is important that the school principal and teachers review and discuss the results of the performance evaluation. Although teachers, whose performances are properly described and supervised, report a high level of job satisfaction and professional commitment, even if they have taken low performance evaluation results (Rahman, 2006). in many countries, including Turkey, teachers do not receive sufficient feedback on their performance (OECD, 2009).

The performance evaluation system will be effective to the extent that the result of the performance evaluation is explained to the teacher who is assessed. Teachers who have sufficient and clear information about their performance will be aware of their deficiencies and be willing to develop themselves professionally. However, the data-

based teacher assessment and employment system is perceived in different ways by the participants. This system is thought to have different purposes such as control, follow-up and evaluation (Arar & Arar, 2016). In this study, it was found that participants were worried about the misuse of performance evaluation by school principals, students and parents. Participants state that teachers may have to submit to the authority of the school principal in order to get a high score from the performance evaluation. Similarly, Leithwood and Jantzi (2006) maintained that some principals can use teacher appraisal as a supervisory and monitoring mechanism that proves their authorities. According to Arar and Oplatka (2011), the use of teacher assessment by school principals reflects their perceptions of role in management. Therefore, the inclusion of principals in the evaluation model of the principals was not liked by the teachers and it was found that they only increased the tension (Heritage, Kim, Vendlinski & Herman, 2009).

A finding that coincides with the literature is that the participants think that teachers in other branches are not sufficient, objective and data-based on performance evaluation and their participation in the evaluation process does not contribute to them. Turkey Education Association (TEDMEM) report (2018), also suggests that teachers' views from other disciplines will not contribute to the personal and academic development of the teacher.

Another finding of the study is that there is no consensus on the contribution of teachers in the same field to performance evaluation. In other words, the participants think that teachers in the same disciplines (i.e. their peers) do not have the competence to evaluate the performance and that they cannot be scientific and impartial during the evaluation, and that the solidarity between teachers will prevent realistic evaluations. On the other hand, studies showing that peer evaluations contribute to teacher motivation have been found in the literature. Peer assessments made by teachers are an excellent tool for instructors to evaluate each other's quality and become a coach (Teaching Summit Report, 2013). Peer assessment is a very useful method for teachers to rate their professional competence and learning skills. Many countries have already successfully used peer reviews in teacher performance evaluation (e.g. Hong Kong, China, the Netherlands).

As Elliott (2015) points out, timely feedback is important, emphasizing how quality education is and how teachers develop themselves professionally and in which areas teachers should be part of the learning process. Considering that school principals have a lot of administrative work at school, it is clear that they are less likely to provide timely feedback to the teacher. On the other hand, colleagues can be both timely and constructive feedback sources for each other. Therefore, it can be concluded that the inclusion of peer assessment in the teacher performance evaluation system is not only important and but also necessary.

In this study, the majority of the participants believe that the inclusion of stakeholders without responsibility, competence and accountability in performance evaluation will prevent fair results from performance evaluation. Bernardin and Beatty (2013) stated that when the participants felt that the performance evaluation system was

unfair, and reliability of feedbacks and resources was doubtful, they ignored the feedback. Danielson (2008) maintained that if teachers feel that they are not threatened, the assessment will be useful to them. In the same way, an appraisal system that encourages teacher learning will be the system that teachers reflect on their practices.

From the findings of this study, it can be concluded that, in order to ensure that the performance evaluation gives valid and reliable results, it should be ensured that what is expected from the teachers is based on specific and objective standards, that the evaluators behave in accordance with these standards, and that they make an evaluation free of prejudice and individual opinions. Danielson (2008) asserts that teachers can be assessed on a standard scale; however, it should be ensured that the evaluators are qualified. In addition, it should be agreed about what quality and successful performance is and the people who will make the evaluation should be educated in this regard.

The majority of the respondents believe that the evaluator will not give a low score for personal reasons and that the different perspectives and disagreements in the school will not affect the performance evaluation results. However, some studies argue that different perspectives and disagreements in the school will affect the performance evaluation results (Arar & Oplatka, 2011; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006, Uçar, 2001). In this context, the standardization of performance appraisal and training of all stakeholders involved in the assessment of quality and successful performance should be a priority for more objective and reliable evaluation.

In this study, twenty-five percent of the respondents do not see any problem with the legal character of the draft, and about thirty percent did not doubt the measurability of the criteria to be used in performance evaluation. According to both qualitative and quantitative findings of the study, participants believe that current performance assessment is not objective. To be more specific, according to the participants, the current performance assessment performed by school principals through class observation is quite subjective, since the observers generally do not use an objective criterion. It can be recommended that the observers should use rubrics or checklists to ensure that teacher assessments are objective.

The majority of the participants shared that the performance evaluation of the teachers was only possible in class observation. However, during qualitative analyze participants criticized the fact that teacher assessments were relied on only one lesson class observation conducted by principals or another school administrator. Sanders (1995) stated that teachers think that the current assessment process closely resembles a competence-based process and that the ideal process is more authentic in nature.

About forty percent of respondents believe that assignments and displacements based on performance evaluation will not lead to large injustices. In a similar way, the majority of the respondents think that the use of the results of the performance assessment in the renewal of teacher contracts will not threaten the personal rights of teachers, especially job security. While performance evaluation is used in radical decisions such as teacher dismissal in some countries, this is not a very preferable practice, and in many countries, there are positive practices such as rewarding,

appointing, salary increases (OECD, 2013). Bernardin and Beatty (2013) stated that when the participants felt that the performance evaluation system was unfair, and reliability of feedbacks and resources was doubtful, they ignored the feedback. Legal measures should be taken and shared with the public so that the system does not harm the personal rights and safety of the teacher, because teachers are included in the system only as they believe.

A significant number of participants perceive the in-service trainings planned to be given according to the results of performance evaluation through face-to-face training or distance learning as punishment. Researches show that teachers have a negative attitude towards in-service training activities (Karasolak, Tannriseven & Yavuz Konakman, 2012) and they are not satisfied with in-service training (Göksoy, (2014). However, the fact that participants perceive in-service training as a punishment is an important finding to be questioned. The reasons for this negative perception may be that the persons who provide in-service training are not sufficient in the field, lack of opportunity for implementation and participation in education is not optional, but compulsory. *“Generic one-size-fits-all training (typically in short courses or one-shot workshops) is not sufficient to meet specific teacher professional development needs, as research has proven; it must be balanced with professional collaborative learning and individual development plans.”* (CDE, 2015, p.18). In order to achieve the desired positive change at the end of the performance evaluation, it may be suggested that in-service trainings are practice-based and organized according to individual needs, and based on voluntary participation.

Another finding of the study is that use of the Teaching Proficiency Exam during teacher performance appraisal will not reveal the needs of the teachers, decrease their performance and will not be fair. This view is in line with international practices. While the Teacher Proficiency Test application is not very common at international level, it is one of the data sources used in evaluating teacher performance in some countries such as England, Slovenia, Chile and Mexico. It can be used to decide whether teacher should enter the profession, to decide the end of the trial period, to reward and to score performance (OECD, 2013). *“Competence is about having knowledge, skills and competence to perform a job or profession successfully and efficiently. The qualification alone does not show how the work is done, how efficient or successful it is, but only a certain level of capacity to do it. Performance refers to the process and results of performing an action, job or task. Performance refers to how effectively an action, job, or task is carried out. Qualification refers to a prerequisite for performance”* (TEDMEM, 2018). As the definition implies, the Teacher Qualification Exam is far from measuring the classroom performance of the teacher, and it may be preferable to use the qualifications and in-service training needs to be started at the beginning of the profession.

Majority of the participants think that it is fair to use the interview results during the teacher appointment. Based on many political-based misconceptions, the questions asked in the interviews should be relevant to teaching and should reveal the enthusiasm and knowledge of the trainee for the profession. In order for the interviews to be fair, standard interview forms should be prepared and the video recording of the

interview should be kept. Sanders (1995) proposed that the existing process be modified to include a portfolio and that a rubric should be developed to assess this portfolio. Sanders also emphasized that practical portfolio examples should be presented as a model for managers and teachers. Dibaz Sayın and Arslan (2017) stated that teachers and school principals wanted the self-assessment to be used in the performance evaluation process. In addition, teacher and principals supported using multiple indicator model which consists of self-assessment, student and school administrator.

Many respondents think that it is fair to use internship experiences during teacher appointments. A quarter of the respondents find it fair to make a performance assessment for contract teachers. In New Zealand, Canada and the UK, regulations state that teacher evaluation includes trial evaluations to determine whether new teachers are ready to enter the system (OECD, 2013). Although it may be a good idea to use pre-service teachers during their appointment, the lack of equal opportunities and conditions of internship constitutes a major problem. Without creating standard conditions for internships, the use of internship points during appointments will not have fair results. In such a decision, the seriousness of the internship practices should be regularly monitored. It was also found that teachers did not find it appropriate to use student test scores as a data source.

Although participants are skeptical that this may happen, effective implementation of teacher appraisal procedures will encourage teachers to learn professionally. Based on the findings, an efficient assessment system can be summarized as follows: An effective appraisal system which allows teachers to participate in the assessment process, should be a fair and impartial, continuous, based on reliable and valid criteria as well.

It is hoped that the findings of this study will help to raise the awareness of all educational components about the teacher performance evaluation system and to shed light on the education politicians in the development of an alternative teacher performance evaluation system. Based on the findings of this study and the related literature, the principles that should be considered when developing an alternative / effective teacher performance evaluation system are presented below.

A. Implications and Recommendations for countries have recently introduced the performance evaluation system:

- While interview is important in terms of demonstrating the motivation and willingness of the trainee to the profession, the interview may cause the individual to be eliminated because of their political identity in developing countries. Therefore, it is recommended that the questions to be asked in the interviews are only aimed at revealing the teacher's reason for choosing the profession and his / her enthusiasm for the profession, and using standardized questions with rubric.
- Another suggestion is to offer an in-service program that is not based on compulsory participation but based on volunteerism that is suitable for

implementation and is sensitive to individual needs. Otherwise, in-service trainings will be nothing but a waste of time.

- It is also recommended that the teacher and the assessor should undertake the need analysis of the individual teacher based on the result of teacher performance appraisal and then establish a realistic approach to way to meet his/her educational needs.
- The views of the students and parents should be taken in the teacher performance evaluation, but these views should not be weighted as points.
- In the performance evaluation, evaluation of teachers in the same branch (or peer review) should be preferred rather than teachers in different branches. However, teachers can be consulted in other branches if there are no other teachers in the school. However, in the absence of teachers from the same branch at the school, the teacher in other branches can be consulted.
- Although it is recommended to use student academic achievement during the performance evaluation of the teacher, it should not be the only measure of the evaluation process and should be used as only one of the indicators in the process (Braun, 2005).
- Teachers' competence and standards should be revised periodically with the participation of teachers, so that teachers should keep up with the era in terms of their professional knowledge.
- Class observations should be included in the evaluation system, since the idea that the teacher's performance can be best understood by observing their actual teaching. However, it would be useful to increase the number of class observations and extend the performance assessment to one year instead of one semester in order to ensure that the performance is well understood.
- School principals' teacher evaluation should not be made for the purpose of giving only one score; it is very important to share the evaluation result with the teachers and to create opportunities for teachers to improve themselves.
- Self-assessment should be one of the data sources that should be included in the performance evaluation in order to help teachers see their own deficiencies and needs.
- Teaching portfolios that allow teachers to document the scope and quality of their performance and improve their skills through continuous reflection should also be included in the performance evaluation. As a form of self-evaluation, the teaching portfolio enables the teacher to realize how s/he has developed over the years. In this respect, the portfolio may include training certificates, publications (or unpublished articles and stories), awards, honors, class experience, extracurricular experience, examples of student work, unit and lesson plans, instructional materials, book reports, teacher-made tests, notes etc.
- A booklet which guide on the performance standards and evaluation criteria should be established for the multi-stakeholder performance evaluation system to avoid confusion and establish a standard practice in the performance evaluation system.

- In order to increase the status of the profession, there should be ways to attract individuals who have high academic success and good teachers in terms of their personal qualities to the teaching profession. A highly qualified teacher training program is required to be qualified teachers for these students (Cameron, 2003). It is important to make teaching attractive and to create conditions for the highest quality individuals to choose the profession, to improve teaching quality. It is recommended that studies should be carried out in order to increase low teacher welfare in developing countries and to increase teacher respectability in society. The highest-performing systems make teaching an attractive and respected career for the best candidates. That is, they provide high quality teacher training, productive mentoring, effective professional development opportunities and attractive career structures, and ensure that teachers work in collaboration with school leaders in the design and implementation of reforms and innovations (Teaching Submit Report, 2013, p.24).
- Teacher evaluation results can be used for improvement (formative) and accountability (summary) purposes. It is important to reach the right balance in teacher evaluation and to establish links between the functions of improvement and accountability (OECD, 2013). An attempt to perform these two functions in a single assessment may be problematic (CDE, 2015). The usage of the formative and summative purposes of performance evaluation should be taken into account, and accountability concerns should not be allowed to hinder the professional development of the teacher.
- Informative meetings should be organized to cover all stakeholders about performance evaluation, and stakeholders should be informed about how the assessment will be conducted. In addition, activities such as presenting successful examples of international performance evaluation should be organized to ensure a positive attitude towards teacher performance evaluation.
- Providing timely and sound information on performance evaluation can prevent the dissemination of unnecessary fears and misinformation in the public.
- It is recommended that the results of the Teacher Proficiency Exam should not be used alone in the appointment and performance evaluation.

B. Implications and Recommendations for the Ministry of National Education:

The research showed that teachers' attitudes towards multi-stakeholder performance evaluation were positive. In this context, after ensuring the validity and reliability of the data collection tools and the necessary the multi-stakeholder performance evaluation system infrastructure is established, there will be no problem in switching to the new performance evaluation system. In order to eliminate negative perceptions and prejudices related to performance evaluation, it is recommended to carry out introductory meetings. In addition, it should be emphasized that the successful examples of multi-stakeholder performance evaluation abroad will be introduced and performance evaluation will be carried out for the academic development of the teacher instead of the use for accountability. Lastly, education policies, especially teacher

training policies, should be consistent, sustainable, and stable, as well as based on the results of scientific research to ensure the quality of education. The development of a new vision for education is closely related to the sustainable and long-term education policies. In line with the political decisions, the continuous change of education policies and practices will adversely affect both the teacher and the student's performance. Therefore, there is an urgent need for continuing policies in education.

6.1 Limitations of research and recommendation for future studies

The number of participants is relatively low, since this study uses a convenient sampling method. Thus, it is important to conduct the research on larger samples in order to generalize the results of the study. Another limitation in this study is that the effect of different school levels on perceptions and attitudes towards performance evaluation has not been investigated in the study. In the following studies, it is recommended that teachers' attitudes towards performance evaluation should be examined at different levels in order to change the prejudices and misunderstandings of teachers and to produce policies in this regard.

About the Author(s)

Özlem Yeşim Özbek is currently working in Çankırı Karatekin University, and is a faculty member in the department of Measurement and Evaluation in Education. **Pervin Oya Taneri** is currently working in Çankırı Karatekin University, and is a faculty member in the department of Curriculum Development and Instruction.

References

- Arar, K. (2014). *Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Teacher Evaluation in Arab Schools in Israel: Meeting Demands of Accountability and Improving Performances*. In: A. Bowers, A. Shoho, & B. Barntett (Eds.). *Using Data in Schools to Inform Leadership and Decision Making*, A volume in *International Research on School Leadership* (pp. 181-204). Charlotte: Information Age Publications.
- Arar, K. & Arar, O. (2016). Implications of principals' teacher performance appraisal and decision-making in Arab schools in Israel, *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership*, 1(2), 255-285.
- Arar, K., & Oplatka, I. (2011). Perceptions and implications of teachers' evaluation among junior Arab school principals. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 37, 162-169.
- Bozan, S., & Ekinci, A. (2018). Öğretmen Performans Değerlendirme Sürecine İlişkin Okul Müdürü ve Öğretmen Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi: Nitel Bir Çalışma. *Mukaddime*, 9 (2), 213-240. DOI: 10.19059/mukaddime.415812
- Braun, H. (2005). *Using Student Progress To Evaluate Teachers: A Primer on Value-Added Models, Policy Information Perspective*. Princeton. New Jersey: Education Testing Service.

- Bernardin, H. J, & Beatty, R. W. (1984). *Performance Appraisal: Assessing Human Behavior at Work*. Boston, MA: Kent Publishing Company.
- Cameron, M. (2003). *Teacher Status Project: Stage 1: Identifying Teacher Status, Its Impact, and Recent Teacher Status Initiatives*. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Ministry of Education.
- Çelebi, N., Babaoğlan, E., Selçuk, G., & Peker, S. (2018). Performans değerlendirme formuna ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 37(2), 211-233. DOI: 10.7822/omuefd.425403
- Çelikten, M. & Özkan, H. H. (2018). Öğretmen performans değerlendirme sistemi. *International Journal of Society Researches*, 8(15), 806-824.
- CDE (Centre for Development and Enterprise). (2015) *Teacher Evaluation: Lessons from other countries*. (Johannesburg: CDE).
- Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cosner, S. (2012). Leading the ongoing development of collaborative data practices. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 11(1), 26-65.
- Danielson, C. (2008). *Enhancing Professional Practice a Framework for Teaching*. (2nd Ed.) the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). Alexandria, VA.
- Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. (2000). *Evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Dilbaz-Sayın, S. ve Arslan, H. (2017). Öğretmen ve okul yöneticilerinin öğretmen performans değerlendirme sürecindeki çoklu veri kaynakları ile ilgili görüşleri ve öz değerlendirmeleri. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi*, 6 (2), 1222-1241.
- Donaldson, M., & Donaldson, G. (2012). Strengthening teacher evaluation: What district leaders can do. *Educational Leadership*, 69(8), 78-82.
- Downey, C. & Kelly, A. (2013). *Professional attitudes to the use of data in England*. In K. Schildkamp, M.K. Lai & L. Earl (Eds.). *Data-based decision making in education: Challenges and opportunities* (117-129). New York: Springer.
- Duriau, V.J., Reger, R. K. & Pfarrer, M. D. (2007). A content analysis of the content analysis literature in organization studies: research themes, data sources, and methodological refinements. *Organizational Research Methods*, 10(1), 5-34.
- Elliott, K. (2015). Teacher performance appraisal: More about performance or development? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(9), 102-116. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2015v40n9.6>
- Farah, S. (2018). A study on teachers' attitudes towards performance appraisal system: A case study of Garissa Township sub-county, Kenya. *European Journal of Education Studies*, . <https://oapub.org/edu/index.php/ejes/article/view/1552>
- Göksoy, S. (2014). Hizmet-içi eğitim faaliyetlerinin süreç ve sonuçlarının niteliğine yönelik öğretmen görüşleri. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 11(1); 387-402. doi: 10.14687/ijhs.v11i1.2645.

- Heritage, M., Kim, J., Vendlinski, T., & Herman, J. (2009). From evidence to action: A seamless process in formative assessment? *Educational Measurement*, 28(3), 24–31.
- Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Huang, H., Shih, Y. (2017). A Study of Primary School Teachers' Attitudes toward Teacher Evaluation for Professional Development and Teaching Effectiveness in the Remote Districts. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 13(8), 5949-5960. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2017.01052a>
- Hürsen, Ç. (2012). Determine the attitudes of teachers towards professional development activities. *Procedia Technology* 1, 420- 425. doi: 10.1016/j.protcy.2012.02.094
- Karasolak, K., Tanrıseven, I. & Yavuz-Konakman, G. (2012). Öğretmenlerin hizmetiçi eğitim etkinliklerine ilişkin tutumlarının belirlenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 21(3), 997-1010.
- Kane, T. J. & Staiger, D. O. (2012). *Gathering Feedback for Teaching: Combining High-Quality Observations with Student Surveys and Achievement Gains*. Research Paper. MET Project. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.
- Kennedy, M. (2010). *Approaches to annual performance assessment*. In M. M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Teacher assessment and the quest for teacher quality: A handbook* (pp. 225- 250). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Konan, N. & Yılmaz, S. (2018). Öğretmen performans değerlendirmeye ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri: bir karma yöntem araştırması, *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 47(219), 137-160.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 201–227.
- Maya, İ., & Kaçar, Y. (2018). School Principals' and Teachers' Views on Teacher Performance Evaluation. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 14, 5, 77-88.
- MEBBİS (2018). <https://mebbis.meb.gov.tr>
- Milanowski, A. (2004). The relationship between teacher performance evaluation scores and student achievement: Evidence from Cincinnati. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 79:4, 33-53. DOI: 10.1207/s15327930pje7904_3
- MoNE. (2010). Law on the Organization and Duties of the Ministry of National Education, Annex, Law Number 3797, Official Gazette 12.5.1992 / 21226.
- memurlar.net. (2018). <https://www.memurlar.net/haber/730414/meb-ogretmen-performans-degerlendirme-yonetmelik-taslagini-goruse-acti.html>
- Nelson, J. A. (2012) *Effects of teacher evaluations on teacher effectiveness and student achievement*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Northern Michigan University.
- OECD (2009). *Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from TALIS*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2013). *Teachers for the 21st century. Using evaluation to improve teaching*. OECD publishing.

- <http://www.oecd.org/site/eduistp13/TS2013%20Background%20Report.pdf>
- Official Gazette. (2011). Decree Law on the Organization and Duties of the Ministry of National Education, September 14, 2011- Official Gazette No. 28054.
- Peel, S., & Inkson, K. (1993). High school principals' attitudes to performance evaluation: Professional development or accountability? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 28(2), 125-141.
- Peterson, K. D. (2006). *Using multiple data sources in teacher evaluation systems*. In Stronge J.H. (Ed.), *Evaluating Teaching*. California: Corwin Press, 212-232.
- Peterson, K. D., Wahlquist, C., Brown, J.E. & Mukhopadhyay, S. (2003). Parent surveys for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 17(4), 317-330.
- Rahman, S.A. (2006). Attitudes of Malaysian teachers toward a performance-appraisal system. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36, 12, 3031-3042.
- Saljooghi, B. & Salehi., B. (2016). Developing a teacher evaluation model: the impact of teachers' attitude toward the performance evaluation system (PES) on job satisfaction and organizational commitment with the mediating role of teachers' sense of efficacy. *International Journal of Medical Research & Health Sciences*, 5, 5(S), 200-209.
- Sanders, S. L. (1995). *Teacher attitudes toward the professional evaluation process*. Published Doctoral Dissertation. East Tennessee State University. Electronic Theses and Dissertations. <http://dc.etsu.edu/etd/2785>
- Sezgin, F., Tınmaz, A. & Tetik, S. (2017). Performans kriterlerine göre öğretmenlerin değerlendirilmesine ilişkin okul müdürü ve öğretmen görüşleri. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 14(2), 1647-1668. doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i2.4557.
- Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2010). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research*. (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Taylor, E.S, & Tyler, J. H. (2012). The effect of evaluation on teacher performance. *American Economic Review*, 102(7): 3628-3651
- Teaching Summit Report (2013). *Teacher Quality: The 2013 International Summit on the Teaching Profession*. Asia Society. AsiaSociety.org/teachingsummit.
- Tunç, B., İnandı, Y., Öksüz, F. & Çal, S. (2013). Multi-component evaluation in education: parent participation school principals' performance evaluation. *Trakya University Journal of Education*, 3(1), 90-99.
- TEDMEM (Turkey Education Association). (2018). Öğretmen Performans Değerlendirme ve Aday Öğretmenlik İş ve İşlemleri Yönetmelik Taslağı Üzerine Değerlendirmeler. <https://www.tedmem.org/mem-notlari/gorus/ogretmen-performans-degerlendirme-aday-ogretmenlik-is-islemleri-yonetmelik-taslagi-uzerine-degerlendirmeler>
- Tziner, A. & Murphy, K. R. (1999). Attitudinal evidences of attitudinal influences in performance appraisal. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13 (3), 407-419.
- Wright, S.P., Horn, S.P. & Sanders, W.L. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement, implications for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 11, 57-67

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).