

Evaluation of Lecturer Performance Depending on Student Perception in Higher Education

Öđrenci Algısına Dayalı Olarak Öđretim Elemanlarının Performanslarının Deđerlendirilmesi

Hüseyin GÜL*

Kocaeli Üniversitesi

Abstract

This study aimed to find out students' perceptions on the performance level of the lecturers in-class activities and whether the performance level of lecturers had changed in terms of faculties, institutes and colleges. Data were collected from a sample of 3089 students by means of the questionnaire developed by the author. Alpha reliability of the scale was found to be .92. As a result of analyzes, the students who attended teacher training classes perceived the performance of the lecturers higher than the students who did not attended teacher training classes. When the findings were analyzed we found out that students taking pedagogical classes perceive the performances of the lecturers $p<.05$ higher than the students of other departments at meaningfulness level.

Keywords: Performance of lecturers, evaluation of education, supervision, supervision act.

Öz

Bu arařtırmada, öđretim elemanlarının sınıf ii etkinliklerini hangi düzeyde yerine getirdiklerinin, öđrenci algılarına dayalı olarak arařtırılması amaçlanmıřtır. Arařtırmada, öđretim elemanlarının gösterdikleri performansın fakülte, yüksekokul ve enstitüler arasında farklılık gösterip göstermediđi test edilmiřtir. Veriler, arařtırmacı tarafından geliřtirilen öleđin 3089 öđrenciye uygulanması ile elde edilmiřtir. Öleđin α güvenilirlik katsayısı .92 olarak bulunmuřtur. Bulgular incelendiđinde, pedagojik formasyon derslerinin verildiđi birimlerdeki öđrenciler, öđretim elemanlarının performanslarını diđer birimlere göre $p<.05$ anlamlılık düzeyinde daha yüksek olarak algıladıkları görülmüřtür.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Öđretim elemanlarının performansı, eđitimi deđerlendirme, okul denetimi, denetim etkinliđi.

Introduction

Performance evaluation is a process of management. It has become compulsory in human relations information system in the management of organizations (Karciođlu & Öztürk, 2009). Performance evaluation is an important issue in theory and in practice. Thus, it is a research subject of organizational psychology (Herdlein & Hasso, 2008; Kline & Slsky, 2009). Besides, performance evaluation is supposed to be subjective as it is measured indirectly (Bingöl, 2006). Performance evaluation is on the effectiveness of what personnel carry out and the understanding of their performance levels. It can be understood by performance evaluation to what extend an employee carries out the work. At the end of the evaluation, it can be understood not only the evaluation of performance but also the failure (Aydın, 2005; Aydın, 2007). For this reason,

* Yrd. Do. Dr. Hüseyin GÜL, Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Teknik Eđitim Fakültesi, Eđitim Bölümü öđretim üyesi. hgul@kocaeli.edu.tr

performance evaluation is a function of human relations management. Various Performance Evaluation procedures different in types can be carried out to what extent which the goals of organizations are achieved.

As for supervision, it is used as the activities of controlling, searching, inspecting, and checking in order to find what the truth is (Counts, Shepard & Farmer, 1998; Taymaz, 2005). When the school is supervised, it is necessary to use the reports and different sources. Aydın (2007), states that supervision should be carried out for the development of education process. Then, when the insufficient examples of the application of education plans are determined, at the same time, the management of personnel and public benefit are taken into account (Bursalıoğlu, 2000; Taymaz, 2005). Proving that the activities carried out and to be carried out at schools are in accordance with the scientific criteria, preparing proposals aiming development and improvement and the advisory activities can be regarded as supervisory activities (Chris, 2008; MEB, 2005; Ouston, Fidler & Earley, 1997).

Certain principles should be followed so that the supervision can be successful. According to Başar (2000) those principles should have an aim, a plan, continuity, objectivity, context, and openness and democracy. Lecture supervision is considered to be a kind of supervision in which methods applied by the teachers, their efficiency in applying them, and levels of the students are studied (Aydın, 2007; Ehren & Visscher, 2008; Taymaz, 2005). The situations that emerge through supervision can also be carried out through classroom observations. Classroom observations should be done by means of certain supervisory models. Scientific, artistic, pedagogical, clinic and various models can be mainly used (Aydın 2005; Aydın, 2007; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988). Classrooms, laboratories, workshops are regarded as places for classroom activities. All activities held here are considered within the scope of supervision.

Evaluation questionnaires delivered to students at the end of school terms and used for evaluation of lecturers at universities are one of those supervision tools and methods. Students' evaluation is benefited at various levels by means of feedback given to related people and institutions. Armstrong (2004), concluded that when supervisors take these evaluations into considerations during training and education, this leads to great deal of development in the cognitive and analytic thinking capacity of students. Although teacher and school performance is evaluated by means of national exams students take, Larry holds that it may be more appropriate if this evaluation is made according to graduation average and teacher performance (Larry, 1993). Sources of the supervision system are supervisor, principal of the institution, lecturers himself/herself, his/her colleagues, parents and students (MEB., 2005; Özmen & Üzmez, 2007).

British government set up a new school supervision system called Office Standards in Education (OFSTED) in 1992. After the implementation of this system, certain thoughts were suggested both in favor and against this system. For example, while Lee (1997), concluded that supervision contributed to education process in primary and secondary schools, Male (1999), found out that this system led to an increase in the stress and work load of the staff. However, there is a consensus that there should be a supervision system. The governments cannot give up supervision as they expect that education should reach its aim and form certain values (Richards, 2001). It is essential that both internal and external supervision should be carried out separately and appropriately (Blok, Slegers & Karsen, 2008).

Supervision for classroom activities in Turkish universities is carried out based on two regulations as "Regulations for Organization, Supervision Committee, Duty and Working in Higher Education" and "Regulations for Establishment of Academic Committees and Scientific Inspection in Higher Education Institutions" (Resmi Gazete, 1982 issue: 17771; Resmi Gazete, 1986 issue: 19082). The data gathered as a result of those evaluations provide feedback for both the lecturers and management. Therefore, what the students think of courses and lecturers help lecturers to understand the level of their performance and to improve themselves. Moreover, it provides an opportunity for the management to supervise the lecturers (Cashin, 1995; Felder, 1992).

The Purpose of Research

Higher education institutions are willing to learn more about the performances of lecturers. What is important in evaluation of lecturers are students' perceptions. It is essential for higher education institutions to know students' opinions about the lecturers. Besides, this provides an opportunity to define students' needs and their planning. For instance, this process improves duty and responsibility feelings of students and prevents the probable problems in the communication between students and lecturers. It also helps the management to be ready for the unknown and unpredictable external factors in order to take necessary precautions in advance. It also gives clues to the lecturers in terms of their development potential. Generally, in Turkey, performances of the lecturers are determined only by their seniors or managers as a result of evaluation and supervisions. This brings about a deficiency. We hold that student perceptions should also be evaluated to compensate for this deficiency. For these reasons, the fact that lecturers' in-class performance is evaluated by students' perceptions is considered important and necessary. This study aimed to find out students' perceptions on the performance levels of the lecturers in-class activities and whether the performance level of lecturers had changed in terms of faculties, institutes and colleges.

Method

This research is a descriptive survey. Students' perceptions about the lecturers' performances were analyzed as dependent variant, while faculty and other institutions of higher education which lead to variation in perceptions were analyzed as independent variant.

Population and Sampling

The population of the study consisted of 9 Faculties, 5 colleges, 19 vocational colleges, and 2 institutions with 55366 students studying during 2008-09 academic year. The scale was filled in 3125 students voluntarily. 36 of them were omitted as they were not filled in according to the criteria. The data were collected from a sample of 3089 students 903 female and 2186 male randomly. This sampling method is the most common one in quantitative studies. (Balci, 2001; Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2008). The scale was projected in such a style that it could be sent to experts through the ASP programming language, and also to students via the web of Kocaeli University. Its style also made it possible for the researchers to download it to their computers through their personal code and in Excel format. After the questions were harmonized, the questionnaire was applied.

Instrument

The instrument called "Questionnaire for Evaluation of Lecturers" (QEL) and developed after thorough review of the literature and factor analysis by the researcher was delivered to the students in the sample. This was realized in all faculties and departments.

First, a list of 20 items was generated related to performance evaluation of lecturers and after consultation with experts in the Faculty of Technical Training in Kocaeli University on measurement and educational administration. The list was reviewed and items that were agreed to be highly similar were eliminated. Thus, the items were further reduced to 15 items that had high face validity. I first tested the instrument on a pilot group consisting of 108 students from five different faculties in order to make the items understandable to the participants in the research. After that, an instrument consisting of 15 Likert-type items was developed.

Students answered each item in the questionnaire on a 5-point scale: 1 very poor, 2 poor, 3 medium, 4 good, and 5 very good.

Table 1.

Factor analysis of the questionnaire (Rotated Principal Component) results

Question Items	Factor Common Variance	Factor Loading After Rotation	
		Factor 1	Factor2
1. Functioning Factor			
Lecturers in general:			
They are punctual and come to class with lesson plans.	.528	.571	.450
They teach courses according to course plans with various teaching materials.	.575	.700	.291
They offer a simple, clear, concise language during lessons.	.686	.683	.469
They keep the interest alive during lessons.	.699	.770	.325
They dominate the class given.	.651	.667	.453
They are compassionate and tolerant to students.	.628	.591	.529
They offer a sufficient number and quality of course related to resources.	.624	.721	.322
They give homework which contributes to doing independent research.	.617	.778	.106
They encourage student participation in lessons.	.694	.786	.275
2. Evaluation Factor			
They allow adequate opportunities and time to be able to take notes.	.526	.423	.589
They encourage students to ask questions during class.	.617	.642	.445
They are reachable by students for requests and consultations during extracurricular time.	.594	.439	.634
They ask questions in exams covering the topics discussed during courses.	.728	.267	.810
They give enough time in exams.	.715	.138	.834
They evaluate exams objectively.	.676	.369	.734

Explained Variance: %63,721; Factor-1:%56,224; Factor-2: %7,497

The scores of the questionnaire were also submitted for reliability estimates. The alpha coefficient of the questionnaire consisting of 15 questions was .92. Spearman and Brown coefficient was found .89 for first section of split-half test reliability, and .82 for the second section. As it is seen in Table 1, the questionnaire was factor analyzed using the principal component method and varimax rotation. After rotation the factors accounted for 63,721 of the variance with two factors, suggesting correlations were substantial enough to justify factor analysis (Büyüköztürk, 2008). Finally the questionnaire was decided to be analyzed with single factor as it has common items.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed in terms of Means, Analysis of Variance and LSD tests. The level of significance for all tests was 0.05. In scoring the level of perceptions by the students, 'very poor' was indicated by the average score of 15.00 to 26.90, 'poor' by 27.00-38.90, 'medium' by 39.00-50.90, 'good' by 51.00 to 62.90 and finally 'very good' by 63.00-75.00. Means of faculties, vocational colleges and institutes were calculated and differences among them were examined by means of F test. When the independent variants are more than two, F test needs to be used (Gren & Salkind & Akey, 2000). When there was no significant difference as a result of F test, LSD test was applied according to reliability coefficient of .95.

Results

We found out that the students who are in communication, engineering, technical education, medical, science and letters, art related colleges consider their professional and academic performance level as medium (\bar{x} =44.42 - 48.99). The students who are in education faculty and social sciences and science institute regarded their performance level as good (\bar{x} =51.55 - 57.75). On average, all students considered academic and professional performances of their lecturers at medium level (\bar{x} =46.40).

Table 2.

The results of variance analysis related to scores of students on performances level of lecturers according to faculty, institute and colleges

Source of Variance	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	12	13611,54	1134,29	7,19	.00**
Within Groups	3076	484807,05	157,61		
Total	3088	498418,59			

*p<.05; **p<.01

Scores for the performance level of lecturers among students according to faculties, institutes and colleges were analyzed through one way of analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by LSD analyses. As in Table 2 and 3, ANOVA and LSD tests showed that there was a significant difference in scores for the performance level of lecturers by students according to school types of the students.

Table 3.
LSD Test Results Related to Scores of Students on Performances Level of Lectures According to Faculty, Institute and Colleges

Faculty, College and Institutes	N	\bar{X}	SD
1. Faculty of Communication	132	44,42	10,75
2. Engineering Faculty	754	44,91	11,26
3. Colleges	197	45,25	14,22
4. Faculty of Technical Education	193	45,34	11,49
5. Faculty of Economics	372	45,35	11,85
6. Medicine Faculty	18	45,65	11,07
7. Science and Letter Faculty	196	45,80	11,04
8. Faculty of Law	29	46,96	10,27
9. Vocational Higher Schools	1009	47,53	14,08
10. Faculty of Arts	35	48,99	12,06
11. Faculty of Education	96	51,55	11,42
12. Institute of Social Sciences	21	55,24	16,35
13. Institute of Sciences	37	57,75	12,31

*p<.05; **p<.01

Students' Scores According To School Types

1. There was a significant difference between the scores of students on the performance of lecturers who were in vocational higher schools and those who were in communication and engineering faculties, colleges, technical education faculty, and faculty of economics at $p < .05$ level. This meaningful difference was originated from the higher scores of the students in vocational colleges on the performance of lecturers.

2. There was a significant difference between the scores of students on the performance of lecturers who were in faculty of arts and those who were in communication and engineering faculties, colleges, faculty of technical education, faculty of economics, faculty of science and literature, and vocational colleges at $p < .05$. This significant difference was originated from the higher scores of the students in the art faculty on the performance of lecturers.

3. There was a significant difference between the scores of students on the performance of lecturers who were in education faculty and those who were in faculties of communication, engineering, colleges, faculties of technical education, law, medicine, economics, science and literature, and vocational colleges at $p < .05$ level. This significant difference was originated from the scores of students on the performance of lecturers in faculty of education.

4. There was a significant difference between the scores of students on the performance of lecturers who were in Institute of Social Sciences and students of faculty of education and those who were in faculties of communication, engineering, colleges, faculties of technical education, law, economics, science and literature, and vocational colleges. This significant difference was originated from the higher scores of the students in Institute of Social Sciences on the performance of lecturers.

5. There was a significant difference level between the scores of students on the performance of lecturers who were in Institute of Science and students of education faculty and those who were in faculties of communication, engineering, colleges, faculties of technical education, law, arts, economics, science and letters, and vocational colleges at $p < .05$ level. This significant difference was originated from the higher scores of the students in Institute of Sciences on the performance of lecturers.

6. The students studying in the institutions mentioned in the first ten lines such as (communication faculty, faculty of engineering, faculty of technical education, faculty of economics, faculty of medicine, faculty of science and literature, faculty of law, vocational high schools, and faculty of arts) scored the level of lecturers' performance as 'medium'. However, the students studying in the institutions seen in the last three lines such as faculty of education, social science and science institutes scored their lecturers' performance as 'good'.

Discussion

I assessed students' perception on the performance level of lecturers a questionnaire with a single factor and 15 items. Results showed that students scored higher on the performance level of lecturers working in vocational colleges, faculty of arts, institute of social science, and institute of sciences than others. If an education institution is to be effective, sufficient and productive, the performance of the management of that institution should be adequate. Productivity in education means that there is to be a good team activity and the goals of school to be achieved and its synergy is to be very high (Cemaloğlu, 2002). Thus, it can be argued that the schools mentioned above are well governed, that team work and their synergy are at high level.

According to lecturers, the sufficiency of the performance is the feeling of adequacy that lecturer perceives on carrying out education-learning activities for which he or she is responsible (Altundepe, 1999). Lecturers are thought to have high degree subject-field knowledge as they have attended undergraduate, postgraduate and doctorate education. The scores on the performance level of lecturers may be affected by students' personality and characteristics. When

teaching-learning setting is assessed as a setting where face to face communication is at high level (Pehlivan, 2005) it is clear that the performance of lecturers are likely to be affected by their communication abilities. Therefore, it can be said that the communication skills of the lecturers working in colleges, art and education faculties, social science, institutions and science faculty are at a good level.

Ayar and Arslan (2008) states that a lecturer should have a well-done time schedule, use various kinds of course materials and actual strategies to provide the disciplines. Also, they clarify that teachers should take the problems in classroom into consideration, guide the learning activity, support the students' attendance to courses, communicate with students whenever required and help students to express themselves well. From this point of view, it can be said that the lecturers working in colleges, faculty of arts, faculty, institute of social science and science and letter faculty are likely to carry out the classroom strategies, explained above, more efficiently than others.

The reason why the performance level of the lecturers was scored low by the students in some schools can be low job satisfaction levels of lecturers. The fact that lecturers like their job and work willingly can affect their job satisfaction levels and their performance in a positive way (Gümüşeli, 2002). In a study on job satisfaction, it was found that there is significant difference between the lecturers who took the cognitive guidance and those who did not in terms of job satisfaction levels related to their work (Edwards & Newton, 1995). Lecturers accepting and taking their duties serious can be another factor (Romi & Leyser, 2006). In some situations, lecturers can be prejudiced against students (Podell & Sodak, 1993). That the instructors work in different universities, change faculty or university frequently may decrease the instructors' motivation, and even it may prevent him or her from working (Ware & Kitsantas, 2007). Thus, those cases may cause the students to criticize their lecturers.

Lack of lecturers both in quantity and quality in schools and faculties may affect the satisfaction of students with the courses and lecturers negatively. That the students just want to take high grade in exams cannot be satisfactory for them. Students need to learn ways to motivate themselves and develop learning strategies to achieve success in the class (Bembenutty, 2009). Being promoted in academic career motivates lecturers, which reflects to the effectiveness of course teaching activities and classroom management. Nevertheless, as delaying of being promoted in academic career affects lecturers negatively, this, in turn, can reflect to the classroom management and activities in a negative way (Bembunutty, 2009; Mischel, Cantor & Feldman, 1996).

Instructors may have a style in teaching as "transferring class content intensively or evaluating the content extensively, or teaching the content with projects and scientific research extensively. What is expected from the lecturers is to carry out those teaching styles in a balanced way (Akhtar, Riaz & Topping, 2009). According to Shaunessy and Mchatton (2009), students' interest with school and courses are related to their feelings with school climate. This kind of feelings may have been taken into consideration by students during their evaluation of the lecturers. When students learn to express their thoughts about their lecturers and prove them using mathematical models, this contributes the development of their self-conscious (Arslan & Yıldız, 2010; Yalçın & Erkal-İlhan, 2008).

When findings are analyzed generally, it was found that there is no significant difference between the science and social sciences, among the faculties, institutes and colleges related to social science. However, scores of students in education faculty, social science institutes were higher level in terms of performance of lecturers. The fact that the students in M.A, M.S. and PhD are fewer in numbers and they are older and mature than the undergraduate students may have brought a higher level of tolerance of the lecturers for them. Besides, in order to be able to attend M.A, M.S. and PhD, students should be successful in undergraduate education, fluent in a foreign language and be supposed to pass an entrance exam, and communicate with their lecturers effectively so they are more successful in communication with their lecturers.

In faculty of education, institute of social sciences and institutes of science that the teacher training courses are taught, scores of students on the performance level of lecturers are affected positively. In faculty of technical education teacher training courses are also taught. However, the students in this faculty cannot be appointed as a teacher very easily. Because of the recent bottle neck in Turkish economy and the increasing rate of unemployment, the students graduated from teacher training faculties have been either not appointed or only some of them have been appointed to the schools as a teacher due to the decrease in supply by the Ministry of Education (Gunbayi, 2007). This situation may have caused the differences in perception of these students when scoring their lecturers' performance.

In higher education institutes, the expectations of the students cannot be the same as the expectations of their lecturers. In a study carried out in Oregon University (1979), it was found out that when instructors supported a desired learning setting parallel with students' expectations and needs, the success of the students were seen to increase accordingly. Lin and Gorell (1997) clarify that the more lecturers form a desired setting and they use effective teaching and learning styles, the more they increase their effectiveness.

Conclusion

In higher education institutions, students' opinions, ideas and suggestions can be beneficial as a supervisory agent, in assessing the performance of lecturers. That the lecturers follow the innovations and their knowledge in the teacher training field, when taken together with their being an expert in the field, can be seen as a factor in increasing their performances. As Galluzo (2005) states, lecturers are responsible for their students and students' learning. Lecturers should know how to teach in courses and observe how their students learn. They should also care practices and experiences systematically in the field. As a part of supervision they should be objective and take the differences among students in teaching and learning setting into consideration. They should also regard themselves as a member of teaching and learning group activities. Consequently thoughts and perceptions of students should be used as a data source in supervising the performances of the lecturers.

References

- Akhtar, A., Riaz, H. & Topping, J. (2009). Students' perspective of university teaching behaviours. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14 (6), 631-647.
- Altundeppe, Ö. (1999). Ortaöğretim Kurumlarında Öğretmen Performansının Değerlendirilmesi. *DEÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 1.
- Armstrong, S. J. (2004). The impact of supervisors' cognitive styles on the quality of research supervision in management education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74 (4), 599-616.
- Arslan, S., Yıldız, C. (2010). 11. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Matematiksel Düşünmenin Aşamalarındaki Yaşantılarından Yansımalar [Reflections from the experiences of 11th graders during the stages of mathematical thinking]. *Eğitim ve Bilim/Education and Science*, 35,(156), 17-31.
- Ayar, A. R. & Arslan, R. (2008). İlköğretim Okullarında Görev Yapan Sınıf Öğretmenlerinin "Sınıf Yönetimi Performansının" Araştırılması. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 16 (2), 335-344.
- Aydın, İ. (2005). *Öğretimde Denetim, Durum Saptama, Değerlendirme ve Geliştirme*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Aydın, M. (2007). *Çağdaş Eğitim Denetimi*. Ankara: Hatiboğlu Yayınevi.
- Balcı, Ali. (2001). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntem, Teknik ve İlkeler*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Başar, H. (2000). *Eğitim Denetçisi*. PegemA.

- Bembenutty, H. (2009). Teaching effectiveness, course evaluation, and academic performance: The role of academic delay of gratification. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 20 (2), 326-355.
- Bingöl, D. (2006). *İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi*. İstanbul: Arıkan Yayınları.
- Blook, H., Slegers, P. & Karsten, S. (2008). Looking for a balance between internal and external evaluation of school quality: Evaluation of the SVI model. *Journal of Education Policy*, 23 (4), 379-395.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (2000). *Okul Yönetiminde Yeni Yapı ve Davranış*. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2008). *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı. İstatistik, Araştırma Deseni SPSS Uygulamaları ve Yorum*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2008). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Cashin, W. E. (1995). Students ratings of teaching: The research revisited. *Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development*, Kansas State University, No:32.
- Cemaloğlu, N. (2002). Öğretmen performansının artırılmasında okul yöneticisinin rolü. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, Sayı: 153-154.
- Chris, M. (2008). Thirty-five years of school inspection: raising educational standards for children with additional needs? *British Journal of Special Education*, 35 (2), 69-77.
- Counts, G. E., Shepard, I. Sue & Farmer, R. F. (1998). Evaluation, and supervision of teachers in Missouri schools. *Southeast Missouri State University, Reports-Research*. 52p.
- Edwards, J. L. & Newton, R. R. (1995, April). *The effects of cognitive coaching on teacher efficacy and empowerment*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22). 150, 39p.
- Ehren, M. C. M. & Visscher, A. J. (2008). The relationships between school inspections, school characteristics and school improvement. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 56 (2), 205-227.
- Ehren, MCM., Leeuw, F.L. & Scheerens, J. (2005). On the impact of the Dutch educational supervision act-analyzing assumptions concerning the inspection of primary education, *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26 (1), 60-76.
- Felder, R. (1992). What do they know, anyway? *Chemical Engineer Education*, 26 (3), 134-135.
- Galluzzo, G. R. (2005). Performance assessment and renewing teacher education. *The possibilities of the NBPTS standards. Renewing Teacher Education*, 78 (4), 142-145.
- Green, B.S., Salkind N.J. & Akey T.M. (2000). *Using Spss For Windows Analyzing and Understanding Data*. London: Prentice-Hall International (UK) Limited.
- Gümüşeli, A. İ. (2002). *2001 Yılında İlköğretim Okulu Müdürleri*. İstanbul: YTÜ Vakfı Yayınları 2002.003.
- Gunbayı I. (2007). School Climate and Teachers' Perceptions on Climate Factors: Research into Nine Urban High Schools, *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology – TOJET*, 6, 3, 70-78.
- Herdlein, R., Hasso, K. & Türk, K. (2008). A survey of academic officers regarding performance appraisal in Estonian and American universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, 30 (4), 387-399.
- Karcioğlu, F. & Öztürk, Ü. (2009). İşletmelerde Performans Değerlendirme ile İnsan Kaynakları Bilgi Sistemleri (İKBS) Arasındaki İlişki – İstanbul İlinde Bir Araştırma. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13 (1), 343-366.
- Kline, T. J. B. & Sulsky, L. M. (2009). Measurement and assessment issues in performance appraisal. *Canadian Psychological Association*, 50 (3), 161-171.

- Larry, D. G. (1993, Jan). *Predicting teaching performance: A multivariate investigation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association.
- Lee, J. (1997). HMI and OFSTED: Evaluation or reevaluation in school inspection. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 45 (1), 39-52.
- Lin, H. L. & Gorell, j. (1997, Nov.). *Preservice teachers' efficacy beliefs in taiwan*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Memphis, TN, November), (150), 24p.
- Male, D. B. (1999). Special school inspection and its effects on teachers' stress and health, workload and job-related feelings: a case study. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 14 (3), 254-268.
- MEB. (Ministry of Education) (2005). *İlköğretimde Denetim ve Performans Değerlendirme Esasları*. Ankara: T. C. MEB Teftiş Kurulu Başkanlığı.
- Mischel, W., Cantor, N. & Feldman, S. (1996). Principles of adolescent self-regulation: The nature of wilpower and self-control. *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles*, Newyork: Guilford Press.
- Oregon Univ. (1979). *Teacher evaluation*. Research Action. Brief Number 4.
- Ouston, J., Fidler, B. & Earley, P. (1997). What do schools do after OFSTED school inspections-or before? *School Leadership & Management*, 17 (1), 95-104.
- Özmen, F. & Üzmez, İ. T. (2007). Örgütsel Etkililik Açısından Performans Değerlendirme – İş ve Eğitim Örgütlerinde Performans Değerlendirme Süreci. *E – Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 2 (1), pp. 30.
- Pehlivan, K. B. (2005). Öğretmen Adaylarının İletişim Becerisi Algıları Üzerine Bir Çalışma. *İlköğretim – Online*, 4 (2), 17-23.
- Podell, D. M. & Soodak, L. C. (1993). Teacher efficacy and bias in special education referrals. *Journal of Educational Research*, 86 (4), 247-253.
- Resmi Gazete (Official Gazette), (03.08.1982). *Yükseköğretim Denetleme Kurulu Teşkilat, Görev ve Çalışma Usulleri Yönetmeliği*, Sayı: 17771.
- Resmi Gazete (Official Gazette), (18.04.1986). *Yükseköğretim Kurumlarında Akademik Kurulların Oluşturulması ve Bilimsel Denetim Yönetmeliği*, Sayı: 19082.
- Richards, C. (2001). School inspection: A Re-appraisal. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 35 (4), 655-665.
- Romi, S., Leyser & Y. (2006). Exploring inclusion preservice training needs: A study of variables associated with attitudes and self – efficacy beliefs. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 21 (1), 81-105.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. & Starratt, R.J. (1988). *Supervision: Human Perspectives*. Mc Graw-Hill College.
- Shaunessy, E. & McHatton, P. A. (2009). Urban students' perceptions of teachers: Views of students in general, special, and honors education. *Urban Review: Issues and Ideas in Public Education*, 41 (5), 18 pp.
- Taymaz A. H. (2005). *Eğitim Sisteminde Teftiş, Kavramlar, İlkeler, Yöntemler*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Ware, H. & Kitsantas, A. (2007). Teacher and collective efficacy beliefs as predictors of professional commitment. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 100 (5), 303-310.
- Yalçın, S. & Erkal-İlhan, S. (2008). Levels of self awareness and self evaluation in nursing and midwifery students and its relationship with academic success [Hemşirelik ve ebelik bölümü öğrencilerin benlik bilinci ve kendini değerlendirme düzeylerinin akademik başarı ile ilişkisi]. *Eğitim ve Bilim/Education and Science*, 33, (149), 51-61.