

Evaluating Teachers' Views on the Impact of Appraisal and Feedback on Professional Development

Sabit Mentese

*Public Management Department, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences,
Tunceli University, Turkey
E-mail: smentese@tunceli.edu.tr*

KEYWORDS Supervision. Evaluation. Feedback. Professional Development. Management

ABSTRACT The purpose of the present research paper is to determine the impact of feedback about appraisal on elementary teachers' professional development. The research was designed as a cross-sectional survey. The population comprised 165 elementary teachers working in primary schools in the central district of Tunceli during 2012–2013 school years. Population was not sampled, but accessed as much as possible. The data was collected using the *Teaching and Learning International Survey* (TALIS). The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was 0.94. Validity studies were done based on expert opinion. The data was analysed using descriptive statistics, *t* and ANOVA tests. The results suggested that teachers are supervised and evaluated by the inspectors mostly outside the school; the feedback they receive are mostly about classroom practices. In terms of professional development this feedback contributed mostly to classroom management practices.

I. INTRODUCTION

The teachers, as the primary implementors of educational activities, should sustainably improve themselves using various sources to succeed in response to fast-changing technologies, increasing socio-economic problems, and contemporary innovations (Taymaz 1984). The teachers in modern societies are supposed to be professionals who can resolve problems, use latest technology, build rapport with students and their parents, utilize what is available in the class or school to create an active learning environment, and most importantly embrace lifelong learning as a principle, and take active role in contributing to overall development of the society (Oktay 1998).

To gain the desired qualifications, a teacher needs professional support from the institution one works for in addition to one's personal endeavours. In this respect, one kind of support from the institution is the feedback provided for the teachers based on the evaluations during the supervision process. It is widely acknowledged that in all the organizations feedback has important contribution to teachers' professional development (London 2003; Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD] 2009).

In the present research, it was aimed to assess the works of elementary teachers and to determine the effect of the feedback they received during appraisals on their professional development.

1.1 Appraisal and Feedback

It can be observed that appraisal and feedback have strong and positive effects on teachers and their work, as well as increasing their job satisfaction, improving work security to some extent, positively affecting professional development. As long as the appraisal focuses to the behaviour and informative feedback is received about the behaviour, it improves the teacher (OECD 2009).

Feedback is a constructive way of communication informing the workers about their performances, enabling them to observe their strengths and characteristics that need to be improved more. Providing feedback at the end of the appraisal is critical in completing the appraisal process.

Turkish Language Institution [TLI] defines feedback as "the information received from the addressee about the effect of the information or instruction sent before (TDK 2005). Feedback can also be defined as using a portion of a system output as an input to inspect the functioning of the system.

Ashford (1968: 466) uses feedback in two meanings. For the first one, feedback means a person's informing the other about his/her acts. In its general daily use, feedback refers to this kind of information. However, the second meaning of feedback within the context of system theory is different. In system theory, feedback means the two-way interaction between cause

and effect. That is, the act of having feedback is defined as an individual's conscious effort to develop correct and proper behaviours to achieve value-generating results (Ashford 1968: 465).

As long as it is provided in a meaningful, useful and desired manner, feedback generates considerably effective results in resolving the professional problems, enhancing motivation and encouraging learning (London 2003: 3). Especially in information-based organizations, there is a gradually increasing need for a feedback loop to provide constant information flow about whether information workers are performing well or doing their job successfully (Liden and Mitchell 1985: 229).

The relevant literature sorts out two types of feedback. Some conceptualize them as positive vs. negative feedback, while some others distinguish constructive feedback from destructive feedback (Kaymaz 2007: 147). Positive feedback is provided for the behaviours that the employee performs relatively well, mostly suggesting personal motivation and rewarding (appreciation), and aiming at encouraging the person to improve more thanks to this motivation and rewarding. For the workers, it is very difficult to use negative feedback for improvement and transform this information to his/her benefit, since negative feedback has, above all, psychological and sociological reflections, e.g. moral and motivation lose disappointment, stress, and damaged image. Under these psychological and social pressures, it is quite difficult to perceive the negative judgments for one's benefit and make use of them for personal improvement without personalizing (London and Smither 2002: 86).

In the present research, feedback is used to mean providing (formally or informally) the teachers with the results of the assessments on their performances to inform them about the fields that they generally perform well or fields that they need to improve more. Feedback can be provided formally (For example in a written report) or informally (For example through personal communications).

According to the latest arrangements, with the Decree with Power of Law on Organization and Functions of Ministry of National Education dated 14.09.2011 and numbered 652, the organizational structure of the Ministry was rearranged, the President of Supervisory Board was annulled and Presidency of Guidance and Supervision was founded. This change means an

evolution from classical inspection to modern guidance in teacher appraisal process.

Successful professional development opportunities offered for teachers also have considerable amount of positive effect on students' performance and learning gains. In this respect, teachers' professional development must be considered as a key factor to enhance the student achievement (Villegas-Reimers 2003: 29).

The concept of professional development for teachers requires comprehensive learning activities involving in-service training, on-going professional development and teachers' self-learning. Although professional development involves in-service training activities for the "professional" development of teachers, it actually focuses on supporting the teachers in personal, professional and social perspectives. "Professional development is defined as activities that develop individual's skills, knowledge, expertise, and other characteristics as a teacher" (OECD 2009: 49).

The categories of professional development for teachers were specified by OECD within TALIS research as appraisal, classroom management, content knowledge, instructional practices, ICT skills, special education, student discipline, school management, and teaching and student guidance in multicultural settings (OECD 2013).

In Turkish National Education system General Competencies for Teaching Profession have been defined under 6 broad and 31 sub-categories of competences with 233 performance indicators (MEB 2006: 11). They are,

1.1.1 Competence Categories

A- Personal and Professional Values-professional Development

- A1 - Caring, understanding and respecting learners
- A2 - Believing that every learner can learn and achieve
- A3 - Caring national and international values
- A4 - Doing self-assessment
- A5 - Ensuring personal development
- A6 - Pursuing and contributing to professional developments
- A7 - Contributing to school improvement and renewal

- A8 - Pursuing professional acts, assignments and responsibilities

B- Knowing about the Learners

- B1 - Knowing about learners' developmental characteristics
- B2 - Considering their interest and needs
- B3 - Caring about the learners
- B4 - Guiding the learners

C- Learning and Teaching Process

- C1 - Lesson planning
- C2 - Material development
- C3 - Arranging learning settings
- C4 - Extracurricular activities
- C5 - Diversifying instruction considering the individual differences
- C6 - Time management
- C7 - Behaviour management

D- Monitoring and Assessing Student Learning and Improvement

- D1 - Deciding about the measurement and evaluation methods and techniques
- D2 - Measuring students' learning using various measurement techniques
- D3 - Analysing and interpreting the data, and providing feedback
- D4 - Revising the learning-teaching process according to the assessment results

E- School-family and Society Relationships

- E1 - Knowing about the school environment
- E2 - Make use of environmental resources
- E3 - Making the schools a cultural centre
- E4 - Knowing about the family and impartiality in relations with families
- E5 - Ensuring parental involvement and cooperation

F- Curriculum and Content Knowledge

- F1 - Objectives and principles of Turkish National education
- F2 - Subject field curriculum knowledge and implementation skills
- F3 - Following, evaluating and developing subject field curriculum.

1.2 Literature Review

There is hardly any study in Turkey about the effect of feedback on professional development of teachers (except for OECD's TALIS research). However, there are a few researches studying not direct but rather indirect effect of feedback on teachers' professional development. One such research was conducted by EriSen (1997), who studied teaching staff's ability to fulfil the feedback and correction behaviours. According to the results of the paper the teaching staff stated that they always or generally provide positive feedback and corrections for the students, while the students stated that only a small part of the teaching staff provide positive feedback and corrections. In another research, Oral (2000) analysed elementary school teachers' feedback and correction behaviours, which revealed that only a few of the teachers perform plenty of positive feedback and corrections and some of the teachers perform negative feedback and correction behaviours. Kogce et al. (2009) reported that teachers make general definitions for feedback mostly different from each other. In addition, it was noted that, while stating about the characteristics of ideal feedback practice, participating teachers emphasized evaluative characteristics focusing on the personalities of the students in addition to descriptive characteristics enhancing the students' performances. Other similar studies were overwhelmingly about the effect of feedback on students' learning (Yunt 1978; Senemoglu 1987; Peker 1992; Gozutok 1995). Still, there are many studies about the effect of feedback on performance (Kluger and DeNisi 1996; Kaymaz 2007). However, no matter why it is given, that is either for professional development, better performance, or for better student learning, positive and timely feedback have a positive effect on behaviours.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of the present research is to assess the performances of elementary school teachers and to determine the perceived effect of the feedback they receive about this appraisal on their professional development.

In this respect answers to the following questions were sought:

1. How often have the teachers been appraised by and/or provided feedback from

- the school principal, colleagues, members of school administration, or an individual or a group outside the school about their work at school?
2. During the appraisal or provision of feedback, what points were considered to what extent?
 3. How and to what extent did the appraisal and/or feedback about teachers' work at school make a change in terms of professional development?
 4. Do the perceptions of teachers about the statements in the three factors differ significantly in terms of gender, age, educational background, professional seniority, and time of service in the current school?

2. METHOD

2.1 Design

This paper was designed according to the survey model since it attempts to describe the current situation. Survey models are research approaches that aim at describing a current or past situation as own. The event, individual or object being researched is described as intact and in its own circumstances. There is no attempt is to change or affect them (Karasar 1984; Balci 2001; Islamoglu 2011).

2.2 Sampling

The population of the study comprised 225 teachers working in ten elementary schools in central district of Tunceli province during 2012–2013 school years (Tunceli Directorate of National Education [TDoNE] 2012). Since it was available to access the entire population, no sampling method was used. As a matter of fact, 181 of the 214 questionnaire forms accessed to research group returned. Among the returning questionnaire forms, 18 were discarded from the analysis due to incomplete or defective answers. Thus, only 163 (72.44 % of the population) cases were included in the analysis.

Table 1 presents demographics about the participants who worked in elementary schools in central district of Tunceli province during of the 2012–2013 school years.

As placed in Table 1, out of 163 participating elementary teachers, 88 (54.0 %) were men and 75 (46.0 %) were women. As for the age of the

Table 1: Demographics about the participating elementary teachers

Variable Groups		N	%	
<i>Gender</i>	Man	88	54.0	
	Woman	75	46.0	
	Total	163	100.0	
<i>Age</i>	Under 25 years	13	8.0	
	25–29 years	44	27.0	
	30–39 years	77	47.2	
	40–49 years	21	12.9	
	50–59 years	8	4.9	
	Total	163	100.0	
<i>Educational Background</i>	2-3 year degrees	7	4.3	
	Undergraduate (faculty)	151	92.6	
	Graduate	4	2.5	
	PhD	1	.6	
<i>Professional Seniority</i>	Total	163	100.0	
	First year	11	6.7	
	1–2 years	15	9.2	
	3–5 years	32	19.6	
	6–10 years	53	32.5	
	11–15 years	32	19.6	
	16–20 years	10	6.1	
	More than 20 years	10	6.1	
	Total	163	100.0	
	<i>Time of Service in the Current School</i>	First year	42	25.8
		1–2 years	39	23.9
		3–5 years	46	28.2
6–10 years		24	14.7	
11–15 years		8	4.9	
16–20 years		3	1.8	
More than 20 years		1	.6	
Total		163	100.0	

participating teachers, 13 (8.0 %) were under 25 years of age, 44 (27.2 %) were aged between 25–29, 77 (47.2 %) were aged between 30–39, 21 (12.9 %) were aged between 40–49, and only 8 (4.9 %) were aged between 50–59. According to this data, it can be said that young teachers are working in the central district of Tunceli province. According to the educational background, 7 (4.3 %) teachers graduated from 2-3 year degrees, 151 (92.6 %) had an undergraduate degree, while 4 (2.5 %) had graduate degree and only one (0.6 %) had a PhD. In terms of their professional seniority, 11 (6.7 %) of the participating teachers had professional experience participating less than one year, 15 (9.2 %) were experienced for 1-2 years, 32 (19.6 %) were experienced for 3-5 years, 53 (32.5 %) were experienced for 6-10 years, 32 (19.6 %) were experienced for 11-15 years, and finally 10 (6.1 %) had professional seniority over 20 years. As for the time of service as teachers in the school they are currently working, 42 (25.8 %) of the teachers were in their first years, 39 (23.9 %) had been

working for 1–2 years, 46 (28.2 %) had been working for 3–5 years, 24 (14.7 %) had been working for 6–10 years, 8 (4.9 %) had been working for 11–15 years, 3 (1.8 %) had been working for 16–20 years, and only 1 (0.6 %) had been working for more than 20 years. This indicates that most teachers in the central district of Tunceli were young and had moderate level of professional seniority. This finding concurs with TALIS results, suggested that while the rate of teachers under 40 years of age in the participating countries is 43 percent, this rate is 73 percent in Turkey (MEB 2010).

2.3 Data Collection

The data was collected using the Teacher Questionnaire Main Application Version (MS–12–01) in the Turkish National Report of the Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS/OECD) conducted by Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development. Since the questionnaire is available for everyone, no permission was sought.

In the first part of the questionnaire form there were five questions about personal information including educational background and professional seniority. Second part included three dimensions. Three items in the first dimension are about how often and by whom the teachers are appraised; 18 items in the second dimension were about the points emphasized in the feedback they receive as a result of appraisal; and 8 items in the third dimension were about the perceived impact of appraisal and feedback about their school-based performances on their professional development process. The Turkish adaptation of the scale was subjected to internal reliability analysis.

Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients for each dimension and entire scale are presented in Table 2.

As exhibited in Table 2, Alpha reliability coefficient was estimated .63 for the items in the first part. The Alpha reliability coefficient was .943 for the items in the 2nd part and .956 for the items in the 3rd part. The alpha coefficient for the entire scale was .940. Expert opinion was considered to suffice for the validity of the scale.

2.3 Data Analysis

The statistical analysis of the data were done using SPSS package program. Data obtained were analysed using descriptive statistics including frequency, percentage, mean scores and standard deviations, as well as using *t* test, in terms of gender variable and using one-way-ANOVA in terms of variables including age, educational background, professional seniority and time of service as teachers in the current school.

Participants' responses to the items in all three parts of the questionnaire were analysed using descriptive statistics including frequency, percentage, mean scores and standard deviations.

Mean scores for the items in the third part of the questionnaire were compared using *t* test, in terms of gender variable and using one-way-ANOVA in terms of variables including age, educational background, professional seniority and time of service as teachers in the current school. One-way ANOVA is used to determine whether there is a difference among three or more independent groups based on a certain variable (Buyukozturk 2006).

Table 2: Reliability analysis of the teacher questionnaire of the impact of appraisal and feedback on professional development

Reliability	1 st part	2 nd part	3 rd part	Entire scale
	How often have you been appraised and/or provided feedback as a teacher about your work in this school by the people below? (3 items)	During the appraisal or provision of feedback, to what extent, do you think, the following points were given importance? (18 items)	To what extent did the appraisals and/or feedback about your work at this school make a change in the following aspects of professional development? (8 items)	
Alpha reliability coefficient (α)	.637	.943	.956	.940

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Appraisal and receiving feedback is important both for teachers and their students. Besides, it is significant to learn about the frequency of appraisal and feedback teachers receive from different shareholders. Accordingly, the first research problem was “How often have the teachers been appraised by and/or provided feedback from the school principal, colleagues, members of school administration, or someone or a group outside the school about their work at school?” The results of the analysis are presented in Table 3.

According to the data in Table 3, 76 percent (n=124) of participating teachers stated that they were appraised by and/or provided feedback from the principal once or more in a year. Also 50.9 percent (n=75) of the teachers stated that they were appraised by and/or provided feedback from other colleagues or members of school administration once or more in a year. However, 38 percent (n=62) of the teachers stated that they had never been appraised by and/or provided feedback from colleagues or members of school administration. These findings concur with the results of TALIS (2009). According to the results of Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) conducted by OECD, teachers are appraised mostly by the school principals.

The second research question was “During the appraisal or provision of feedback, what points were considered to what extent?” There were 18 items in the questionnaire about question. Accordingly, the means scores for teacher views about “what points were considered to what extent during the appraisal or provision of feedback” are presented in Table 4. The distribution of the answer to each item in this part of the questionnaire is presented in Table 4.

As it is seen in Table 4, 33.7 percent (n=55) of the teachers stated that, during the appraisal or provision of feedback, especially their “classroom management” skills were given importance. In addition, teachers stated that they were appraised and feedbacked in consideration to their knowledge and understanding in their subject field (32.5 %; n=53), Other indicators concerning student performance (31.9 %; n=52), Feedback from the parents (31.3 %, n=51), their knowledge and understanding about the teaching practices (information transfer) in the main subject field (31.3 %, n= 51), their students’ test scores

Table 3: Frequency of appraisal and feedback teachers receive from different shareholders (N=163)

Item No.	Items	Never		Less than once in two years		Once years in two years		Once a year		Twice a year		Three or more times in a year		X	S	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
1	School principal	16	9.8	15	9.2	8	4.9	61	37.4	53	32.5	10	6.1	163	3.9202	1.36979
2	Other colleagues or members of school administration	62	38.0	18	11.0	8	4.9	36	22.1	31	19.0	8	4.9	163	2.8773	1.74898
3	Someone or a group outside the school (e.g. mayor, provincial director of national education, inspector)	33	20.2	26	16.0	42	25.8	45	27.6	14	8.6	3	1.8	163	2.9387	1.32727
Total		111	68.0	59	36.2	58	35.6	142	87.1	98	60.1	21	12.8			

Table 4: Teacher views about the points considered when they are appraised or provided feedback

Item No.	Item	I do not know whether considered or not		Never considered		Not considered so much		Moderately considered		Considered to a great extent		N	X	SS
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
1	Students' test scores	19	11.7	12	7.4	24	14.7	59	36.2	49	30.1	163	3.6564	1.29758
2	Retention and pass rates of students	14	8.6	13	8.0	20	12.3	67	41.1	49	30.1	163	3.7607	1.21124
3	Other indicators concerning student performance	6	3.7	4	2.5	21	12.9	80	49.1	52	31.9	163	4.0307	.93903
4	Feedback from students about my instruction	10	6.1	12	7.4	17	10.4	77	47.2	47	28.8	163	3.8528	1.10684
5	Feedback from the parents	15	9.2	21	12.9	21	12.9	55	33.7	51	31.3	163	3.6503	1.29354
6	The extent to which I work in harmony with the principal and my colleagues	17	10.4	8	4.9	19	11.7	74	45.4	45	27.6	163	3.7485	1.21383
7	Appraisal of my teaching excellence directly looking at my classroom teaching practices	19	11.7	10	6.1	19	11.7	69	42.3	46	28.2	163	3.6933	1.26847
8	Innovative teaching practices	13	8.0	10	6.1	26	16.0	69	42.3	45	27.6	163	3.7546	1.16052
9	Relations with the students	6	3.7	11	6.7	15	9.2	82	50.3	49	30.1	163	3.9632	.99932
10	My progress in terms of professional development	17	10.4	10	6.1	18	11.0	71	43.6	47	28.8	163	3.7423	1.23523
11	Classroom management	10	6.1	7	4.3	14	8.6	77	47.2	55	33.7	163	3.9816	1.07423
12	My knowledge and understanding in my subject field	10	6.1	5	3.1	14	8.6	81	49.7	53	32.5	163	3.9939	1.04525
13	My knowledge and understanding about the teaching practices (information transfer) in my main subject field	14	8.6	8	4.9	10	6.1	80	49.1	51	31.3	163	3.8957	1.15798

Table 4: Contd...

Item No	Item	I do not know whether considered or not		Never considered		Not considered so much		Moderately considered		Considered to a great extent		N	X	SS
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
14	Teaching students with special needs	21	12.9	13	8.0	24	14.7	77	47.2	28	17.2	163	3.4785	1.23896
15	Student discipline and behaviour problems	12	7.4	7	4.3	20	12.3	75	46.0	49	30.1	163	3.8712	1.11747
16	Teaching in "multicultural settings"	24	14.7	12	7.4	24	14.7	68	41.7	35	21.5	163	3.4785	1.31157
17	Extracurricular activities (e.g. school plays and performances. sportive activities)	15	9.2	15	9.2	27	16.6	68	41.7	38	23.3	163	3.6074	1.20409
18	Other: (please write below)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(30.1 %, n=49), class retention and pass rates of their students (30.1 %, n=49), their relations with the students (30.1 %, n=49), student discipline and behaviour problems (30.1 %, n=49), feedback from students about their instruction (28.8 %, n=47), their progress in terms of professional development (28.8 %, n=47), their teaching excellence directly looking at classroom teaching practices (28.2 %, n=46), Innovative teaching practices (27.6 %, n=45), the extent to which they work in harmony with the principal and their colleagues (27.6 %, n=45), their extracurricular activities with students (for example school plays and performances, sportive activities) (23.3 %, n=38), teaching in "multicultural settings" (21.5 %, n=35), and teaching students with special needs (21.5 %, n=28). These results concur with the results of TALIS research. For example, according to the TALIS results, participating teachers from 16 countries (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Korea, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, Poland, Portuguese, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey) considered teaching in multicultural settings as the least important aspect of teacher appraisal and feedback process (MEB 2010). Further, it was observed that "classroom management" is given importance the most during appraisals by the school principals. In the list, classroom management is followed by classroom teaching, harmony with the principal and colleagues, subject field knowledge and teaching understanding, and innovative teaching practices (OECD 2009).

The third research question was "How and to what extent did the appraisals and/or feedbacks about teachers' work at school make a change in terms of their professional development?" The distribution of the answer to each item in this part of the questionnaire is presented in Table 5.

According to the data in Table 5, some teachers stated that the appraisals and related feedback they received have made no change in the instruction they provide for the students with special needs, (25.2 %, n=41), in their knowledge and understanding of their main subject field (23.3 %, n=38), in the instruction they provide for the students in "multicultural settings" (22.7 %, n=37), in their professional development or training plan to improve their teaching (22.1 %, n=36), in their knowledge and understanding of instructional practices (information transfer) in their main subject field (20.2 %, n=33),

Table 5: Teacher views about the changes appraisals and feedback made in terms of professional development

Item No.	Items	Made no change		Made little change		Made moderate change		Made considerable change		n	X	SS
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%			
1	In your classroom management practices	33	20.2	27	16.6	79	48.5	24	14.7	163	2.5767	.97434
2	In your knowledge and understanding of main subject field	38	23.3	32	19.6	69	42.3	24	14.7	163	2.4847	1.00833
3	In your knowledge and understanding of instructional practices (information transfer) in my main subject field	33	20.2	35	21.5	70	42.9	25	15.3	163	2.5337	.98308
4	In your professional development or training plan to improve your teaching...	36	22.1	32	19.6	69	42.3	26	16.0	163	2.5215	1.00822
5	In the instruction you provide for the students with special needs	41	25.2	37	22.7	60	36.8	25	15.3	163	2.4233	1.02978
6	In the way you handle students' discipline and behaviour problems	29	17.8	29	17.8	75	46.0	30	18.4	163	2.6503	.97837
7	In the instruction you provide for the students in "multicultural settings"	37	22.7	29	17.8	75	46.0	22	13.5	163	2.5031	.98991
8	In the importance you give to improving students' test scores	32	19.6	22	13.5	75	46.0	34	20.9	163	2.6810	1.01656

in their classroom management practices (20.2 %, n=33), in their way of handling the students' discipline and behaviour problems (17.8 %, n=29), and in the importance they give to improving students' test scores (19.6 %, n=32). Some teachers stated that appraisals and related feedback made a considerable change in the importance they give to improving students' test scores (20.9 %, n=34), in the way they handle students' discipline and behaviour problems (18.4 %, n=30), in their professional development or training plan to improve their teaching (16 %, n=26), in their knowledge and understanding of instructional practices (information transfer) in their main subject field (15.3 %, n=25), and in the instruction they provide to the students with special needs (15.3 %, n=25).

The fourth research problem was "Do the perceptions of teachers about the statements in the three dimensions differ significantly in terms of gender, age, educational background, professional seniority, and time of service in the current school?" The results of the analysis are presented in Tables 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

As it is seen in Table 6, no significant difference was found between teachers' views about the items in first dimension $\{t(161)= 1.643,$

$p>.05\}$, second dimension $\{t(161)= 1.415, p> 0.05\}$, and third dimension $\{t(161)= 1.032, P> 0.05\}$ of the scale by gender variable at 0.05 significance level. Besides, teachers' views on the impact of appraisal or feedback on their professional development under three dimensions did not differ significantly by gender variable.

As it is seen in Table 7, no significant difference was found between teachers' views about the items in first dimension $\{F(4-158)= 0.622, p>.05\}$, second dimension $\{F(4-158)=0.526, p> 0.05\}$, and third dimension $\{F(4-158)=0.356, P> 0.05\}$ of the scale by age variable at 0.05 significance level. In addition, teachers' views on the impact of appraisal or feedback on their professional development under three dimensions did not differ significantly by age variable.

As may be observed in Table 8, no significant difference was noted between teachers' views about the items in first dimension $\{F(4-158)=0.737, p>.05\}$, second dimension $\{F(4-158)= 1.415, p> 0.05\}$, and third dimension $\{F(4-158)= 1.112, P> 0.05\}$ of the scale by educational background variable at 0.05 significance level. Further, teachers' views on the impact of appraisal or feedback on their professional development under three dimensions did not differ signifi-

Table 6: Results of t test analysis on teachers' views under three dimensions by gender

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Significant difference</i>
1st dimension	Woman	88	9.3523	3.35295	161	1.643	.102	None
	Man	75	10.2533	3.64318				
2nd dimension	Woman	88	69.3977	14.52824	161	1.415	.159	None
	Man	75	66.1467	14.72513				
3rd dimension	Woman	88	19.9886	7.63461	161	1.032	.304	None
	Man	75	21.1200	6.10928				

$P<0.05$

Table 7: Results of ANOVA test analysis on teachers' views under three dimensions by age

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Source of variance</i>	<i>Sum of squares</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean squares</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Significant difference</i>
1st dimension	Between groups	30.890	4	7.723	.622	.648	
	Within groups	1962.251	158	12.419			
	Total	1993.141	162				
2nd dimension	Between groups	458.019	4	114.505	.526	.717	
	Within groups	34378.411	158	217.585			
	Total	34836.429	162				
3rd dimension	Between groups	70.463	4	17.616	.356	.839	
	Within groups	7814.273	158	49.457			
	Total	7884.736	162				

<0.05

Table 8: Results of ANOVA test analysis on teachers' views under three dimensions by educational background

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Source of variance</i>	<i>Sum of squares</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean squares</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Significant difference</i>
1st dimension	Between groups	36.498	4	9.124	.737	.568	
	Within groups	1956.643	158	12.384			
	Total	1993.141	162				
2nd dimension	Between groups	494.918	4	123.729	.569	.685	
	Within groups	34341.512	158	217.351			
	Total	34836.429	162				
3rd dimension	Between groups	215.886	4	53.971	1.112	.353	
	Within groups	7668.850	158	48.537			
	Total	7884.736	162				

P<0.05

Table 9: Results of ANOVA test analysis on teachers' views under three dimensions by professional seniority

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Source of variance</i>	<i>Sum of squares</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean squares</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Significant difference</i>
1st dimension	Between groups	60.901	6	10.150	.819	.556	
	Within groups	1932.240	156	12.386			
	Total	1993.141	162				
2nd dimension	Between groups	900.877	6	150.146	.690	.658	
	Within groups	33935.552	156	217.536			
	Total	34836.429	162				
3rd dimension	Between groups	498.497	6	83.083	1.755	.112	
	Within groups	7386.239	156	47.348			
	Total	7884.736	162				

P<0.05

Table 10: Results of ANOVA test analysis on teachers' views under three dimensions by time of service in the current school

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Source of variance</i>	<i>Sum of squares</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean squares</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Significant difference</i>
1st dimension	Between groups	65.675	6	10.946	.886	.507	
	Within groups	1927.467	156	12.356			
	Total	1993.141	162				
2nd dimension	Between groups	1512.069	6	252.012	1.180	.320	
	Within groups	33324.360	156	213.618			
	Total	34836.429	162				
3rd dimension	Between groups	484.992	6	80.832	1.704	.123	
	Within groups	7399.744	156	47.434			
	Total	7884.736	162				

P<0.05

cantly by educational background variable.

As displayed in Table 9, no significant difference was found between teachers' views about the items in first dimension {F(6-156)=0.819, p>.05}, second dimension {F(6-156)=0.690, p>0.05}, and third dimension {F(6-156)=1.755, P>0.05} of the scale by professional seniority variable at 0.05 significance level. Be-

sides, teachers' views on the impact of appraisal or feedback on their professional development under three dimensions did not differ significantly by professional seniority variable.

As presented in Table 10, no significant difference was found between teachers' views about the items in first dimension {F(6-156)=0.886, p>.05}, second dimension {F(6-156)=1.180, p>0.05}, and third dimension {F(6-

156)=1.704, $P > 0.05$] of the scale by time of service in the current school variable at 0.05 significance level. In addition, teachers' views on the impact of appraisal or feedback on their professional development under three dimensions did not differ significantly by time of service in the current school variable.

In this part of the questionnaire, participating teachers were asked to write their views if any. A few teachers ($n=12$) answered the open-ended question. According to the analysis of the responses, teachers' views were very different including both those caring the feedback and those who do not care feedback. Among them only two stated that feedback was not necessary and adequate, while others found appraisal and feedback necessary and useful, and noted that it would be better if such practices are objective and decision makers (appraisers) are adequate. Further, teachers commented about their concerns about inspectors' professional competencies, that is whether they are competent enough to guide the teachers. One participant's comment on this issue was significant: "My appraiser actually needs to be appraised himself, what help would it make to me?"

There is no doubt that appraising and providing feedback to the teachers about teachers' performance in terms of fulfilling their duties and responsibilities, their strengths and weaknesses in a systematic way based on objective standards by specialized appraisers would contribute to their professional developments. However, these inspections, appraisals, and feedback should be done in an open and participatory way in cooperation among all the shareholders.

Consequently, it is aspired that the ministry of national education should increase the number of inspectors, the inspectors should always be involved in personal training activities, and inspectors should also be evaluated by the teachers inspected.

4. CONCLUSION

As in all open system, well-functioning of the education circle requires all components of the system to function in cooperation and coordination. Teachers, as not just the input of the education system, they are actually integrated in all components of the system. They participate in all phases and steps of the system. Similarly, the teachers are also a part of feedback

and appraisal. They are the agents who monitor and evaluate student learning, and provide feedback to learners and all other interested parties. In addition to this, they (should) receive feedback about their own performance. The process requires this. Thus, this proves again that all the components of the education system are inter-related with one another not only in terms of input-output relation but also in terms of cause-effect relation.

Inspection, appraisal, and feedback have undergone some change in the course of time and evolved into what is known as modern inspection (that is guidance) from classical inspection. This is also true for Turkish Education System. However, quitting classical inspection methods and promoting to guidance-oriented inspection and appraisal does not herald the resolution of inspectional problems in education. What is meant with successful inspection and appraisal is to contribute as a result to the teachers' professional development. Understanding this seems possible only when the feedback-receiving teachers believe or acknowledge that it brings good to them professionally. This is because it is possible that due to the inadequacy of the appraiser the feedback received may have a negative impact. In the present research, it was aimed to appraise the elementary school teachers' works and to determine the impact of feedback about this appraisal on their professional development. As a result, following conclusions were made based on the analysis of data obtained from 163 elementary school teachers:

1. In response to the question "How often have you been appraised by and/or provided feedback from the school principal, colleagues, members of school administration, or an individual or a group outside the school about your work at school?" most of the teachers (76%, $n=124$) answered they are appraised by and receive feedback from school principals, and 50.9 percent ($n=75$) do so by/from colleagues or members of school administration once or more in a year. On the other hand, 38 percent ($n=62$) of the teachers stated that they had never been appraised by and/or provided feedback from colleagues or members of school administration.
2. In response to the question "During the appraisal or provision of feedback, what points were considered to what extent?"

most of the teachers (33.7%, n=55) answered especially their "classroom management" skills were given importance. The least rated aspect in terms of importance attached during appraisal were teaching in "multicultural settings" (21.5%, n=35), and teaching students with special needs (21.5%, n=28).

3. In response to question "How and to what extent did the appraisals and/or feedback about your work at school make a change in terms of your professional development?" considerable number of teachers (25.2%, n=41) stated that appraisals and related feedback they received have made no change in the instruction they provide for their students with special needs, while; relatively less teachers stated that appraisals and related feedback have made considerable change in their knowledge and understanding of instructional practices (information transfer) in their main subject field (15.3%, n=25), and in the instruction they provide for the students with special needs (15.3%, n=25).
4. As a result of the analysis on the answers to the research question that "Do the perceptions of teachers about the effect of appraisal and/or feedback on their professional development differ significantly in terms of gender, age, educational background, professional seniority, and time of service in the current school?", no significant difference was observed among participants views.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Consequently, it was concluded that the appraisals and feedback about elementary school teachers' works may cause positive impact on their professional development, yet it seems to be inadequate with the current inspection practices. One leading reason for this was lack of multi-source nature (other teachers, school administration, parents, non-governmental organizations, public authorities, professional chambers etc.) of the appraisals, as well as the inadequacy of the appraisers giving feedback to the teachers about the evaluations in professional terms. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers' appraisal should be done more systematically through multi-sources rather than by a sin-

gle authority and, most importantly, the appraisers should be better qualified simultaneously.

REFERENCES

- AB Komisyonu Eurydice Türkiye Birimi 2009. *Avrupa Eğitim ve Yetistirme Sistemlerinin Yapisi*. Türkiye.
- Ashford SJ 1986. Feedback-seeking in individual adaptation: A resource perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29: 465-487.
- Avci N 1989. *Enformasyon Toplumu ve Eğitim Sistemlerine Etkileri*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Aydın I 2005. *Eğitimde Denetim Durum Saptama Değerlendirme ve Gelistirme*. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Aydın M 1986. *Çağdas Eğitim Denetimi*. Ankara: IM Eğitim Araştırma Yayın Danismanlık A.S.
- Aysim S 2010. *İlköğretim Okullarındaki Denetim Uygulamalarının Değerlendirilmesi*. Ankara: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Eğitimi Araştırma ve Gelistirme Dairesi Başkanlığı (EARGED).
- Balci A 2001. *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntem, Teknik ve İlkeleri*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Basar H Eğitimde Çağdas Denetim Yaklaşımları, From <<http://okul.selyam.net/docs/index-3212.html>> (Retrieved on 7 February 2014).
- Basar H 1988. *Oğretmenlerin Değerlendirilmesi*. Ankara.
- Basar H 1993. *Eğitim Denetçisi, Rollerini-Yeterlikleri-Secilmesi-Yetistirilmesi*. Ankara, Pegem Yayınları.
- Basar H 1995. *Oğretmenlerin Değerlendirilmesi*. Pegem Yayınları, Ankara.
- Basaran İE 2006. *Türk Eğitim Sistemi ve Okul Yönetimi*. Ankara, EKINOKS.
- Bursalioğlu Z 1987. *Okul Yönetiminde Yeni Yapı ve Davranış*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayını. No:154.
- Codding RS, Feinberg AB, Dunn EK, Pace GM 2005. Effects of immediate performance feedback on implementation of behavior support plans. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 38: 205-219.
- Cossairt A, Hall RV, Hopkins BL 1973. The effects of experimenter's instructions, feedback, and praise on teacher praise and student attending behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*. 6: 89-100.
- Dagli A 2006. İlk Öğretmen Denetmenlerinin Eğitim ve Yaşam ile ilgili Karsilastıkları Sorunlar ve Bu Sorunların Cozumüne İlişkin Öneriler. *D.U. Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6: 1-8.
- Darling-Hammond L 1999. *Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: A Review of State Policy Evidence*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.
- Dodd NG, Ganster DC 1996. The interactive effects of variety, autonomy, and feedback on attitudes and performance, 17(4): 329-347.
- Erisen Y 1997. Öğretim Elemanlarının Donut ve Duzeltme Davranışlarını Yerine Getirme Dereceleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 1: 45-61.
- Gonulacar S 2007. İc Denetimde Hedefler ve Beklentiler. *Mali Hukuk Dergisi*, 130/131, s. 20-27.

- Gözütok FD 1995. Birleştirilmiş ve normal sınıflı ilkokullarda dönüt düzeltmenin öğrenmeye etkisi [Effect of corrective feedback on learning in unified and traditional primary classrooms] *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi'nin 6-8 Eylül 1995'de Düzenlediği II.Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresinde sunulmuş bildiri*: Ankara.
- Herold DM, Greller MM 1977. Feedback: The definition of a construct. *Academy of Management Journal*, 20: 142-147.
- Herold DM, Liden RC, Leatherwood ML 1987. Using multiple attributes to assess sources of performance feedback. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 30: 826-835.
- Islamoglu AH 2011. *Sosyal Bilimlerde Arastirma Yontemleri (SPSS Uygulamali)*. Istanbul: Beta Basim Yayim Dagitim A.S.
- Karasar N 1984. *Bilimsel Arastirma Yontemleri*, Ankara: Hacettepe -Taş Kitapçılık.
- Kaymaz K 2007. Davranis Boyutuyla Performans Geribildirim Olgusu ve Sureci. *Ankara Universitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakultesi*, 4: 141-178.
- Liden RC, Mitchell TR 1985. Reactions to feedback: The role of attributions. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 28: 291-308.
- London M 2003. *Job Feedback: Giving, Seeking, and Using Feedback for Performance Improvement* 2nd Edition. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc. Pub.
- London M, Smither JW 2002. Feedback orientation, feedback culture, and the longitudinal performance management process. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12: 81-100.
- Mazdar S 1997. Hungry for feedback?, *Management Development Review*, 10(6/7): 246-248.
- MEB 2001. İlkogretim Kurumlari Rehberlik ve Teftis Yonergesi. *Tebliğler Dergisi*, Pubat 2001/2521.
- MEB 2010. TALIS: Uluslar arasi Ogretme ve Ogrenme Ara Stirmasi (Teaching and MEB Dis Iliskiler Ankara: Genel Mudurlugu, Turkiye Ulusal Raporu (2009). Learning International Survey.
- MEB Öğretmen Yetistirme ve Egitimi Genel Müdürlüğü (2006). Temel Eğitim Destek Projesi (TEDP), 'Öğretmen Egitimi Bileşeni' Öğretmenlik Mesleği Genel Yeterlikleri, Ankara.
- Nancy DG, Daniel CG 1996. The interactive effects of variety, autonomy, and feedback on attitudes and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17: 329-347.
- OECD 2009. Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments: First Results from TALIS – ISBN 978-92-64-05605-3.
- OECD 2009. OECD Gostergeleri. Bir Bakista Egitim, From <<http://www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/educationataglanca2009oecdindicators.htm>> (Retrieved on 11 February 2014).
- OECD TALIS 2013.From <<http://www.oecd.org/index.htm>> (Retrieved on 13 February 2014).
- Oktay A 1998. *Turkiye'de Ogretmen Egitimi*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim.
- Oral B 2000. Ogretmen Adaylarinin Algilarina Gore İlkogretim Sınıf Ogretmenlerinin Donut ve Duzeltme Davranislari. *Egitim Arastirmalari*, 2: 59-64.
- Oz F 2003. *Turkiye Cumhuriyeti Millî Egitim Sisteminde Denetim*. Eskisehir: Osmangazi Universitesi Yayinlari.
- Peker MR 1992. Geri Bildirim Üniversite Öhrencilerinin Ölçme ve Degerlendirme Dersindeki Badarisina Etkisi. Uludag Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, cilt 7, Sayi, 1 ss.31-39.
- Sanal R 2004. *Turkiye'de Yonetsel Denetim ve Devlet Denetleme Kurulu*. Ankara: TODAIE Yayini.
- Sanetti LMH, Luiselli J, Handler M 2007. Effects of verbal and graphic performance feedback on behaviors upport plan implementation in an inclusion classroom. *Behavior Modification*: 31: 454-465.
- Secen A 2011. İlkogretim Okullarındaki Denetim Uygulamalarının Degerlendirilmesi. *T.C. Millî Egitim Bakanligi Egitimi Arastirma ve Gelistirme Dairesi Başkanligi (EARGED)*.
- Senemoglu N 1987. *Bilissel Giriş Davranislariyla Donut Duzeltmenin Erisiye Etkisi*. Ph. D. Thesis, Unpublished. Ankara: Hacettepe University.
- Simonsen B, Myers D, DeLuca C 2010. Teaching teachers to use prompts, opportunities to respond, and specific praise. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 33(4): 300-318.
- T.C. MEB 2011. *Rehberlik ve Denetim Baskanligi Ogretmen Denetim Rehberi*, Ankara.
- Tata J 2002. The influence of managerial accounts on employees reactions to negative feedback. *Group and Organization Management*, 27: 480-503.
- Taymaz H 1984. Ders denetimi. Ankara Universitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakultesi Dergisi, 17: 9-19. From <<http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/40/517/6424.pdf>>, (Retrieved on 14 February 2014).
- Taymaz H 1993a. *Teftis: Kavramlar, İlkeler Ve Yontemler*. Ankara: Pegem Yayincilik.
- Taymaz H 1993b. *Teftis İlkeleri, Kavramlar, Yontemler*. Ankara: Kadioglu Matbaasi.
- Taymaz H 2000. *Okul Yonetimi*. Ankara: Pegem Yayincilik.
- Taymaz H 2002. *Egitim Sisteminde Denetim Kavramlar, İlkeler, Yontemler*. Ankara: Pegem Yayincilik.
- Taymaz H 2005. *Egitim Sisteminde Teftis Kavramlar, ilkeler, Yontemler* (6th issue). Ankara: Pegem A Yayincilik.
- Tuckey M, Brewer N, Williamson P 2002. The influence of motives and goal orientation on feedback seeking. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75: 195-216.
- Timuçin EU 2008. *Dogrudan Davranişsal Danışmanligin Birlikte Egitim Ortamina Yerlestirilmis Yetersizligi Olan Öğrencilerin Problem Davranislarini Azaltmadaki Etkililigi*. Yayinlanmamis. Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Ankara.
- Tunceli Milli Eğitim Mudurlugu 2012-13 Istatistikleri. Tunceli Milli Eğitim Mudurlugu-TMEM 2012. From <<http://tunceli.meb.gov.tr/>> (Retrieved on 5 February 2014).
- Turk Dil Kurumu 2005. *Turkçe Sozluk*. Ankara: Turk Tarih Kurumu Basimevi.
- Yunt PO 1978. *Donut ve Duzeltme Etkenlerinin Okulda Ogrenmeye Etkisi*. Ph. D. Thesis, Unpublished. Ankara: Hacettepe University.