

%25

(Ingvarson and Chadbourne,

1994)

1995)

.(1996

2000

1987

(Oppler et al., 1992; Sackett and DuBois, 1991; DuBois et

.al., 1993)

(organizational politics)

) "...

.(174 :1998

.(Ball, 1987)

"

"

()

.(Bocheneck, B., 2000)

)

).(

" (

(Cascio and

Mohrman and Lawler (1983)

.Bernardin, 1984)

-

.(Bolin, 1988) "

Cleveland and Murphy (1992)

"

.(Timperly, 1998) "

%50

Duckett (1991)

.1

.2

)

(

" 1975

)

1980

.(1976

80/8

/

(1984

)

) 25

87/9

1987

.(1984

.(Bernardin and Villanova, 1986)

)

(Pullakos

.(1998

1987

.et al., 1986)

(Cardy and Dobbins,
cited in Arvey and Murphy, 1998)

Robbins and DeNisi (cited in Arvey and Murphy, 1998)

Blasé and Blasé
(2003)
expression of
.hostility

(Varma et al., 1996)

Ferris et al. (cited in Arvey
and Murphy, 1998)

.micro-politics

Bernardin and Beatty (1984)

Organizational Politics

" "

Cleveland and Murphy
:
(1992)

Maurer et al. (1993) Sumer and Knight (1996)

Contrast

.effect

Woehr and Roch (1996)

Longenecker and Gioia (1988)

Longenecker et al.

Mintzberg (cited in Ivancevich et al., 1990)

(1987)

Scrivin (1994)

Blasé

(1988)

Bjerke et al.

(cited in Tziner et al., 1996)

Prince and Mohrman and Lawler (1983)

Mohrman (1991)

(1995)

%46

%58

1995

()

(Ingvarson and Chadbourne, 1994)

%29

2600

Deeming (cited in

Ingvarson and Chadbourne, 1994)

"

()

"

Schrader and Steiner (cited in Tziner et al., 1996)

Tziner et al. (1996)

0.98 =)
)

(0.97

(0.86 =

(4) 6 3 (%45.2)
%10.2 3 %19.7
%25

(%50.6)
3 %37.7
%10.9 3

(5) (2)
(2)

(6) (1.94)
2.18)
(2.53
(2)

)
: (2.53 2.32

(7))
: (2.23 1.94

/ (3)

:(1)

52.8	238	
47.0	212	
99.8	450	
26.8	121	
25.5	115	
24.6	111	
23.1	104	
100	451	
25.9	117	/
19.1	86	
11.5	52	
19.3	87	/
7.1	32	
82.9	374	
19.7	89	3
45.2	204	6-3
10.2	46	6
75.1	339	
10.9	49	3
37.7	170	6 - 3
50.6	228	6
99.2	447	
11.5	52	
22.6	102	
39.2	177	
7.3	33	-
14.6	66	-
95.2	430	

:(2)

2.53		1
2.48		2
2.48		3
2.32		4

2.23		5
2.19		6
2.18		7
1.94		8
18.35		

:(3)

0.000	446	6.046	2.41	
			2.02	
0.000	447	6.761	2.46	
			1.91	
0.000	448	7.349	2.24	
			1.61	
0.000	447	6.894	2.75	
			2.18	
0.000	448	5.727	2.89	
			2.45	
0.000	448	3.629	2.67	
			2.36	
0.000	447	7.156	2.54	
			2.09	
0.000	445	6.168	2.39	
			1.95	

:(4)

			..		
0.000	43.258	276.163	3	828.488	
		6.384	445	2840.937	
0.000	34.258	92.004	3	276.013	
		2.686	446	1197.784	
0.000	50.646	552.499	3	1657.497	
		10.909	447	4876.325	
0.000	57.016	314.497	3	943.491	
		5.516	446	2460.120	
0.000	30.917	292.443	3	877.329	
		9.459	447	4228.126	
0.000	31.654	187.772	3	563.315	
		5.932	447	2651.616	
0.000	28.246	294.993	3	884.978	
		10.444	446	4657.842	
0.000	62.762	996.957	3	2990.872	
		15.885	444	7052.768	

:(5)

	.				
0.049	443	1.97	8.66	6	
			9.19	6	
0.5	444	6.73	4.34	6	
			4.46	6	
0.87	445	0.16	7.76	6	
			7.82	6	
0.67	444	0.418	7.41	6	
			7.52	6	
0.54	445	0.608	10.64	6	
			10.83	6	
0.839	445	0.204	7.63	6	
			7.58	6	
0.316	444	1.003	11.5	6	
			11.83	6	
0.609	442	0.512	13.01	6	
			13.24	6	

(6)

			.			
0.002	6.505	47.831	2	95.662		
		7.353	334	2455.964		
0.001	7.19	18.796	2	37.592		
		2.614	335	875.712		
0.004	5.523	61.594	2	123.188		
		11.152	336	3746.941		
0.000	8.982	54.05	2	108.101		
		6.017	335	2015.852		
0.087	2.46	24.036	2	48.07		
		9.773	336	3283.562		
0.495	0.704	4.466	2	8.931		
		6.344	336	2131.741		
0.003	5.763	66.493	2	132.986		
		11.538	335	3865.372		
0.002	6.589	103.428	2	206.856		
		15.697	333	5227.037		

(7)

			.			
0.035	2.611	19.447	4	77.79		
		7.447	367	2733.208		
0.091	2.018	6.025	4	24.101		
		2.986	368	1098.966		
0.185	1.557	23.102	4	92.406		
		14.833	369	5473.433		
0.333	1.148	8.245	4	32.981		
		7.18	368	2642.156		
0.376	1.059	10.835	4	43.339		
		10.227	369	3773.755		
0.07	2.189	15.559	4	62.236		
		7.109	369	2623.285		
0.833	0.365	4.17	4	16.679		
		11.414	368	4200.340		
0.011	3.337	71.021	4	284.083		
		21.283	367	7810.85		

Thompson

"
" (1992)

Blasé and Blasé (2003)

"

"

(Hodjkinson, 1991)

Reflective Thinking

.Blasé and Blasé (2003)

()

:

:

Raelin (1994)

(Nhundu, 1992)

Blasé (1988)

:

-

Contextual

-

-

.(Nhundu, 1992)

-

value-

and-virtue-based management

-

(204)

.(46 89)

-

%20

.77-49 :(56)16

1996

.65-27 :(83)10

1995

1984

1987

-113 :29

.131

1995

- Development Program, *School Organization*, 11(2): 153-169.
- Hodjkinson, C. 1991. *Educational Leadership: The Moral Art*, State University of NY Press, Albany, NY.
- Ingvarson, L. and Chadbourne, R. 1994. *Valuing Teachers Work*, Melbourne, ACER.
- Ivancevich, J., Matteson, M., Bocheneck, T. 1990. *Organizational Behavior and Management*, Boston: BPI Irwin.
- Longenecker, C., Sims, H. and Gioia, D. 1987. Behind the Mask: The Politics of Employee Appraisal, *Academy of Management Executive*, 1(3): 183-193.
- Longenecker, C. and Gioia, D. 1988. Neglected at the Top: Executives Talk about Executive Appraisal, in Tziner et al. (1996), *Development and Validation of a Questionnaire for Measuring Perceived Political Considerations in Performance Appraisal*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17:179-190.
- Maurer, T., Palmer, J., Ashe, D. 1993. Diaries, Checklists, Evaluations and Contrast Effects in Measurement of Behavior, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2): 226-231.
- Mohrman, A. and lawler, E. 1983. Motivation and Appraisal Performance Behavior, in Murphy, K. and Cleveland, J. 1995. *Understanding Performance Appraisal*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nhundu, T. 1992. The Relationship between Self-and Supervisor Appraisals with Role Clarity and Job Satisfaction, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(1): 29-41.
- Oppler, S., Campbell, J., Pulakos, E., Borman, W. 1992. Three Approaches to the Investigation of Subgroup Bias in Performance Measurement: Review, Results, and Conclusions, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77 (2): 201-217.
- Pullakos, E., Shmitt, N., Chan, D. 1986. Models of Job Performance Ratings: an Examination of Rate Race, Rate Gender, and Rater Level Effects. *Human Performance*, 9: 103-119.
- Prince, J., and Mohrman, A. 1991. The Characteristics of Effective Performance Appraisal Meetings: Manager Versus Subordinate Views, Paper Presented at the *Western Academy of Management*, Santa Barbara.
- Raelin, J. 1994. Three Scales of Professional Deviance within Organizations, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15: 483-501.
- Sackett, R., Dubois, C. 1991. Rater-ratee Race Effects on Performance Evaluation: Challenging Meta-analytic
- Arvey, R. and Murphy, K. 1998. *Performance Evaluation in Work Settings*, Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Ball, S. 1987. *The Micro-politics of the School: Towards a Theory of School Organization*, Methuen, London.
- Bernardin, H. and Beatty, R. 1984. *Performance Appraisal: Assessing Human Behavior at Work*, Boston.
- Bernardin, H. and Villanova, P. 1986. *Performance Appraisal*. In: Locke, E. (ED.) *Generalizing from Laboratory to Field Settings*, Lexington, Mass.
- Blasé, J. and Blasé, J. 2003. The Phenomenology of Principal Mistreatment: Teachers' Perspectives, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(4): 367-422.
- Blasé, J. 1988. The Politics of Favoritism, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 29(2): 152-178.
- Bocheneck, M. 2000. *The Politics of Employee Appraisal*, www.esc.edu/esconline/sitemail.nsf/mail.
- Bolin, F. 1988. Does a Community of Scholars in Supervision Exist, *Journal of Supervision and Curriculum*, 3(4): 296-307.
- Brislin, R., Lonner, W. and Thondike, R. 1973. *Cross-Cultural Research Methods*, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Cascio, W. and Bernardin, H. 1984. Implications of Performance Appraisal Litigation for Personnel Decisions, *Personnel Psychology*, 34(2): 211-226.
- Cleveland, J. and Murphy, K. 1992. Analyzing Performance Appraisal as Goal-directed Behavior, *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 10: 121-185.
- DuBois, C., Sackett, P., Zedeck, S. and Fogil, L. 1993. Further Exploration of Typical and Maximum Performance Criteria: Definitional Issues, Prediction, and White-black Differences, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(2): 205-211.
- Duckett, L. 1991. *Promoting Appraisal through an Active Staff*

- Issues in Educational Research*, 2(1): 35-44.
- Tziner, A., Latham, G., Price, B. Haccoun, R. 1996. Development and Validation of a Questionnaire for Measuring Perceived Political Considerations in Performance Appraisal, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17:179-190.
- Varma, A., DeNisi, A., and Peters, L. 1996. Interpersonal Affect and Performance Appraisal: A Field Study, *Personnel Psychology*, 49(2): 341-360.
- Woehr, D. and Roch, S. 1996. Context Effects in Performance Evaluation: the Impact of Ratee Sex and Performance Level on Performance Level Ratings and Behavioral Recall, *Organizational Behavior*, 66(1): 31-41.
- Conclusions, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6): 873-877.
- Scriven, M. 1994. Assessment in Teacher Education: Getting Clear on the Concept, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12: 443-450.
- Sumer, H. and Knight, P. 1996. Assimilation and Contrast Effects in Performance Ratings: Effects of Rating the Previous Performance on Rating Subsequent Performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4): 436-442.
- Timperly, H. 1998. Performance Appraisal: Principals' Perspectives and some Implications, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(1): 44-58.
- Thompson, A. 1992. The Ethics and Politics of Evaluation,

A Study of Selected Factors that Affect Teachers' Performance Appraisal in the Sultanate of Oman

Aref Atari and Abdallah Al-Shanfari *

ABSTRACT

This research study aimed at investigating the perceptions of teachers, principals, assistant principals and supervisors of the factors that may affect teachers' performance appraisal at the public schools of the Sultanate of Oman. 451 teachers, principals, assistant principals and supervisors participated in this study. The instrument comprised 31 statements categorized into 8 clusters. The findings revealed that four clusters of factors, namely caring for, encouraging, similar affiliations with and being impressed of teachers, affected to some extent teachers' performance appraisal. By contrast, four clusters of factors, namely avoiding confrontations with, maintaining power, falling under pressures and gratification, were less influential. The findings also showed statistically significant differences on all clusters between participants that could be attributed to gender and in favor of males. Statistically, significant differences on two clusters between supervisors and principals and in favor of principals were also indicated. While experience in administration resulted in statistically significant differences on six clusters in favor of the less and more experienced *vis-à-vis* the moderately experienced, experience in teaching led to statistically significant differences on only one cluster in favor of the more experienced. And finally statistically significant differences on two clusters were the function of specialization but the direction of significance was not always the same; on one cluster it was in favor of social studies and English language and on another it was in favor of science and mathematics. The findings were discussed against the background of relevant literature and previous research studies. The study concluded with recommendations *inter alia*: replication of the study and conducting similar studies using different methodology and instruments; raising awareness of the contextual, complex and problematic nature of teacher performance; introducing the contextual factors of teacher performance appraisal and the role of values and culture in supervisor and principal education, training and development programs; showing interest in the bad aspect of organizational life and the role of inter-politics in affecting teacher performance appraisal; training on soul searching and reflective thinking to bring the factors affecting performance appraisal to the conscious level.

KEYWORD: Teacher performance appraisal.

* Department of Foundations and Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Sultan Qaboos University, Oman. Received on 18/1/2004 and Accepted for Publication on 18/7/2004.