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ABSTRACT

The objective of this paper was to design, develop and evaluate a causal model of teachers’ attitude toward the performance evaluation system (PES) with the mediating role of teachers’ sense of efficacy on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The study population included all teachers of male-only high schools in Tehran. 117 teachers were selected as the sample population using availability sampling. The present study is an applied research in terms of its objective and a descriptive research in terms of its data collection method. Furthermore, the study uses a correlational research design through structural equation modeling. In order to measure the study variables, the following questionnaires were used: Teachers’ Attitude toward Performance Evaluation, Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. The results showed that teachers’ attitude toward the performance evaluation system had a significant positive effect on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and self-efficacy. Also, teachers’ sense of efficacy had a significant positive effect on job satisfaction. Moreover, the results showed that teachers’ attitude to the performance evaluation system had a positive and significant effect on organizational commitment with the mediating role of self-efficacy. Thus, the present study verified the causal model of teachers’ attitude toward the performance evaluation system with the mediating role of teachers’ sense of efficacy. Finally, the structural equation modeling reflects the positive impact of teachers’ attitude toward Iran’s Ministry of Education’s employee performance evaluation system on job satisfaction, sense of efficacy and organizational commitment.
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INTRODUCTION

Today, the human factor is the most sensitive and the key element to organizational success as pointed out by most modern theories of organization and management. Organizational employees are evaluated in order to determine the performance of human resources in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. Thus, by recognizing the weaknesses of the employees, organizational deficiencies, and unqualified workforce, necessary measures can be taken for making improvements. It is a very tangible and evident fact that every individual must be in their rightful place in organizational processes and be evaluated continuously in terms of actual capabilities. In this sense, it becomes possible to take effective steps to achieve career goals, improve human resources, and recognize and fix failures and deficiencies [19]. Therefore, the establishment of a sound management system and the provision of basic facilities for the use of logical quality and quantity control tools by managers in various fields are among the important issues.
that will be discussed as the infrastructure in the management of any organization. Using these tools, creating a perfect setup for realizing different goals, and adjusting it to real organizational needs will enable managers to make the most of available resources and take action to achieve increased efficiency and enhanced performance. Achieving success in any organization depends on the efficient use of scientific instruments that lead to coordination and cooperation so that managers can consciously seek and use such tools in order to maintain staffing. Of all the different methods of human resource management, the performance evaluation method has certain features and has always been discussed with vigor. Proper management would be impossible without analyzing and evaluating organizational tasks, responsibilities, and eligibility and unless it is accompanied by a proper recognition of employee skills, deficiencies, efficiency and productivity. They work but also have an impact on employee effort and task performance. Obviously, performance evaluation processes are one of the most critical issues faced by organizational authorities. Despite constant efforts for designing better and more effective employee evaluation systems, evidence suggests that authorities are generally not satisfied with such methods and systems used for employee performance evaluation. The reason for this dissatisfaction is rooted in various factors including the complexity of the assessment process and the presence of deficiencies in the comprehensive evaluation system. Lack of management support, non-practicality of the evaluation system, evaluator incompetence in fair and proper evaluation, and lack of proportion and consistency between the evaluation system and facts on the ground are among the factors that undermine the effectiveness of most systems [18]. Evaluation has long been known as one of the important factors for success in education and training systems. One of the major issues in Iran’s Ministry of Education, due to its large community of human resources, especially teachers, is performance evaluation. Given the important role of teachers, as one of the most important strata of human resources in the education of students, the Ministry of Education must design and implement a system of performance evaluation in order to reach such goals as creating motivation and satisfaction in teachers; identifying training, promotion, and demotion needs; increasing or decreasing wages and benefits; and identifying talented and unqualified employees so that teachers can become aware of the situation and their performance after starting work at school in order to realize predetermined organizational goals and improve their own performance. As a result, employees become aware of their own strengths and weaknesses and deploy the necessary facilities to increase their effective performance. It is possible that, despite a reasonable and appropriate evaluation system, an action plan fails in the implementation stage and does not achieve its predetermined goals and objectives. As a result, an organization must not only evaluate the quality of an evaluation plan but also assess its practical implementation. Recognizing and improving efficient or positive performance, improving implementation and lack of effective management are issues that are pointed out by various studies [9]. Mirzabeygi et al. [9] reported a high level of dissatisfaction with the evaluation and promotion system. Several studies have shown that employee attitude will have great individual and organizational effects on the evaluation system. The results of a study by Ghamari Zare et al. [8] showed that there was a significant relationship between the positive attitude of nurses toward the competence of the head nurse, performance evaluation process and outcome quality, and a sense of job satisfaction. Clutterbuck [7] found that the employees’ perception of the performance evaluation system will determine employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Thornton [24] conducted a study on the performance evaluation system and concluded that we must consider teachers’ attitude in evaluating teacher performance. Teachers’ attitude toward the evaluation system can make the evaluation system appear efficient yet undesirable. In relation to performance evaluation, Max Abbott [1] believes that evaluation results must be available so that people can use these results as a basis for personal and professional growth and development. Teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation can also be accompanied by teachers’ commitment to the organization. Organizational commitment is affected by so many different variables. It is in fact some sort of emotional or sentimental attachment to the values and goals of an organization. This attachment is manifested not through instrumental values but through the role of the individual in relation to organizational values and goals. Becker [5] has defined organizational commitment as the willingness to continue working in an organization based on one’s perception of the costs associated with leaving that organization. Organizational commitment in teachers is part of their emotional response to their experience of teaching at school. Scholars have tried to define the concept of organizational commitment in teachers. Some of them have focused on specific activities of teachers as samples of their teaching career [10]. Signs of organizational commitment include the rightful, appropriate, and timely use of resources for teaching duties [1, 28] With this discussion, it becomes clear that teachers’ attitude to performance evaluation can have very important individual and organizational consequences. Studies and reports indicate that evaluation processes focus mostly on the validity and usefulness of the evaluation and less on employee/ teacher attitude toward evaluation processes. Therefore, the present study provides a reliable view of the status of teachers’ attitude to their performance evaluation system in the current situation by obtaining and analyzing the required data from the community. In addition, this study will focus on the probable impact of teachers’ attitude toward the performance evaluation system on their organizational commitment. According to the results of this study, teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation is likely to lead to increased levels of awareness in education authorities and increased levels of organizational commitment in employees/ teachers. The main research questions are: Does teachers’ attitude toward the performance evaluation system have an impact on their job satisfaction? Does teachers’ sense of efficacy play a mediating role in the relationship between...
teachers’ performance evaluation on the one hand and the variables of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on the other hand? In order to answer these questions, the researchers have surveyed high school teachers in relation to their experiences of performance evaluation and intellectual capital.

**Theoretical Foundations**

**Teacher Performance Evaluation**

Performance evaluation is used as a valid measure and powerful instrument for determining the competence of teachers and improving education programs (Pecheone & Chung, 2006). Evaluating the performance of teachers is a key organizational function that requires an internal commitment to time, energy, and human resources across the entire educational sphere [15]. If the goals of performance evaluation are vague, teachers will not feel that it functions to support them [17]. The main objectives of teacher performance evaluation: empowering managers to improve the quality of education, determining areas of potential improvement for the development of education, and ensuring that all teachers of the educational system operate at a level beyond the minimum level of competence [15].

**Sense of Efficacy**

The theoretical conceptualization of self-efficacy goes back to Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory (1977 and 1997). Bandura [4] defined self-efficacy as “beliefs in one’s capability to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations” (2). Self-efficacy is identified as a major mediator for behavior and, more importantly, for behavior change. Social cognitive theory assumes that people are capable of human agency or deliberately pursuing practical processes. Such agency becomes possible through a process called dual determinism. Dual determinism operates on the basis of a multi-directional pattern. According to this theory, agency determines our future behavior as a result of the interplay between the three forces of environment, behavior and internal personal traits (such as cognitive, emotional and biological processes). In line with a plethora of studies on the concept of self-efficacy in general, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk (2011) defined teacher efficacy as a teacher’s judgment of his or her ability to create positive outcomes for student learning and engaging them in the learning process even in the case of unmotivated students or students with learning disabilities. According to Bandura [4], teacher efficacy can be defined as the belief in one’s capability to initiate and foster further progress in special circumstances and concerning special assignments. Efficacy in teaching refers to a teacher’s beliefs about his or her tasks and responsibilities and is associated with his or her training experiences [27].

**Job Satisfaction**

With a variety of existing theories and ideas about job satisfaction, we realize very clearly that there is a need for a certain research method that would merge theories of job satisfaction, job characteristics and personal attributes. The impact of employment tasks, supervision methods and any other natural job characteristic on job satisfaction only show the average effects on the studied population and obscures the fact that, within that population, different people have different ways of reacting to similar environmental conditions. The first model presented in this regard belonged to Holland (1985) which focused on the importance of compatibility between the individual and the workplace for attaining job satisfaction. Thus, the degree of job satisfaction is dependent on the degree of compatibility between the individual and the environment. Nevertheless, Holland’s model of compatibility between the individual and the environment received criticisms too. According to Gerhard (1997), “Different studies yielded little evidence that suggested compatibility for satisfaction. Besides, this model presumes that the level of satisfaction is dependent only on employment compatibility and thus ignores job characteristics and personal traits.” Morrison’s model is one of the most influential models of job satisfaction for modern organizations since it encompasses employee personality traits. Another advantage of this model is its interactive approach since by simultaneously considering the impact of personal and situational factors on job satisfaction we realize clearly that both personal and situational factors impact the level of employee satisfaction and it is a crucial to consider both of them simultaneously.

**Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment is a mental state or attitude that represents desire, need or obligation to continue working in an organization. In this context, desire means a personal willingness or tendency to continue serving an organization. Need means one is obliged to continue serving an organization because he or she has already invested in it. Furthermore, obligation denotes the liabilities, responsibilities and duties one has toward an organization. From another perspective, organizational commitment refers to a sense of belonging and attachment to the organization. Therefore, organizational commitment denotes “employee loyalty to the organization and an ongoing process through which the employees express their interest in the organization, its success and its continuous efficiency. According to Moody et al., commitment designates something beyond determined duties. Expressing commitment in practice is essential for performing job tasks especially in key positions. Cook and Wall also presented the three concepts of “loyalty”, “sense of identity and identification”, and “readiness” for commitment.
Research Hypotheses
The following hypotheses were developed to examine the conceptual model of the study.
- Teachers’ attitude toward the performance evaluation system has a significant positive effect on job satisfaction.
- Teachers’ attitude toward the performance evaluation system has a significant positive effect on teachers’ sense of efficacy.
- Teachers’ attitude toward the performance evaluation system with the mediating role of efficacy has a significant positive effect on organizational commitment in teachers.
- The conceptual model of teachers’ attitude toward the performance evaluation system fits well into the experimental model.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
The present study is an applied research in terms of its objective and a descriptive research in terms of its data collection method. Furthermore, the study uses a correlational research design through structural equation modeling. Structural equation modeling is a general and very powerful multivariate analytical method from the family of multiple regression analysis. In more precise terms, structural equation modeling is an expanded version of the general linear model that allows researchers to simultaneously test a set of regression equations. Structural equation modeling is a comprehensive statistical approach to the testing of hypotheses about the relationship between observed and latent variables. Structural equation modeling is also known as “causal modeling” or “analysis of covariance structures”. This study is a correlational research project and uses structural equation modeling. The study population is comprised of all high school teachers of Tehran in the academic year 2014-2015. 117 teachers were selected as the sample population from male-only high schools of Shahid Emami Al-Agha (n=34), Adlparvar (n=36), and Mardani Azar (n=47) using availability sampling.

Data Collection Instruments
Teachers’ Attitude toward Performance Evaluation
To measure teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation, the researchers used a researcher-made questionnaire with 15 items rated on a five-point Likert Scale. To analyze the construct validity and determine the factorial structure of the questionnaire, the researchers used factor analysis and principal component analysis. The test was run via the Varimax method and a differentiation level of at least 0.4. The overall KMO (=0.91) and Bartlett’s K-squared test statistic were significant at a probability level of lower than 0.001. The questionnaire was consisted of four subscales: attitude toward evaluator competence, evaluation processes, evaluation results, and proportion in evaluation indices. After completing the factorial analysis and extracting the four factors, the reliability coefficients of questionnaire subscales were calculated via the internal consistency method. The four subscales (attitude toward evaluator competence, evaluations processes, evaluation results, and proportion in evaluation indices) yielded reliability coefficients (Cronbach’s alpha) of 0.75, 0.83, 0.71, and 0.86, respectively.
Organizational Commitment

To measure organizational commitment, the researchers used the standardized Meyer and Allen’s three-component model of organizational commitment (1984 and 1990) including three subscales: affective commitment (8 items), continuance commitment (8 items) and normative commitment (items 8). These subscales were used for measuring the willingness of employees to stay and work in their organization and their affective or emotional attachment to their organization. Here are two sample items: I often think about leaving this organization (reverse scoring); and, I don’t feel an affective attachment to this organization (reverse scoring). This questionnaire was translated into Persian by Golparvar (2007). In addition, Khaksar (2008) reported Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of 0.79, 0.78 and 0.72 for the three subscales of affective, continuance and normative commitment, respectively. The present study also yielded reliability coefficients (Cronbach’s alpha) of 0.76, 0.82, and 0.79 for the three subscales of affective, continuance and normative commitment, respectively.

Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy

To measure teachers’ sense of efficacy, the researchers used The Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk, 2001). This scale has 24 items rated on a five-point Likert scale from very high (=4) to very low (=0). The sum of scores of all items represents the overall efficiency score. The subscales of this questionnaire are: self-efficacy in involving students in the learning process, self-efficacy in teaching methods, and self-efficacy in class management. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk (2001) examined the construct validity of the scale via factor analysis. The scale yielded a sound factorial structure composed of the three above-mentioned factors. They reported a reliability of between 0.87 and 0.94 for the total scale and the subscales using the internal consistency method. The questionnaire yielded a reliability coefficient (Cronbach’s alpha) of 0.68.

Job Satisfaction

The present study used the Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1985) which has been frequently used by organizational researchers in the last few years along with other global and standardized questionnaires. This questionnaire measures nine dimensions of job satisfaction five of which relate to descriptive indicators of employment. It also relies on the Minnesota job satisfaction questionnaire (MSQ) which measures overall satisfaction as well as internal and external factors. The Spector Survey also measures both internal and external factors of job satisfaction in nine dimensions. The reliability of this scale was reported as equal to 0.91 by Spector (1985) and 0.88 by Murray (1999). The Spector Survey also yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.91. The data collected via questionnaires were fed into IBM SPSS Statistics v18 and LISREL v8.5 to be analyzed using descriptive statistics including percentages and inferential statistics including the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and structural equation modeling.

Findings

Table 1 shows the results of the status of teachers’ attitude toward Iran’s Ministry of Education’s employee performance evaluation system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Type of attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluator competence</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Good (30-44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Average (15-29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Poor (14 and under)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evaluation processes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Good (30-40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Average (18-29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Poor (less than 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluation results</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Good (44-58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Average (28-43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Poor (less than 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Proportion in evaluation indices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good (32-46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Average (20-31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Poor (less than 19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 presents the data on the ranking of each of the dimensions of teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation including evaluator competence, evaluation processes, evaluation results, and proportion in evaluation indices. The table shows that the average yielded by evaluator competence is higher than the other three dimensions. Therefore, the highest quality of performance evaluation from teachers’ perspective is related to evaluator competence followed by evaluation processes, evaluation results, and then proportion in evaluation indices. In addition, frequency distribution in relation to the status of teachers’ attitude toward Iran’s Ministry of Education’s employee performance evaluation system shows that the majority of teachers have rated each item as “poor”. It is worth noting that the total mean and standard deviation of teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation is determined as 68.71±3.25.
Table 2 The correlation matrix between the independent and dependent variables of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitude toward performance evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.501 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers’ sense of efficacy</td>
<td>0.301 **</td>
<td>0.214 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0.291 **</td>
<td>0.311 **</td>
<td>0.452 **</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 summarizes the correlation matrix between the four dimensions of teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation (evaluator competence, evaluation processes, evaluation results, and proportion in evaluation indices) and the three dimensions of organizational commitment (affective, normative, and continuance commitment). This table shows that there is a significant positive correlation between the final score of teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation and the final scores of organizational commitment at a one percent significance level. Furthermore, there is a significant positive correlation between the final score of teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation and the final scores of organizational commitment at a one percent significance level. Considering the literature review, the theoretical model of the study can be put into analysis as a model that defines all the variables individually and with reference to the subscales. For this purpose, the following variables must be fed into the LISERL software: the diagram of the measurement model at the level of latent variables, teachers’ attitude toward Iran’s Ministry of Education’s employee performance evaluation system as the exogenous variable, and organizational commitment as the endogenous variable.

Figure 1: Structural equation modeling for the assessment of the impact of teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and teachers’ sense of efficacy.

Table 3 The goodness of fit of the structural equations model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Chi square</td>
<td>343.59</td>
<td>P = 0.63</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td>Favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3 and less</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05 and less</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>At least 9.0</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>At least 9.0</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>AFGFI</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>At least 9.0</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>PFGI</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>At least 0.5</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the results, the chi-square value is equal to 343.59 and thus, considering the p-value, the conceptual model fits well into the experimental model. Also, the chi square/degree of freedom ratio is equal to 2.35 and shows that, considering the criterion, the conceptual model fits well into the experimental model. The RMSEA index is equal to 0.031, which is within an acceptable criterion range, and shows an acceptable error level in the model. Furthermore, CFI, GFI, AGFI and PGFI values are also favorable in relation to the criterion and indicate that the conceptual model fits well into the experimental model. Therefore, it can be concluded that the causal model of teachers’ attitude toward the performance evaluation system with the mediating role of teachers’ sense of efficacy fits appropriately into its set of observations. As can be seen, the model is functional in terms of goodness-of-fit indices. The relationships between the variables of the model are as follows:

Teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation has a direct, significant and positive effect on job satisfaction (=0.62) and teachers’ sense of efficacy (=0.56). In addition, teachers’ sense of efficacy has a direct, significant and positive effect on job satisfaction (=0.59). The model verifies the mediating role of teachers’ sense of efficacy in the relationship between teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation on the one hand and job satisfaction and organizational commitment on the other. As a consequence, teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation has a direct, significant and positive effect on job satisfaction (=0.53) and organizational commitment (=0.49). Moreover, teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation has a significant positive effect on organizational commitment (=0.42).

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study in relation to the status of teachers’ attitude toward the performance evaluation system are suggestive of a weak or negative attitude toward all the four performance evaluation dimensions including evaluator competence, evaluation processes, evaluation results, and proportion in evaluation indices. In the same line, Mirzabeygi et al. [13] found that employees had a negative attitude toward performance evaluation. In another study titled “An analysis of the features of teacher performance evaluation system,” Taghavi (1990) concluded that teachers were not satisfied with the application of evaluation results. The results of the present study show that there is significant positive relationship between teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation on the one hand and the variables of normative and continuance commitment. Consequently, improved teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation is associated with higher levels of normative and continuance commitment. The results also showed that teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation will have a significant effect on organizational commitment. As a result, it can be concluded that teachers’ attitude toward performance evaluation plays an important role in organizational commitment. Improved levels of organizational commitment subsequently lead to improved performance and commitment in employees. This finding is consistent with the findings of studies by Afsharzadeh et al. (2008), Ghafouri (2007), Mazaheri (2006), and Mehdizadeh (1995). Shiri (1996) found that performance evaluation results, considering employee attitudes toward evaluation, led to improved levels of continuance motivation, training, employee development, workforce efficiency, and organizational commitment. According to the results of a study by Towne (2006) titled “Employee performance appraisal systems: Effects on communication within organizations,” whenever they perceive that their CEO is capable of conducting correct and long-term appraisals, the employees will have a stronger sense of teamwork, belonging to the organization, and information flow. In line with the findings of Towne’s study and of this study, Torabi and Sotoudeh(2010) found that a positive employee attitude toward performance evaluation has a positive impact on their organizational commitment. Every study is faced with a series of limitations and this study is not an exception. The present study examined teachers’ attitude to performance evaluation and its impact on organizational commitment in high school teachers. To ensure the accuracy and generalizability of the results, it is necessary to examine the same concept in teachers of other educational levels as well. Besides, the present study examined the impact of teachers’ attitude to performance evaluation on job satisfaction, sense of efficacy and organizational commitment from the perspective of male-only high school teachers. So it is essential to conduct the same examination on female-only high school teachers as well. Although the researchers used different indices to measure these factors, these subjective indices may not be able to cover the range of objective indices. Therefore, it is suggested that future researchers deploy objective indices as well to measure these factors. According to the results of this research, it is recommended that education authorities revise evaluation results – including incentives, bonuses and job promotions – as well as evaluation indices and evaluators in order to improve employee satisfaction and the effects of performance evaluation on organizational commitment and to establish justice in evaluation processes and results.

CONCLUSION

According to the findings of the present study, it can be concluded that teachers’ attitude toward Iran’s Ministry of Education’s employee performance evaluation system is mostly negative. In other words, it can be said that teachers have an unfavorable view toward performance evaluation in the dimensions of evaluator competence, evaluation processes, evaluation results, and the Ministry of Education’s indices. In addition, the results showed that teachers’
attitude toward performance evaluation has a direct and significant impact on their organizational commitment. In this sense, it is suggested to consider teachers’ attitude both in evaluation processes and as an effective factor in organizational commitment.
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Appendix

Meyer and Allen’s Three-component Model of Organizational Commitment

Affective Commitment Scale Item
1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I enjoy discussing things about my organization with people outside it.
3. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.
4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one. (R)
5. I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization. (R)
6. I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organization. (R)
7. I do not feel a ‘strong’ sense of belonging to my organization. (R)

Continuance Commitment Scale Items
9. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up. (R)
10. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
11. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave my organization now.
12. It wouldn’t be too costly for me to leave my organization now. (R)
13. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
14. I feel that I have very few options to consider leaving this organization.
15. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.
16. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice—another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.

Normative Commitment Scale Items
17. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.
18. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.
19. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me. (R)
20. One of the major reasons I continue to work in this organization is that I believe loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.
21. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.
22. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.
23. Things were better in the days when people stayed in one organization for most of their careers.
24. I do not think that to be a ‘company man’ or ‘company woman’ is sensible anymore.

Note: (R) Reverse-coded item

Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (Long Form)

Teacher Beliefs

Directions: Hello dear teachers. Thank you for your time and cooperation in filling out this questionnaire. This questionnaire has been developed in 24 items to collect data on teachers’ sense of efficacy on a five-point Likert scale. Efficacy refers to people’s perception of personal ability to do things successfully. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.

Thanks again for your cooperation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>How much can you do to help your students think critically?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>How much can you do to help your students value learning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>How much can you do to foster student creativity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>How much can you do to keep a student who is disruptive or noisy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>How well can you keep a few problem students from ruining an entire lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>How well can you respond to defiant students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?

23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?

24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?

Teachers' Attitude toward Performance Evaluation

Principals (evaluators) have sufficient knowledge and skills to evaluate my performance.

Principals (evaluators) consider performance evaluation as a satisfactory experience for themselves.

Principals (evaluators) consider performance evaluation constructive and appropriate.

Principals (evaluators) evaluate performance based on merit and rules rather than based on favoritism and personal relations.

Principals (evaluators) have explained performance evaluation criteria to me and to my colleagues.

The quantity and quality of my work have been considered by principals (evaluators) during evaluation processes.

Principals (evaluators) have defined the objectives of evaluation to me and my colleagues.

Performance evaluation has helped me improve my strengths and correct my weaknesses.

Performance evaluation by the school principal has helped me observe workplace regulations and principles at school.

Performance evaluation has created a positive interaction between me and the school principal.

The performance score precisely represents my performance.

I have developed a sense of belonging and commitment to the organization.

The elements specified for the evaluation of teachers are fair.

Evaluation indices specified for the evaluation of teachers are targeted and precise.

Evaluation indices specified for the evaluation of teachers have led to improved performance and dynamism in me and my colleagues.