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ABSTRACT

Teachers experience a plethora of emotions relating to being evaluated and we are losing a lot of good teachers due to some of these emotions. The purpose of this phenomenological study was to investigate how teachers at one rural high school describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES as well as if there were gender differences in their responses. This research is important because teachers need to understand that their emotions are not taboo and they are not alone in the evaluation process. Additionally, evaluators benefit from knowing how teachers respond to evaluation so that they can better understand the evaluation process and how it impacts teachers. The results of this study revealed that teachers are still experiencing many of the same emotions as they did nearly 40 years and not a lot has changed. In this study I used observation notes, semi-structured interviews, and a focus group in order to gain a better understanding of the emotions teachers experience. Not only did I focus on the emotions teachers experience, I also sought to understand the experiences teachers had that led to their emotions. Among the participants in this study were 2 math teachers and 2 ELA teachers. Using feminist theory as a theoretical lens I found that the women in my study seemed to be impacted by evaluation more so than the men. Additionally the women in my study appeared to be more nervous when being evaluated and were less comfortable sharing their emotions than the men in my study. The limitations and recommendations for future research are included at the end of chapter 5.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Evaluation is a topic that almost everyone resonates with. Classroom evaluations can be taken very personally amongst teachers, especially if the evaluation has negative implications on the teachers and their effectiveness. Evaluation has undergone many changes throughout the years. Although previously a process developed at the local level, the state of Georgia recently implemented its own evaluation system called TKES (Teacher Keys Effectiveness System). TKES uses a Teacher Effectiveness Measure (TEM) to evaluate teacher effectiveness. Beginning in the 2016-2017 school year, a teacher’s TEM score is based on three components which include Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS), professional growth, and Student Growth Percentages (SGP) (GADOE, 2016).

While in a department meeting three years ago, the topic of teacher evaluation came up because of the upcoming implementation of TKES. During this meeting I observed teachers voicing their concerns about the various components outlined in TKES. As I sat back and listened, I noticed there was a powerful emotional response to the topic of evaluation. There was also a difference in the way female and male teachers responded to the upcoming changes. The male teachers appeared not to be phased by the upcoming changes. In fact, one male teacher said something to the extent of, “they can observe me when they want, I am not going to put on a dog and pony show for anyone” and another male teacher simply stated, “this too shall pass.” The female teachers on the other hand seemed to take the evaluation process much more personally and voiced concerns about how it would impact the way they teach as well as the added stress they would feel due to the need for extensive documentation. “There’s just not enough time” one teacher said. The female teachers also voiced concerns about being evaluated based on student progress and that they could not control what a student has or has not been taught prior to entering their classroom. Overall the women responded with nervousness, stress, and worry whereas the men displayed much more sedate responses. During the course of this meeting it struck me how much emotion was in
the room and I could not help but wonder if all male and female teachers respond to evaluation in the same way.

In order to better understand how teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation one must first know the purpose of evaluation. Evaluation can be used for many purposes. It can be used to improve teaching or serve as evidence in administrative decision-making regarding issues such as salaries and personnel decisions including layoffs, contracts, and tenure (Jensen, 1981; Toch, 2008). Although this may be the intent of evaluation, there are skeptics that question whether or not evaluation is instrumental in improving teaching. One skeptic is Glass. Glass (1975) writes that although evaluation can support teacher improvement, it can also hinder teacher improvement by stimulating defensiveness and distrust amongst teachers. Interestingly some principals said that it was not until No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was implemented that they were forced to take evaluations more seriously (Toch, 2008).

Teachers often complain about the evaluation process. Jensen’s (1981) study reveals 61% of teachers feel evaluations are done to judge their teaching abilities causing them to doubt their effectiveness. One chief complaint of teachers is that evaluators are often disconnected from the classroom and the teacher. Many evaluators have not been in the classroom for quite some time and do not know the teacher’s goals or teaching philosophy (Jensen, 1981). Another complaint of teachers is that evaluators do not spend enough time conducting the evaluation (Jensen, 1981; Toch, 2008). Nearly forty years later, in my 2018 study, the same complaints are being raised by teachers. Because evaluators are often far removed from the classroom setting and only get a small snap-shot view of what is going on in a teacher’s classroom, it is questionable as to whether or not their evaluations are fair or representative of a teacher’s abilities. Teachers also complain that student achievement, for which their teaching effectiveness is often measured, is influenced by many other factors that they do not have control of. For example, Darling-Hammond, et al. (2012) writes that student achievement is influenced by various school factors, their home and community, student needs, their peers, prior teachers, and the types of assessments used to measure their achievement (p. 2). School factors that influence student achievement can range
from the types of resources used in the classroom, the type of curriculum used, class sizes, and instructional time (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2012). Additionally, students come into the classroom with various levels of support and/or challenges. This can come from their home and community but it can also come from their individual needs as a student as well. Students have different levels of support from home in regards to the emphasis put on education as well as financial constraints that do not allow all families to provide their children with equitable resources. Not only that, but students have a large spectrum of ability levels and health conditions that may influence their academic success (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2012).

The studies above hint at the emotional responses teachers have to evaluation including defensiveness, distrust, self-doubt, and lack of self-efficacy (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2012; Glass, 1975; Jensen, 1981; Toch, 2008). Teachers are being held to high expectations yet they have little voice in terms of the students they teach or the evaluators that evaluate them. There is more to learn about teachers’ reactions and emotional responses to evaluation. The studies above also do not address whether or not there are differences in the emotional responses of male and female teachers. Additionally, these studies do not address power differentials that exist within the school culture. For example, teachers often feel vulnerable because their evaluation determines how good of a teacher they are. Many teachers struggle with a lack of efficacy in the classroom and struggle with being able to share their emotions for fear of being judged. The focus of my study was to describe how teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES.

Not only is it important to explain how teachers respond to evaluation, it is also important to understand why teachers feel the way they do about evaluation. Zembylas (2003b) writes that feminist studies “examine the role of culture, power, and ideology in creating emotion discourses; they highlight how teachers participate in this process by adopting or resisting these dominant discourses” (p. 109). This conceptualization of emotion is important to understand teachers’ emotional responses to evaluation because emotion is much more than a private experience (Zembylas, 2003b). Emotion is about power and
culture. It is about how teachers respond to the struggles they face and the culture of their students and their school. My study explored the emotions teachers described in response to teacher evaluation. In evaluation, there is an uneven distribution of power because some teachers feel as though they cannot openly discuss these emotions due to emotional rules set by social and cultural expectations. I focused my efforts using feminist theory to conduct a qualitative study using observation notes, a focus group, and semi-structured interviews.

Teachers, especially women, are bombarded with emotional rules that determine how they should feel and respond in certain situations (Zembylas, 2003a). This has an impact on the struggles teachers face in the context of teacher evaluation because they do not want to be viewed as weak and sometimes feel like they cannot express their emotions. Men also experience these emotional rules, however, women experience emotional rules differently. For example, women are often portrayed as nurturing, caring, and “too emotional” and because of this they are often excluded from certain positions of power (Zembylas, 2003a; Zembylas, 2006; Zembylas & Fendler, 2007). At the same time women can be viewed as weak and vulnerable when displaying emotions such as care, empathy and concern. Therefore, in order to escape becoming isolated or the focus of attention, women often submit to emotional rules, also called feeling rules that influence their teaching and regulate the emotions they display (Niesche & Haase, 2012; Zembylas, 2002; Zembylas, 2003b; Zembylas, 2006). These emotional rules are based on power relations as well as social and cultural expectations (Zembylas, 2003a). Social and cultural expectations determine which emotions are acceptable. Emotional rules change depending upon one’s geographic location as well as the culture of one’s school. There seems to be a double standard in terms of which emotions are considered acceptable and for whom they are acceptable. For example, men who express anger are often viewed as passionate about a topic or situation, whereas women who express the same level of emotion are often viewed as irrational or unstable (Hochschild, 1983). Teachers are faced daily with managing their emotions because some are considered acceptable and others are not. Many teachers do not want to be viewed as weak or incompetent and therefore regulate their emotions on a daily basis. In order to
better understand the emotions and experiences teachers are faced with, I used phenomenology and 
feminist theory to investigate how teachers describe their emotions pertaining to evaluation and if they 
follow the emotional rules that loom over them.

It is important to study teacher evaluation and how teachers describe their emotional responses to 
evaluation because emotion is not just a private problem but an expression of cultural norms and power 
(Zembylas, 2003b). In order to understand these responses, I conducted a study of one Georgia high 
school using a phenomenological approach. Phenomenological studies are often used when asking 
participants in a study to describe their experiences that lead how they react in certain situations 
(Merriam, 2009). Additionally, a phenomenological study enabled me to investigate how teachers 
describe their emotional responses to their current teaching situation and how they are evaluated before, 
during, and after the implementation of TKES. My study focused not only on how teachers describe their 
emotional responses to evaluation but also whether or not there are differences in these responses based 
on gender and how these differences are connected to the struggles teachers face in and out of the 
classroom.

I conducted a qualitative study using a phenomenological approach. Phenomenology emphasizes 
the lived experiences of participants in order to better understand their emotions (Merriam, 2009). To 
collect data, I used observation notes, a focus group, and semi-structured interviews. Details of how data 
were collected are provided in greater detail in chapter three. Building on Ezzy (2002) who contends that 
feminist methodologies emphasize experiences, my questions not only asked teachers how they feel about 
various issues but I also asked them to share their experiences in an effort to better understand their 
emotional responses and why they feel the way they do. The purpose of my research was to investigate 
how teachers describe their emotional responses to TKES evaluation. This is important because teachers’ 
emotional reactions and experiences are part of larger power dynamics but for this paper I only focused 
on teachers’ emotional responses to evaluation. How teachers respond to evaluation helps me better 
understand the ways power is distributed and/or how it operates in this particular school. Learning more
about what causes teachers to display various emotions can also help us better understand power
distribution in the school because it can make clear what impacts both positive and negative emotions to
be displayed. To do this, my research looked at the responses of teachers to see if their emotional
responses differ by gender and what experiences may have influenced the way they described their
emotions. To obtain this data I conducted a phenomenological study using a feminist lens. Some of the
core principles of feminism is that there are differences in assumed gender roles. Women are also viewed
as second class citizens by some and this can oppress women. As I detail later in this paper, although
women tend to work outside of the home much more often than in the past, most women still assume the
role as caretaker. This can add to the stress of teachers because so many are not only working in the
classroom but they also assume the caretaker role when at home. Teachers also experience a plethora of
emotions when they are evaluated on their effectiveness as a teacher. My study collected data at one
Georgia high school located in Tkesville, Georgia (pseudonym) to see how teachers emotionally respond
to teacher evaluation. This was appropriate for this study because in order to compare responses based on
gender I must have a population that contains approximately equal numbers of men and women.
Conducting this study using an elementary school would have been a limitation because of the higher
percentage of female teachers at the elementary level. Conducting a study using only one school as
opposed to collecting data from multiple schools increases the validity of this study. Although the
participants inevitably came from different backgrounds and different experiences, they also shared many
commonalities. Some of these commonalities include working in the same environment, working with
students of the same backgrounds and cultures, working under the same administration, having similar
opportunities for the same professional development, and having the same working expectations in the
classroom.

The reason this study is so important is because teachers need to understand that their emotions
are not taboo and they are not alone in the evaluation process. Additionally, evaluators benefit from
knowing how teachers respond to evaluation so that they can better understand the evaluation process and
how it impacts teachers. Teachers can be emotionally drained and are overburdened with tedious tasks (Golby, 1996; Zembylas, 2003a). Teachers can feel burnt out, stressed, and incompetent and these are some of the leading reasons why teachers leave the field of teaching (Golby, 1996; Savage, 2004; Zembylas, 2003a; Zembylas, 2003b). One example is that teachers often feel the pressure of getting lesson plans submitted, contacting parents, and improving test scores but for women there can be an added stress when deciding to have a family as well as maintaining a career. Women must factor in the time off they must take when having a baby for example. This ties in with feminism because one of the ideas I discuss later is how time is defined differently by gender. As teachers go through yet another evaluation system, it is helpful to understand how that system as well as evaluation as a whole makes them feel. The results of this study sheds light on the way teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES. This study can also help evaluators better understand the emotions teachers have in regards to the evaluation process before TKES, now, and the future of evaluation. Through this research and its focus on gender, stakeholders will be made more aware of the uneven distribution of power in the teaching profession, specifically in terms of evaluation and how teachers feel they can respond to evaluation. I would like to see if teachers feel they are able to share their emotions with their evaluator and whether or not they do so. Teachers are sometimes in a position where they are at the mercy of their administrators and their evaluator. For example, evaluators are who determines whether or not a teacher is effective or not and who determines whether or not a teacher receives a contract for the following school year. This can cause women to feel oppressed, which is a key component of feminism, because female teachers are often viewed as being too emotional and although not as common today, female teachers are sometimes excluded from certain positions of power such as various leadership positions in their schools (Zembylas, 2003a; Zembylas, 2006; Zembylas & Fendler, 2007). Women were sometimes excluded because they were viewed as being too emotional. For example, it was thought that women would have a difficult time refraining from showing negative emotions. Additionally, women often find themselves following emotional rules that essentially define
how they should respond based on social and cultural expectations (Niesche & Haase, 2012; Zembylas, 2002; Zembylas, 2003a; Zembylas, 2003b; Zembylas, 2006).

**Problem Statement**

This study sought to understand how teachers describe their emotional responses to TKES and whether or not there are differences in emotional responses between men and women teachers. As previously stated, teachers are leaving the teaching profession due to teacher burnout and stress. Zembylas (2003a) describes teachers as being emotionally exhausted and that teachers often feel powerless and lonely (p. 112). Additionally, Golby (1996) argues that teachers are overburdened with tedious tasks which is one of the leading causes of teacher burnout, stress, dissatisfaction, and disengagement from teaching (Zembylas, 2003a, p. 107-109).

Teachers also feel a lack of efficacy and competence due to the pressures placed on them by administration (Zembylas, 2003a). Teachers are overworked and have high expectations placed on them in regards to testing and student performance. Often times, teachers struggle with whether or not they are doing a good job. School policy, professional relationships, and the lack of teacher efficacy are emotionally laborious for teachers (Kelchtermans, 1996; Zembylas, 2003a, p. 110). Many teachers are reduced to managing student productivity and lack academic freedom in their classroom (Pinar, 2004, p. 27). Although teachers are faced with these same struggles on a daily basis and during the evaluation process, the way teachers describe their emotional responses to these obstacles can be different. For this reason, my study not only focused on how teachers describe their emotional responses but also whether or not their responses differ by gender.

Describing emotion can be very subjective and tends to be mostly associated with women because women are viewed as more emotional than men (Zembylas, 2003a, p. 104). Most of the research on emotion has been geared towards psychological fields rather than the field of education. We are told how women tend to be more emotional than men, but I wanted to better understand the emotional
differences of teachers. Teachers seem more stressed but how they express their emotions can be quite different. As I observed in a department meeting, the female teachers were much more expressive in terms of the added responsibilities and concerns they had, whereas the men in the room appeared not to be concerned at all. In this particular example, it appeared the women were more burdened with the need to feel like they are doing a good job. This is a key reason why teachers leave the field of teaching (Zembylas, 2003a, p. 113). Teacher stress is caused by several factors. Some of which include a lack of efficacy, expectations for high student performance, and time requirements of their job (Kelchtermans, 1996; Zembylas, 2003a). As I saw in my department meeting, just the idea of a new evaluation system caused the female teachers to anticipate the added stress they would face and the emotion in the room was very evident. If stress is one of the leading causes for teachers to leave the field of education, this topic was well worth researching further. Sadly, the field of education is losing good teachers and if we want to keep these good teachers from leaving the field, we need to put in the time and effort to understand how teachers describe their emotional responses to the changes being implemented. Conducting further research on how teachers respond to evaluation and the implementation of TKES supports evaluators in better understanding how teachers are impacted by evaluation and why teachers feel the way they do.

Research Questions

The following are the research questions I will focus on for this study. 1. How do teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES? 2. What if any are the differences in emotional responses between men and women teachers concerning TKES evaluations?

In this study I focused on the question of how a high stakes evaluation system impacts teachers emotionally. To answer this question I approached this study through a feminist lens. As I will discuss later in this paper, some of the core principles of feminism include differences in assumed gender roles, women being oppressed by feeling they must manage their emotions, and women being viewed as second class citizens. The use of feminist theory helped me understand emotional impacts and the demands of a high stakes evaluation system and how female and male teachers are impacted differently.
Importance of Study

Evaluation can be used to assure learning is taking place and that schools are effective in teaching their students. Likewise, evaluation can be used for teacher growth and pedagogical improvement (Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003). In order to adequately evaluate teachers, it is important to understand how teachers respond to the evaluation process and why they feel the way they do. Although there has previously been a lack of research on emotion, especially in education, we are now in the midst of the 3rd wave of research on teaching and emotions. This study served to add much needed knowledge to the field of education and curriculum studies and aimed to shed light on the evaluation process - especially teacher emotional responses. Emotional responses matter because teachers are burnt out at work and are stressed (Golby, 1996; Savage, 2004; Zembylas, 2003a; Zembylas, 2003b). These negative emotional responses often leave teachers feeling like failures and seeking work outside of the teaching profession (Golby, 1996; Savage, 2004). Because emotions are not just a private individual experience but socially and culturally constructed, understanding teachers’ emotional responses to evaluation is not just about understanding personal experiences but also political, social and cultural context of teacher evaluation. This study is informative to the administrators of the participants’ school but it also informs those at the state and national level who develop the evaluation process schools use.

In many cases, those who implement policies and procedures in education have either never been in the classroom or it has been a very long time since they have. I trust that they have good intentions but they are so far removed from the classroom and what teachers feel and deal with on a daily basis, it is difficult for mere people to make informed decisions about how teachers should be evaluated. The purpose in conducting a study using feminist theory is to inform stakeholders and policy makers about the struggles teachers experience and how evaluation impacts them emotionally. This study also shed light as to why the teaching profession is losing good teachers. For example, some of the struggles teachers face include stress, teacher burnout, and lack of teacher efficacy (Golby, 1996; Savage, 2004; Zembylas, 2003a; Zembylas, 2003b). Stress is a struggle for some teachers because of the added responsibilities
teaching brings to their lives. Feminist theory points out that women have responsibilities at home such as taking care of children and/or the household and the added stress of teaching and the implementation of a new high stakes evaluation system can leave teachers feeling vulnerable and burnt out. These are all things that most teachers struggle with and are some of the reasons the teaching profession is losing good teachers. A core principle of feminist theory is the oppression women face. Teachers, specifically women, do not feel they can share their emotions because they do not want to appear weak or unworthy of their position. Women as well as men are often faced with emotional rules that dictate how they should feel or respond in certain situations (Zembylas, 2003a). This study uses a feminist lens to see if there were differences in how male and female teachers described their experiences relating to evaluation as well as how male and female teachers react to evaluation because of the impacts and demands of high stakes evaluation systems. In order to keep good teachers from leaving the field, it is critical to put the time and effort into understanding how teachers describe their emotional responses to the changes being implemented in the way teachers are evaluated.

Although this study focused on the evaluation of teachers, evaluation is something everyone can relate to in some fashion. If you have ever held a job of any kind, you have been evaluated. If you have ever attended school, you have been evaluated. If you have ever played on a sports team, you have been evaluated. If you have ever visited a doctor’s office, you have been evaluated. The reality is that evaluation is a part of our everyday lives and it impacts people emotionally. For this reason, the results of this study aimed to aid in helping those involved in evaluating others understand how being evaluated makes a person feel.

Procedures

In order to collect data on the way teachers describe their emotions relating to teacher evaluation, I conducted a study using a phenomenological approach. I sought to better understand these emotional responses by understanding the experiences teachers share to describe their emotions as they relate to evaluation. In order to obtain a diverse group of teachers, I utilized a purposeful sample of male and
female teachers from a high school in Tkesville, Georgia. Teachers were selected to ensure a representation from a range of experience levels, content areas, age, and gender. These teachers participated in a focus group as well as individual semi-structured interviews. Interviews focused on evaluation before the implementation of TKES, TKES and their current situation, and the future of evaluation. A more detailed description of my data collection process can be found in the methods section of this paper.
Definition of Key Terms

Accountability:

Accountability refers to the expectations placed on teachers in terms of student achievement and meeting the standards set for in evaluation rubrics.

Education:

Education is “the action or process of teaching someone,” “a field of study that deals with the methods and problems of teaching” (Merriam-Webster’s online dictionary, n.d.).

Efficacy:

Efficacy refers to a teacher’s feeling of self-worth and/or effectiveness.

Emotion:

Emotions are influenced by other people’s expectations (Zembylas, 2003a). Emotions are also “considered to be processes involving multiple components arising from experiential, behavioral, and physiological systems” (Sutton, Mudrey-Camino, & Knight, 2009).

Emotional Rules:

Emotional Rules are defined by our emotions being controlled by what teachers can and cannot feel because of power relations and ideology (Zembylas, 2003a). Another term used is feeling rules which are defined what is considered socially acceptable (Zembylas, 2002).

Emotion work:

School Administrator:

For the purposes of my research, a school administrator includes principals and vice principals whom evaluate teachers.

Teacher (highly qualified):

A teacher is someone who is certified in their content area and teaches a group of students a list of state directed standards of that content.

Teacher Evaluation:

Teacher evaluation is a process by which teachers are evaluated using a rubric or evaluation system to determine the effectiveness of that teachers. Teacher evaluation also serves the purpose of improving teaching and as evidence needed in making administrative decisions (Jensen, 1981; Toch, 2008).

TKES (Teacher Keys Effectiveness System):

TKES is a Georgia evaluation system used to monitor teacher effectiveness, student achievement, and to maintain teacher accountability.
Chapter Summary

The recent implementation of TKES has sparked an interest in me to explore the emotions teachers describe relating to evaluation. Since the implementation of TKES, I have encountered numerous discussions where teachers shared their emotions about evaluation and this prompted me to question whether or not other teachers felt the same way and the experiences that led to these emotions. As summarized above, a phenomenological study best served my study because in order to understand the emotions teachers describe, it was also important for me to answer the question of why they have those emotions in the first place. What are the experiences that lead up to those described emotions? It was important for me to understand the power struggles teachers face and how these power struggles including unwritten emotional rules influence teacher emotion. These power struggles shed light on how teachers describe their emotion and whether or not there are gendered differences in their responses. Although this topic can be very broad, I focused primarily on how teachers describe their emotional responses to TKES and the differences in emotional responses between men and women teachers. Before collecting my own data, I reviewed literature which gave me insight to prior research relating to teacher emotion, changes in evaluation, and the emotions teachers describe concerning evaluation.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

My purpose was to explore how teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES. To inform my study, I reviewed literature on teacher emotion and emotional responses related to evaluation. Much of my study refers back to Jensen’s 1981 study which includes several teacher interviews describing their experiences in evaluation. Although this study is dated, it did a great job expanding on specific emotions teachers experience throughout the evaluation process. Additionally, the emotions described in this study are also described in several other studies which I make note of. In this section I define feminist theory as the framework for my study and also provide a brief review of literature on emotion. I then provide an overview of the history of teacher evaluation followed by identifying the purpose of teacher evaluation and teacher responses described in previous studies on teacher evaluation. As I review these studies I also focus on the emotions teachers display regarding evaluation and the evaluation process. My study builds off of these studies to describe the emotions teachers feel and how evaluation and the implementation of TKES plays a role in teacher emotion.

Evaluation has gone through a series of changes in how teacher effectiveness is measured. From the Progressive era where teachers were evaluated based on appearance and helpfulness to the push of NCLB where the focus shifted to teacher effectiveness ultimately being measured on student achievement and test scores. As these changes have taken place throughout history, teachers have become more and more accountable for student achievement and feelings of stress, self-efficacy, amongst other things has impacted teacher emotion.

Looking back to the department meeting where teachers expressed their emotions regarding the implementation of TKES, I recall the female teachers expressing their emotions in a much different way than the male teachers in the room. The emotions the male and female teachers experienced were also different. Male teachers were more annoyed that it was another hoop to jump through but had a very
passive attitude in terms of how they felt about being evaluated in general. To them it was just something that had to be done and they were not going to put more work on themselves because of it. Female teachers on the other hand were much more concerned about the results of their evaluations and they showed negative emotions of being stressed and frustrated about what the new evaluation system would mean for them. In a sense they were concerned about their ability to validate their professional identity and themselves as effective teachers. It was this meeting that prompted my desire to research teacher evaluation and whether or not there was a gender difference in the way teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implications of these differences for educators. If women feel so differently about evaluation, I want to know why they feel like this and how these emotions impact their work as educators. In order to analyze if women are impacted emotionally in ways that differ from men, I used feminist theory as my theoretical lens to analyze the data that I collected. I begin by defining feminist theory and articulating the conceptualization of emotion utilized in this study.

**Theoretical Framework – Feminist Theory**

Acker (1987) defines feminist theory as addressing “the question of women’s subordination to men: how this arose, how and why it is perpetual, how it might be changed and (sometimes) what life would be like without it” (p. 421). She goes on to say that “feminist theories serve a dual purpose, as guides to understanding gender inequality and as guides to action” (Acker, 1987, p. 421). Swirsky & Angelone (2016) refer to this as a social imbalance between men and women. This social imbalance is referred to as patriarchy. “Patriarchy describes the lack of social power that leads to the subordination and oppression of women” (Swirsky & Angelone, 2016, p. 445). Jackson (1997) defines feminist theory in a multitude of ways. She builds these ideas from work done by Welch (1994), Weiner (1994), Weiler (1991), Acker (1994), Ellsworth (1989), Humm (1991), Giroux (1992), and others. First, feminist theory as summarized by Jackson (1997) is characterized by (1) questioning one’s role, (2) determining differences, and (3) investigating one’s experiences.
Before moving onto the different schools of feminism, it is also important to realize that feminism has changed over time. There have been three waves of feminism that have been discussed in research. First-wave feminism took place during the 19th and early 20th century. This is a time when women were fighting for equal rights including but not limited to property rights and the right to vote. During this time women’s primary role was in the home as a wife and a mother. According to Hughes (2002), “first-wave feminists did not question the sanctity of motherhood but assumed this was a woman’s natural calling” (p. 46-47). It was not until the second-wave that a woman’s role in the work place was taken more seriously. Second-wave feminism took place during the 1960s to the 1980s. During this time period, feminism focused on family and reproduction, sexuality, and the workplace. A focus was on women’s oppression or subordination due to their financial dependence as well as their responsibilities as home-makers and mothers (Hughes, 2002). Working at home for some women was very isolating and some women suffered from depression because of it. Also during this time there were issues with marginalization amongst women. The normative meaning of women was that of being white and middle class (Hughes, 2002). Black women as well as lesbians felt marginalized not just by society but by other women as well (Rich, 2007). Later during second-wave feminism, women were fighting for equal rights and equal pay for equal work in the work place. Third-wave feminism began in the 1990s. During this wave there has been a shift in a woman’s role. More and more women are working than ever before. Although there is still a fight going on for women’s rights and equality, there is also a focus was on gender equality and femininity (Rich, 2007).

Feminist theory includes several different schools of thought. When defining feminist theory, Acker (1987) identifies three main theoretical frameworks that fall under the umbrella of feminist theory. These include liberal, socialist (Marxist), and radical feminists. Liberal feminists identify with “concepts of equal opportunities, socialization, sex roles and discrimination” and are less likely to “confront power and patriarchy” (Acker, 1987, p. 419). Liberal feminists believe liberation can be achieved without altercation (Acker, 1987). The main goal of a liberal feminist is to “remove barriers,” such as “individual
psyche” or other barriers in the school that prevent women from “reaching their full potential” and to secure equality among men and women (Acker, 1987, p. 423). Socialist feminists on the other hand focus on “gender divisions under capitalism” and that in order for women to be liberated class, race, and gender oppression must be eliminated (Acker, 1987, p. 419 & 423). They tend to put an emphasis on the positions women hold at work and within their family. Lastly, radical feminists according focus on “male monopolization of knowledge and culture and on sexual politics in schools” (Acker, 1987, p. 419). Some argue that radical feminism can lead to gender oppression and exploitation ultimately portraying “women as the inevitable victim of evil men” and that “men hold power over women through control of sexuality and the threat of violence” (Acker, 1987, p. 421-422). Because this study is focused predominantly on how the experiences of men and women differ, the liberal tradition of feminist theory informs this study more so than the socialist/Marxist or the radical traditions of feminism.

Although there are three main theoretical frameworks associated with feminist research, “The feminist movement works to end the social dominance of women and supports gender equality” (Swirsky & Angelone, 2016, p. 445). Although there have been gains over the last several years, gender inequality is still a concern (Swirsky & Angelone, 2016; Hilpert, Husman, & Carrion, 2014; Ragins & Winkel, 2011). In order to better understand feminist theory I will explain the core concepts of feminist theory and how it focuses on gender. For example, Marshall (1988) writes, “Feminism insists on the recognition that subjective identity is also constructed as masculine or feminine” (p. 209). Some of the core concepts I discuss include differences in assumed gender roles, women being oppressed because some women become reliant on men to provide for them, women being viewed as second class citizens, and differences in time as it relates to men and women (Hughes, 2002; Jackson, 1997; Marshall, 1988; and Rich, 2007).

The first core principle of feminist theory focuses on the roles which women are most widely associated with. To better illustrate this concept, below you will find a summary of ideas from Hughes (2002), Jackson (1997), Marshall (1988), Hilpert, Husman, & Carrion (2014), and Ragins & Winkel (2011). From an early age, many women learn that they are expected to put others first and have taken on
the role of care givers (Jackson, 1997 & Hughes, 2002). Women are viewed as being more caring and tend to take on jobs in the service industry. They also tend to fill more part time and lower status jobs than men (Hughes, 2002). According to the 2012 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, “women earn about 18% less than men and are less likely to be employed in higher paying fields such as computer science and engineering” (as cited in Swirsky & Angelone, 2016, p. 446). Hilpert, Husman, & Carrion (2014) also addressed this as a concern in their 2014 study indicating there is a “shortage of women in science-related fields,” especially engineering. The 2013 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reflects that in 2012 only 13.7% of employed engineers were women (Hilpert, Husman, & Carrion, 2014). In addition to science related fields, Ragins & Winkel (2011) state that women are “underrepresented in leadership positions” (p. 377). Although women are just as capable and just as intellectual as men, they sometimes feel forced to make a decision as to whether they will stay at home and have babies or go to work (Hughes, 2002 & Marshall, 1988). This is not as common today with more and more women entering the workforce as well as having children. Some women who are financially able often choose to stay home because men tend to take on higher positions at work and tend to make more money (Hughes, 2002 & Marshall, 1988). Traditionally men end up going into the workforce and women left the workforce to stay home and raise children (Marshall, 1988). While this pattern is no longer predominant, the social expectations of these traditional roles still inform cultural expectations. Previously, women were often tasked with the responsibility of domestic chores and caring for the family (Hughes, 2002). It is important to note though that in our current time this traditional pattern is an expectation and is only possible for a small percentage of wealthy families.

This brings me to the second core principle of feminist theory which is that women are often viewed as second class citizens and some are faced with oppression because some women become reliant on someone else to provide for them. This concept will be explained by summarizing ideas from Hughes (2002), Jackson (1997), Marshall (1988) and Rich (2007). The reality is that women live in a patriarchal world where male domination is found in the home and in society (Rich, 2007). As a result, in the past
women were often deemed second-class citizens in terms of how they were viewed in society and although all women were not married, many who were married were financially dependent on their husbands to provide for them while they stayed home with their children. Hughes (2002) describes some women as falling into depression because of the isolation they felt in taking care of the home and young children. Although this does occur, this is not true of all women or all stay-at-home moms and this is not as common today. In the past very few women held high positions in society and some fell into the patterns of male domination and women’s subordination (Hughes, 2002; Marshall, 1988). In some cases women were reliant on the male to be the breadwinner and to take care of the family financially while they stayed at home to take care of children (Hughes, 2002; Jackson, 1997). Additionally, men often took on higher positions of power in our nation and in the corporations meaning women sometimes felt they were also dominated outside of the home as well by the men who made the rules in our society as well as at their jobs. It was not uncommon in the past for women to feel like an object. For example, Jackson (1997) builds on the ideas of Paulo Freire saying that men are illustrated using “the image of the bow and rifle”, whereas women are illustrated “making a decorative vase from clay.” Women were viewed as weak and in this patriarchal society, men were viewed as “master, hero, brute and pimp” who “do not cherish women, but rather use them to satisfy their physical longings” (Rich, 2007). Rich (2007) describes women as being subservient to men and that “the biological family is an inherently unequal power distribution” because of this reliance (p. 21-22). Although not as common today, some women are still being marginalized and not treated as equals and are being pushed into a secondary status in the labor force because they are taking on a domestic role instead (Marshall, 1988). Bear in mind, Marshall’s writings are from the 1980’s and although these ideas are not as prevalent today, these ideas were still central to feminist theory during that time. More currently, Swirsky & Angelone (2016) state that in their study on equality, empowerment, and choice, only 21% of women identified themselves as a feminist. It appears that “feminism may be more relevant to those with acute awareness of patriarchy in everyday life,
thus empowering them to take a stand” (Swirsky & Angelone, 2016, p. 447). In other words, if women do not feel a direct impact of patriarchy they are less likely to feel the need to do anything about it.

Although not a core principle of feminist theory, another important idea pertains to the passing of time and how its meaning differs from men and women. I feel it is a noteworthy topic because in my department meeting the women were much more stressed about the implementation of TKES than the men and one of their major concerns was the added responsibilities and the amount of time they would have to spend ensuring they had proper documentation. It made me question why the responses of men and women differed and why the men were not as concerned with time related issues. The concept of time will be explained by summarizing ideas from Hughes (2002) and Hilpert, Husman, & Carrion (2014). Hughes (2002) describes that time as it refers to men can be described as linear clock time, whereas with women, it is described as “cyclical, reproductive time” (p. 133). The reason I found this to be a noteworthy topic is because the differences in how time is defined goes hand in hand with women taking on the role as care givers and the oppression women often face because of it. Hughes (2002) argues that it is the responsibilities of care placed on women that require them to be more flexible with their time and this “contributes to the subordination and oppression of women” (p. 136). Female time is not described as clock time as it is with males because a woman’s time is much more fragmented. Women must make decisions on when having children is appropriate, take off work to have children, and provide care to the children once they are born. They must remain accessible to their children as care givers. Men on the other hand tend to take on a full-time job where their work is continuous and their pay is continuous. In a more recent study by Hilpert, Husman, & Carrion (2014), they found that young professional women continue to focus on the balance between their career and family in ways that young professional men do not. This plays out in teachers lives as well.

I can see these principles play out in my own life through some of my personal experiences. For example, I was recently on maternity leave and regardless of whether or not I wanted to stay home I was not given a choice because of the medical nature of having children. I had to take off periodically for
doctor’s appointments as well as for the birth of our child. It is interesting that the female has to take off of work but for the male it is optional. It was certainly nice to be home with my little one but it definitely caused a disruption in time in terms of my day to day functions and my job. It was I who had to wake up in the middle of the night and I who took my daily shower based on when my baby was down for a nap. Although my husband was a big help, it was at his convenience. Ultimately the responsibility fell upon me. The role of care giver was me and he was the one who continued to work and support us. There were definitely times I felt isolated.

So what does this mean for my study? In my study, I want to see how teacher responses to teacher evaluation differ in terms of gender. How are teachers emotionally impacted by evaluation and does this impact differ based on gender? Also, what is the significance of these differences? Women are portrayed as care givers and typically emotion is considered feminine rather than masculine but according to Zembylas (2006), teachers must control their emotions based on so-called emotional rules. Although women are viewed as nurturing and emotional, women must be cautious about which emotions they display in the work place if they do not want to be viewed as weak (Zembylas, 2003a & Niesche & Haase, 2012). Feminist theory is appropriate for my study because feminist theory focuses on gender, specifically women, and how people are oppressed, and the power dynamics people face because of their gender (Merriam, 2009). In the case of my study, female teachers are not oppressed in terms of being told they cannot share their emotions, however, they is a degree of subordination that takes place between a teacher and their evaluator.

According to Ezzy (2002), feminist methodologists also focus on experience. In my study I asked teachers to describe their emotions regarding teacher evaluation but I also asked them to share specific experiences that led to their emotional response. In reviewing these responses I sought to determine if there were differences in the way male and female teachers respond to teacher evaluation. Understanding these differences can help evaluators better understand teachers and how their experiences impact them as teachers and how evaluation impacts how teachers feel about themselves.
Essentially, although men and women feel various emotions in public, it is sometimes difficult to identify them. We are confronted daily with emotions but typically control them. A cultural assumption is that women school teachers are emotional and suited for caring and nurturing. In the end, we understand other people’s emotions by first understanding and remembering our own (Zembylas, 2003a, p. 120). Our emotions are impacted by culture but also the expectations of those around us (Zembylas, 2003a). Emotion regulation defines this process as the attempt to modify one’s emotions (Sutton, Mudrey-Camino, & Knight, 2009). How one chooses to regulate their emotions is based on the emotional rules accepted by one’s culture, ideology, and power relations (Zembylas, 2003b; Zembylas, 2002). Emotional rules are defined by our emotions being controlled by what teachers can and cannot feel and these emotional rules are defined by what is considered socially acceptable (Zembylas, 2003a & 2002). Each culture determines what emotions are considered normal and emotional rules are very specific to one’s culture. These norms influence how one expresses their emotions and how they respond to others (Boler, 1999; Zembylas, 2006; Cukur, 2009). Building on the ideas of feminist theory, I focused on how teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and I sought to better understand potential power dynamics teachers face because of the evaluation process and the implementation of TKES.

Although emotional rules impact all teachers, women are impacted differently than men due to the societal and cultural stereotypes of women. For example, women are often viewed as nurturing and more emotional than men (Zembylas, 2003a). Additionally, women tend to be viewed as caregivers and when women do express forms of frustration, they are accused of being irrational (Zembylas & Fendler, 2007; Boler, 1999; Blackmore, 2004). Because of this, women often try to hide their negative emotions in an attempt to avoid being labeled as irrational. Approaching this study through a feminist lens helped me to better understand the responses of female teachers and how they feel about evaluation so that we can better understand the emotional impact it has on them and how they feel about themselves in terms of self-efficacy.
Defining Emotion

Emotions are not private and teachers exhibit a plethora of emotions which are stimulated by people, values, and ideas (Zembylas, 2003b, p. 111; Nias, 1996, p. 293; Boler, 1997, p. 222). So what is emotion anyway? Burkitt (1997) defines emotion as an inner process that can be seen outwardly through an individual. Western Culture defines emotion as an individual thing that is a “repository of the self” (Savage, 2004, p. 26). Rosaldo (1984) defines emotion as “thoughts somehow felt in flushes, pulses, movements of our livers, minds, hearts, stomachs, [and] skin” (p. 43). As one can see, emotion can be defined in a multitude of ways but to define emotion as merely words would be inadequate. Leavitt (1996) goes on to say that emotions include feelings, not just an interpretation of how one feels (p. 522-523). Feelings then are an inward experience and emotion is the outward response of how a person reacts to a situation. For example, feelings may include someone feeling sad and because of this sadness an emotion such as crying may occur.

Zembylas (2006) writes that emotions can be positive or negative and are constructed through social-cultural conditions (p. 251). Averill (1986) writes that emotions are influenced by social roles and how we respond to certain emotions varies according to the situation (p. 100). Building off of these different ideas, emotions can be more thoroughly defined as positive and negative feelings that are felt inwardly but can also be seen outwardly and that can be influenced by one’s social role and/or current situation (Averill, 1986; Berkitt, 1997; Leavitt, 1996; Rosaldo, 1984; & Zembylas, 2006). One’s culture can determine which emotions are acceptable when and for whom. Some emotions are deemed acceptable while others are considered disturbing or shocking (Gerhards, 1989). Culture “refers to the collective attitudes, meanings, and beliefs” of a particular group (Zembylas, 2006, p. 252). For teachers, this could impact the ways in which emotions are expressed in the school.
Defining Emotional Rules

In terms of education, “education is an environment governed by rules of power and authority” (Boler, 1999, p. 4). Because of these power relations and ideologies, teachers are expected to control their emotions so that they are not viewed as weak, irrational, vulnerable, and inferior in the workplace (Niesche & Haase, 2012; Zembylas, 2002). In the classroom, most teachers submit to unwritten emotional rules to keep from being viewed as eccentric or unprofessional. Emotional rules influence how people respond to their emotions based on societal norms and expectations (Zembylas, 2003a). In other words we are careful who we show our emotions to. We tend to hide our emotions when we think we will be viewed in a negative way. In some cases, these emotional rules promote emotional responses and in other cases, emotional responses are denied (Zembylas, 2006, p. 252, 256). To keep from drawing negative attention to themselves, many teachers end up adhering to these unspoken emotional rules and hide their emotions in order to stay off the radar (Zembylas, 2003b; Zembylas & Fendler, 2007; Zembylas, 2006; Cukur, 2009). In an attempt to keep from appearing too kind, too calm, too anxious, or too angry, some teachers attempt to disguise their emotions (Zembylas, 2006, p. 254). Boler (1999) calls this management of emotions as a way of identifying what norms are acceptable in a particular population (Boler, 1999). The norms determined are different depending on the setting one is in. In and out of the classroom, teachers are required to self-police themselves (Boler, 1999, p. 31-32). This is also called emotion regulation (Zembylas, 2006). To do this, teacher use the norms around them to “transform” themselves to fit the mold of the cultural expectations around them (Zembylas, 2003b). Teachers are expected to express emotions of “empathy, calmness, and kindness” and must control emotions such as “anger, anxiety, and vulnerability” (Zembylas 2002, 200-201).

These norms also vary from culture to culture. Boler (1999) describes the Aristotelian view of emotions which says there is a right time and right way to express one’s emotions. If one is emotionally deviant and does not control their emotions, they run the risk of getting negative attention (Cukur, 2009; Zembylas, 2003b). Foucault (1995) says that we use the norms around us to manage ourselves in an
attempt to make ourselves look perfect. Mestrovic (1997) refers to this as McDonaldizing emotion because society only wants to see the “happy meal” of emotions where negative emotions are avoided and happy emotions are promoted (p. xi). This is not the case with all teachers. There are some teachers who ignore the emotional rules set by societal norms.

So how do these power dynamics apply to feminism? Certain emotions tend to be acceptable because they are believed to be appropriate for a specific gender. Niesche & Haase (2012) write that a good leader is someone who can manage or hide their emotions (p. 276). In order to be an effective leader, one must respond to daily challenges without letting their emotions be visible to others. One might be screaming on the inside but on the outside they appear to be cool, calm, and collected. Women are often seen as weak if they display their emotions in a professional environment (Niesche & Haase, 2012, p. 285). Because of this, women are sometimes excluded from certain positions in society giving men more privileges (Zembylas, 2003a, p. 118). Women are viewed as the “virtuous mother/schoolteachers” and not as leaders (Boler, 1999, p. xxii).

Foucault (2000) argues that we must be able to manage our own emotions before we can manage others. Emotion work is the act of self-management of emotions (Savage, 2004, p. 25; Cukur, 2009, p. 560). In education, negative emotions such as a lack of teacher efficacy, stress, and teacher burnout are becoming more and more prevalent and in some cases causes teachers to want to leave the field of education (Savage, 2004; Zembylas, 2003a; Zembylas, 2006). Many teachers are often on guard and try to please their administrations and those evaluating them. Because of the power struggles outlined throughout this paper and the emotions felt specifically by women, my research is framed using a feminist lens. Feminist theory informs my study because men and women both experience emotion as it relates to teacher evaluation and in this study I aimed to determine whether or men and women were impacted differently by evaluation. In order to better understand the current evaluation system and how the evaluation process impacts teachers and their emotions, the following section provides a brief history of
History of Teacher Evaluation

Evaluation is not a new concept in the world of education. Evaluating teachers dates back to the 1700s although during this time education was not as big of a concern. During this period, clergy members were responsible for hiring teachers and judging their teaching (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). Because there was no defined agreement as to what a teacher of expertise had, teacher quality as well as the feedback given to teachers was not consistent (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011).

The 1800s marked the common school movement in the United States and the need for qualified teachers grew. In Horace Mann’s 1840 report, he stated that teachers required five qualifications in the common school. These qualifications included having a “perfect” knowledge of content, an aptitude for teaching, good classroom management, and the ability to teach students good behavior and morals while modeling those same attributes (Spring, 2007, p. 144). Unlike the 1700s, clergy members were not considered to be suitable for the role of evaluating teachers. Instead evaluators were county superintendents who traveled within the county to observe teachers. These superintendents needed to have teaching skills as well as content area knowledge so that they could make more informed decisions about teachers (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011).

During the Progressive Era (1890-1950), character education was a big priority (Fraser, 2001). During this time, John Dewey, often called the “father of progressive education,” felt students needed to “practice citizenship and further develop the ideals of democracy” (Fraser, 2001, p. 233; Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011, p. 14). The Search for Great Teachers is an evaluation system that dates back to 1896. According to McNerney & Imig (2013), the top two characteristics believed to make a good teacher were helpfulness and personal appearance. Unfortunately, the correlation of teacher characteristics did not have a connection with student learning or achievement tests and evaluation
seemed to be in place more to help administrators determine whose contract would be renewed rather than it being linked to achievement (McNergney & Imig, 2013; Buttram & Wilson, 1987).

During the early part of the 1900s, Frederick Taylor was a key figure during a period of scientific management. Taylor’s focus was to prepare students for the factory in an effort to improve production (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). In 1916, Ellwood Cubberley published his book “Public School Administration.” Schools were increasingly viewed from a ‘factory mindset.’ Instead of producing goods, schools were to ‘produce’ workers. Cubberley (1916) defined a measurement system to judge teacher performance which “emphasized measurement and analysis of data” and also outlined how feedback could be given to teachers using an A to F scale (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011, p. 14).

Another key figure during this period was William Wetzel. Wetzel emphasized measuring “student learning to determine the effectiveness of a teacher or school” (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011, p. 15). Wetzel chose to measure teacher performance by reviewing their teaching strategies and behaviors in the classroom. In order to do this he emphasized three components to his evaluation process including aptitude tests to measure student ability, “measurable objectives for each course, and the use of reliable measures of student learning” (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011, p. 15).

The Cold War Era (1950-1970) was famous for the 1957 launch of Sputnik. This changed education because the United States became concerned about staying ahead of the Soviet Union. As a result, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) was passed in 1958. NDEA focused on supporting school curriculum and scientific research and gave state and local communities control of public education with the assistance of federally funded education programs (Fraser, 2001). Eisenhower recommended federal funds be given to states for the improvement of testing, guidance, and counseling programs, the hiring of qualified science and math teachers, and the purchase of equipment and materials (Spring, 2007, p. 369-370). Although there is not a relationship to teacher evaluation, it is also interesting to note that during this period civil rights, integration, and school reform were taking place after the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision which made racial segregation in public schools unconstitutional.
(Fraser, 2001). Up until this point, teachers were judged primarily on personal appearance and helpfulness (McNergney & Imig, 2013). Evaluation of teachers shifted from teacher helpfulness and appearance to choosing teachers who were more qualified. During the Cold War Era, teacher performance was measured on observable behaviors and student outcomes in an effort to compete with other countries and the advancement of scientific research (Ellett & Teddlie, 2003). Evaluations during this period were typically only done once or twice a year and were more of a snap shot visit where an evaluator completed a checklist observation (Peterson, 2004). Interestingly, this is one of the chief complaints outlined earlier in this paper by Jensen (1981) and Toch (2008).

The late 1960s and early 1970s marked an era for clinical supervision of teachers. Robert Goldhammer (1969) developed a five-phase process that put a lot of emphasis on reflection amongst teachers and their supervisors (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). Phase one included a pre-observation conference where an observation would be planned, phase two included a classroom observation, phase three included analysis where data was used to help teachers, phase four included a supervision conference where the teacher and supervisor met to discuss the results of their observation, and phase five included an analysis of the analysis where the evaluator was examined rather than the teacher (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). Unfortunately, after time these phases seemed to dissipate in the evaluation process and instead of being productive steps, they became a mere checklist to get through.

Another model for evaluation included the Hunter Model which was developed by Madeline Hunter during the 1980s. Her model included a seven-step framework and put a big emphasis on professional development as a means to improve teaching practice. Her model included an anticipatory set for students, outlining the objective and purpose of the lesson, input, modeling of content, checking for understanding where students were expected to show their understanding by completing a task, guided practice, and independent practice (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). Evaluators observed teachers and used script taping to determine teacher excellence.
During the 1980s and 1990s, teacher evaluation systems shifted their focus to the improvement of teacher quality (Darling-Hammond, 1990). A model introduced in the 1980s was Differentiated Supervision, introduced by William Glatthorn (1984). He emphasized teacher choice regarding their professional development. Essentially, professional development would be differentiated based on individual teacher needs (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). Also during this time, “A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform” was published in 1983 saying that schools were not producing quality students (Fraser, 2001). During the 1980s, the RAND group also conducted a study to determine problems with supervision. In their report, “Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices,” they found four primary problems in the evaluation process of teachers. These problems included that teachers felt principals lacked competence, teacher resistance to evaluation, lack of consistence in the evaluation process, and evaluators not having adequate training (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). Another model introduced during this time was Charlotte Danielson’s Danielson Model in 1996. In her model she emphasized four domains including, “planning and preparation, the classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities” and within these domains a total of 76 elements were used to show evidence of accomplishment within each domain (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). Danielson’s intention behind this model was “to honor the complexity of teaching,” encourage professional communication, and to provide “a structure for self-assessment and reflection on professional practice” (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011, p. 24). In this model, teacher performance was rated using four levels which included unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished.

Many of the prior supervision models appeared to be more of a checklist observation with high hopes of improving teacher performance but they ended up losing effectiveness. Observations were not enough to show teacher effectiveness. This brings us to the No Child Left Behind era (2001 – 2009). No Child Left Behind (NCLB) put a focus on testing to show student progress and achievement and became a means to not only hold schools accountable but also put an emphasis on reading and math (Fraser, 2001). Schools were given the daunting task of bringing proficiency levels up to 100% in only ten years (Fraser,
Standardized testing became a formal part of evaluating teachers and was implemented to monitor teachers and schools as a way to hold them accountable for their students’ progress. After NCLB passed in 2001, evaluation became more crucial and put a higher demand on having highly qualified teachers (Hazi & Rucinski, 2009). During this time highly qualified meant that teachers could pass a content area based test called the Praxis. Data collection, teacher and evaluator training, and defining teacher quality became essential to ensuring highly qualified teachers (Hazi & Rucinski, 2009). NCLB required proficiency in English/Language Arts and Math and highly qualified teachers.

Currently, there is no single approach to teacher evaluation nationwide. The process of evaluation procedures has been left to state and local levels to decide. My focus as I move into more recent evaluation systems is to describe changes in Georgia and not necessarily nationwide. In 2009, a standards based evaluation system was announced which would be funded with Georgia’s Race to the Top grants (McGuinn, 2012; Odden, 2004). The focus shifted from teachers being qualified, or content area experts, to teachers being effective, requiring the collection of multiple data sources including scoring rubrics, teaching standards, and an opportunity for professional development (Odden, 2004). Some issues with this system included the lack of time to adequately train evaluators and achievement data was not available for all teachers because most teachers do not teach state tested courses (McGuinn, 2012). Not all teachers were held to the same standards regarding testing. For example, at this time standardized tests were given to only some grade levels prior to high school. Additionally, at the high school level tests were given to core content areas but not necessarily in every grade. This created inequitable evaluation because not every teacher would have students taking a state mandated standardized test. Other than student pass/fail rates, which could easily be skewed by teachers, these teachers could look good on a checklist evaluation and could very well possibly be a bad teacher. Another issue with this evaluation system is that teachers were rated in most cases using a checklist evaluation where they were rated with either a satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating. There was not an in-
between and teachers often did not know where they needed to improve unless they were deemed unsatisfactory. This was a broken system that needed improvement.

This brings us to the most current evaluation system, the Georgia Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES), which was implemented in 2012 (GADOE, 2016). Because my study focuses on the emotional responses to TKES, I felt it was necessary to expand on the TKES system more extensively. TKES uses a Teacher Effectiveness Measure (TEM) to evaluate teacher effectiveness. Even since its initial implementation, how a teacher’s TEM score is derived has changed. This change took place at the start of the 2016-2017 school year. A teacher’s TEM score is now derived using Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS) (50%), professional growth (20%), and Student Growth Percentages (SGP) (30%) (GADOE, 2016). Each of these components will be described more thoroughly later in this section. According to the Georgia DOE’s TKES Implementation Handbook, a teacher’s TAPS are measured using ten performance standards that are rated using various observations throughout the school year. Observations previously included four walkthrough observations and two formative observations but now the number of observations required is determined by whether or not a teacher is a highly effective teacher and how new they are to the teaching profession and school system. A teacher with three or less years of teaching experience, teachers on a non-renewable certificate, teachers who recently changed their field of certification or who have been out of the profession for longer than a year, or teachers who have received inadequate evaluation results previously will be on the full formative assessment process which includes four formative observations and two summative observations. Teachers with prior proficient ratings and/or veteran teachers are on the flexible evaluation process. For these teachers, there is a minimum of two classroom observations required. It is recommended that they receive at least one walkthrough observation and one formative observation but the type of observations received are determined by the LEA (Local Education Agency). Additionally, these observations are used to inform a Summative Performance Evaluation at the end of the year. Although all ten performance standards may not be rated on walkthrough observations, all ten standards should be rated on the two
formative observations and the end of year summative performance evaluation. In addition to observations, teachers are also given the opportunity to upload documentation to show evidence of meeting each of the ten performance standards. Documentation can be uploaded at any time to the TLE Electronic Platform which is where evaluation documentation is housed.

The ten TKES standards used to evaluate teacher effectiveness are grouped into five domains. The five domains include planning, instructional delivery, assessment of and for learning, learning environment, and professionalism and communication. See Appendix A for a detailed description of these standards. Each of these standards are designed to rate teachers and their overall effectiveness but this is only one component of TKES. The second component of TKES is professional growth. This was previously student surveys of instructional practice but these student surveys were not optional and were later removed as a requirement of TKES. Professional growth is determined by measuring progress of growth goals. To do so, teachers have professional learning goals and learning plans.

The last component of TKES is based on Student Growth Percentages (SGP) and LEA (Local Education Agency) determined measures. SGP’s apply only to teachers who teach state mandated tested subjects. State assessment data is used to determine a student’s SGP by comparing their state mandated test scores to those of students who scored in the same brackets on previous state tests. For teachers teaching non-tested subject areas, they are assessed based on SLO (Student Learning Objective) measures or other measures determined by the LEA. A SLO is a test that is developed and/or approved by the DOE. Growth measures are determined based on a pre-SLO test which students take at the beginning of the school year and the post-SLO test taken at the end of the school year. For teachers teaching both state tested and non-tested subjects, their student growth will be based on a combined measure. It is important to note that the SLO test is not a requirement and in the school where my study will take place, they do not use a SLO test to determine student growth.
Teacher effectiveness is rated using a rubric which includes four levels. These ratings are done for walkthrough and formative observations and are ultimately compiled to come up with a summative assessment at the end. Not only are teachers rated on a level of one through four, they are also provided with feedback that promotes professional growth by telling them where their strengths are and where they can improve. Conferencing is another way teachers obtain feedback and where they are given an opportunity to provide feedback to their evaluator. Teachers go through a pre-evaluation conference at the beginning of each year which gives them an opportunity to complete a self-assessment of strengths and weaknesses. The pre-evaluation conference can be held individually or in small group settings and takes place prior to any observations. A mid-year conference is also held to discuss teacher progress and/or needs. This gives teachers an opportunity to improve prior to their summative performance evaluation. Lastly, the summative conference is held to discuss a teachers TEM score and to discuss any areas of needed support. If a teacher’s TEM score is a one or two, meaning they have been rated as needs development or ineffective, the teacher would be given a remediation plan.

Teacher evaluation has certainly changed over the years. As early as the 1700s teachers were being evaluated but it was not until the 1800s when teacher evaluation became more concerned with teachers having pedagogical skills (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). Unfortunately, teachers appeared to be qualified if they could maintain good classroom management and determining their pedagogical skills seemed to be more difficult (Spring, 2007). This transitioned to teachers appearing qualified if they were considered to be helpful and had good personal appearance in the early 1900s (McNerney & Imig, 2013). With a rising concern to compete with other countries and scientific research, teacher evaluation began to take more notice in during the mid-1900s. Teacher performance became more about student achievement (Ellett & Teddlie, 2003). In the late 1900s the Hunter Model and the Donaldson Model were implemented but their focus seemed to remain the same. Even with changes taking place, the ways in which teacher and student achievement were evaluated still needed to be improved. These efforts for improvement continued through the NCLB era and into the current
Georgia evaluation system, TKES. In the following section I reviewed literature to show the many teacher responses to evaluation and how teachers respond to the various components of teacher evaluation.

**Teacher Responses to Evaluation**

In order to understand how teachers describe their emotional responses to TKES, I needed to understand how they respond to evaluation in general. I attempted to explore the studies done on the responses of teachers regarding teacher evaluation and identified the major themes found within the following studies. Themes to be discussed include teachers’ willingness to participate in evaluation, teacher responses regarding the purpose of evaluation, the role of the evaluator, and critical factors in the evaluation process such as time, evaluator interaction, evaluator attitude, evaluation evidence, and the emotional impact evaluation has on teachers.

**Teacher willingness.** Because of the feelings many teachers have about teacher evaluation, there are many teachers who prefer to not take part in evaluations. Jensen (1981) conducted a study to get a better insight on teacher responses and willingness to participate in teacher evaluation with the intention of improving formative evaluation. Although most seem willing or at least tolerant to participate in the evaluation process, 17% were unwilling and 22% showed uncertainty in their participation (Jensen, 1981). The question is why do so many teachers not support teacher evaluation? Donaldson (2012) argues that teachers do not respect the process of evaluation and because of this, they do not take evaluation seriously. Teachers found evaluations to be too short and not frequently enough. They also distrusted those conducting the evaluations because they were untrained (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011).

Although many identify the purpose of evaluation as a way to improve teachers and schools, others have a differing perspective. Jensen (1981) indicated 72% of the teachers in her study felt the purpose was for self-growth and 63% said accountability was the purpose. Toch (2008) argues that many
principals said that it was not until No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was implemented that they were forced to take evaluations more seriously. Jensen’s (1981) findings reveal 61% of teachers feel evaluations are done to judge their teaching abilities. Other teachers showed concern and responded differently about who should conduct the evaluations. Some preferred to be evaluated by a range of people including their “peers, administrators, parents, and children” whereas “others prefer to include only the principal or a district administrator” (Jensen, 1981, p. 132). Some teachers seem to be intimidated by their evaluator. One teacher expressed her unwillingness to participate in formal evaluations because she felt it gave too much power to the evaluator (Jensen, 1981). Just as she said evaluations were used for administrative decisions, Glass (1975) concurs saying that teachers feel threatened because evaluations are often used to see who will be hired back. Because of this, their self-esteem suffers and they begin to assign various roles to an evaluator, some positive and some negative.

**Role of the evaluator from a teacher’s perspective.** The role of the evaluator is difficult to define. 48% of teachers identify the evaluator as the “perceiver of classroom events or the facilitative critic” and another 48% identified the evaluator as a reinforcer who gives suggestions (Jensen, 1981, p. 132-133). Another concern teachers have is that many evaluators have not been in the classroom for an extended time and that kids have changed. Teachers feel that in order for their evaluator to effectively critique them, they need to be experienced in the classroom as well (Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003). Donaldson (2012) says that feedback is not given in a meaningful way and due to a lack of pedagogical knowledge, feedback is often vague. This lack of constructive feedback limits teachers’ ability to seek opportunities to develop their skills. Another 35% said they get nervous when evaluators take too many notes and it causes them to stumble (Jensen, 1981).

I suppose the age old question is, what do teachers want from their evaluator? In Jensen’s (1981) study, over half of the teachers interviewed said they felt the evaluator should first know the teacher’s goals and teaching philosophy. 45% said they should also know the students and who the discipline problems are as well as what backgrounds the students come from. Teachers also want feedback and to
discuss the results with the opportunity to defend themselves and this is something they feel they rarely get (Jensen, 1981; Toch, 2008). In a study conducted by Sawyer (2001), she writes, “Teachers complained that evaluation was something that was done to them rather than with their collaboration” and describes the evaluation process as being vague and leaving teachers unsure of what is expected of them (p. 44). Evaluators often spend more time with new teachers or those who perform poorly but without adequate feedback teachers are often left unsure of how to proceed (Sawyer, 2001).

**Critical factors of evaluation.** Some of the critical factors of evaluation identified by Jensen (1981) include teacher responses to time, evaluator interaction, evaluator attitudes, and evidence used for evaluation ratings. I have outlined these below and also described other research done that backs up the findings of Jensen’s 1981 study. In addition I described some of the emotions teachers feel based on prior research done in the field in order to get a more holistic view of research already done on this topic.

Time, or lack thereof, is one of the top factors in evaluation. 88% of the teachers in Jensen’s (1981) study indicated that evaluators are not in the room long enough to see what is going on and because of this they end up evaluating trivial things that have little importance. Donaldson (2012) argues observations are often done at the last minute as a check off of something that has to be done. Likewise, Glass (1975) also identifies time as being a leading problem in the evaluation process saying that evaluation is superficial and too short. She calls this a snapshot visit. Many teachers complain about snapshot visits saying they were not productive and had little to nothing to do with the quality of instruction in the classroom (Toch, 2008). In addition, in most cases, these snapshot visits provided a lack of feedback as judgments were often made because of an immediate reaction when entering the classroom (Jensen, 1981; Toch, 2008). Some teachers feel these types of classroom visits tend to be nitpicky, meaningless, hold very little value, and a waste of everyone’s time (Toch, 2008). After all, teachers can easily put on a show for a short period of time (Jensen, 1981).
Another factor critical in the evaluation process is that of interaction. 74% of teachers said they would like the evaluator to interact with kids to see what they are learning and for them to get involved in classroom discussions but simultaneously 63% said they want an “inconspicuous and unobtrusive evaluator” (Jensen, 1981, p. 135). Ultimately, teachers want the evaluator to interact some but not overdo it. However, in this teacher responses vary greatly. Some said evaluators should blend in, be natural, and should talk quietly to students, whereas others said they should not seek attention and not say anything at all (Jensen, 1981). A third factor in teacher evaluation pertains to the attitude of the evaluator. All too often teachers feel intimidated, as though they are on trial (Jensen, 1981). In fact, two thirds of the teachers in Jensen’s study said they feel anxious during an evaluation and that it causes them to act and react to students differently than they normally do. Although some teachers believe teaching to be a very personal and private thing, 72% said at the very least, the evaluator should come into the classroom looking for something positive instead of looking for all the problems (Jensen, 1981). Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton (2003) surveyed educators to investigate teacher responses regarding principals and their role in evaluation. What they found is that teachers tend to be more supportive if their principal allowed their teachers to participate in leadership decisions versus those who are more authoritative (Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003).

Lastly, another factor is the criteria used to determine quality performance. 70% of teachers said that they need to better understand the evidence evaluators were seeking out to make their decision about various topics such as classroom “atmosphere, tone, or climate” and teacher “rapport with the children, planning, involvement in the faculty, communication with parents, knowledge of subject matter, the physical organization and appearance of the classroom and the children’s progress” (Jensen, 1981, p. 135). This mirrors Sawyer’s 2001 study when she said teachers need to know what is expected of them. If a teacher does not understand what evidence the evaluator is looking for it makes accomplishing those criteria much more difficult. Additionally, McGreal (1982) argues that evaluators are not consistent, classroom visitations are not focused, and evaluators are not properly trained. There seems to be different
requirements for tenured versus non-tenured teachers and often times evaluators have a difficult time determining which goals to set that will lead to professional growth (McGreal, 1982).

Teachers tend to face many situations in and out of the classroom that influence how they describe their emotional responses to teacher evaluation. Based on the above research, teachers are influenced by the evaluator, time constraints, and the overall evaluation system used. Whether or not a teacher feels their evaluator is qualified to conduct an evaluation with constructive feedback has a definite impact on how they feel about the evaluation overall. For example, it can be difficult for a teacher to take evaluation feedback without resistance when the evaluator does not have knowledge of their content area or when they do not spend enough time in the classroom to get a full view of the teacher and their teaching practices. Feedback that a teacher feels is not relative to them can make it difficult for a teacher to grow professionally. Time is also of the essence and can be viewed from two different perspectives. First, as discussed above, evaluators spend a limited amount of time in the classroom conducting their observations. Teachers tend to feel snapshot visits are not very credible in determining teacher performance. Secondly, teachers are not given a sufficient amount of time to do their job to the fullest they could. A teacher’s time is spread thin between actually teaching, lesson planning, meetings, parent contacts, grading, etc. It seems teachers are expected to do the unreachable and an evaluation cannot capture the amount of time and effort teachers pour into their classroom because there is so much done behind the scenes of a classroom lesson.

It is important to note that the research above is prior to the implementation of TKES. The focus of my study was to describe how teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES. Recall from earlier in this paper that to conduct my research I conducted teacher interviews that focused on evaluation before the implementation of TKES, TKES and their current situation, and the future of TKES. The time periods outlined above impacted my study because it shed light on the concerns teachers had about evaluation prior to the TKES implementation as well as
changes they wanted to see in order to make the evaluation process better. In the following section I reviewed literature on how evaluation emotionally impacts teachers.

**Emotional impact**

Overall teachers go through a plethora of emotions, many of which are linked to evaluation. Throughout research on teacher emotion, the emotional exhaustion of teachers is discussed. In a 2000 study, Schmidt found that teachers felt powerless and lonely (Zembylas, 2003a, p. 112). They are overburdened with tedious tasks. Golby (1996) identifies some of the tasks required by teachers to include grading, lesson planning, as well as other administrative tasks. This goes hand in hand with the feelings of incompetence some teachers feel because of a decreased sense of accomplishment because teachers often struggle to get these various tasks done (Zembylas, 2002, p. 202). Teachers’ feelings of incompetence and feeling overburdened by tedious tasks are some of the leading causes of teacher burnout, stress, dissatisfaction, and disengagement from teaching (Zembylas, 2003a). Burnout and stress lead to emotional detachment (Savage, 2004, p. 25). Zembylas (2003) references studies by Huberman (1993, 1999) and Travers & Cooper (1996) saying teacher stress is a key reason why teachers leave the field of teaching and for this reason, teacher efficacy and competence is also a key component of teacher emotion. Just as Golby references this as being an issue amongst teachers, so does Jeffrey & Woods in their 1996 research. Jeffrey & Woods (1996) focus on the emotions connected to pressures placed on teachers by administration and these pressures cause teachers to question their professional competence. Many teachers are overworked and have high expectations placed on them in regards to testing and student performance. Kelchtermans (1996) emphasizes teacher vulnerability. Some teachers feel vulnerable because of school policy, professional relationships, and the lack of teacher efficacy (Zembylas, 2003a, p. 110). Mirroring these studies is the study of Brackett, Palomera, Mojsa-Kaja, Reyes, and Salovey (2010) where teachers expressed negative emotions and decreased job satisfaction due to student behavior, emotional demands, large class sizes, inadequate salaries, relationships with their administration, physical exhaustion, the lack of teacher efficacy, and more (p. 406). Likewise, in a study
by Sutton, Mudrey-Camino, and Knight (2009), teachers expressed many of these same concerns and also expressed feelings of frustration, anger, anxiety, happiness, lack of confidence, burnout, and more.

Teachers are held accountable through teacher evaluation and this can be a struggle for some teachers, especially since they are already feeling a multitude of negative emotions. Some teachers are left feeling powerless, lonely, and incompetent and often do not feel they can speak their mind about these negative emotions because of unwritten emotional rules that loom over them (Zembylas, 2003a & Zembylas, 2002). Many teachers also struggle with the fact that their negative responses could be used against them when determining whether or not they get a contract for the following year. Their opinion or concerns do not seem to be relevant and some teachers often feel minimized. Some teachers are left feeling defensiveness, distrust, self-doubt, and a lack of self-efficacy (Glass, 1975; Jensen, 1981; Toch, 2008). Additionally, standardized testing plays a role in how teachers feel. In many cases, teachers are at the mercy of preparing students to take a test (Smith & Fairman, 2005). In some cases teachers are reduced to managing student productivity and lack academic freedom in their classroom (Pinar, 2004, p. 27). I found this very similar to the factory model described by Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston (2011). In the factory model, it was important for schools to produce good workers. Similarly, standardized testing can cause teachers to feel like they have to produce good test takers in order to prove their validity as a good teacher.

Teachers sometimes feel powerless because of the lack of academic freedom they have in the classroom. This feeling of powerlessness definitely plays a role in how a teacher emotionally respond in certain situations. Additionally, relationships play an integral part in teacher evaluation. Not only should teachers maintain a positive relationship with students, they also need to maintain a positive relationship with school administration, parents, and other teachers. Standard ten of TKES is on communication which applies to communication with students, parents, district and school personnel, and other stakeholders (GADOE, 2016). Building these positive relationships is important in building effective communication. The emotional bonds some teachers form with students is what makes many of these
teachers “exceptional” (Zembylas, 2003a, p. 111). Theodore Roosevelt said, “People don’t care how much you know until they know how much you care” (Good Reads, 2016). I have heard this numerous times in my teaching career and in my experience, it is these emotional connections that promote student growth as well as student willingness to want to learn from a specific teacher. Salzberger-Wittenbert et al. (1983) and Nias (1996) were also key contributors in research and they focused primarily on teacher/student relationships.

Salzberger-Wittenbert et al. (1983) argue that understanding emotional factors such as teacher stress and teacher efficacy will promote better relationships (as cited in Zembylas, 2003a, p. 107-108). Better relationships will be promoted because teachers will be more likely to respect those who are evaluating them when they feel less stress and feel like they are doing a good job in the classroom. When teachers feel like they are not effective teachers they tend to feel negative about their current situation and it carries over into the relationships they have with others, especially their evaluator. Nias (1996) also puts an emphasis on teacher/student relationships. Nias (1996) emphasizes emotional interactions and conducted interviews about teacher/student relationships in an effort to better understand the feelings many teachers experience. “Teaching is highly charged with feelings, aroused by and directed towards not just people but also values and ideas” (Nias, 1996, p. 293) In Nias’s study, many of the teachers described feeling that teaching requires a personal investment of ‘self’ (as cited in Zembylas, 2003a, p. 108). What this means is that teachers have a personal investment with their emotions and their time and these can not only influence their teaching practices but can also influence their morals in and out of the classroom.

Education is packed with emotions, some of which are displayed and some of which are hidden in an attempt to appear “in control.” According to emotional rules of teaching, some emotions should be suppressed while others should be expressed, not all emotions are considered to be acceptable. Those emotions that should be suppressed, according to emotional rules include anger, anxiety, and vulnerability, whereas, those that should be expressed include empathy, calmness, and kindness.
(Zembylas, 2002). Many of the emotions expressed in the research I reviewed had to do more with emotions felt because of factors outside of the classroom. Outside forces also impact teacher emotion (Zembylas, 2002). Some of these outside forces include administrative tasks, curriculum limitations, and relationships with those outside of the classroom. Many teachers are constantly on guard and teacher efficacy has become a big issue amongst teachers. With the recent implementation of TKES, teachers are being faced with even more changes in how they are evaluated and are being asked to do more to prove their effectiveness as a teacher. My study focused on how teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES. To do so, I conducted a phenomenological study focusing on teacher experiences that influence the way they describe their emotional responses to evaluation. I now better understand the way teachers describe their emotions and the experiences that have influenced their emotions.

**Chapter Summary**

When it comes to evaluation, teachers feel a plethora of emotions and these emotions impact how they view their role in the classroom and how they perceive themselves. Jensen’s study backs up the ideas of Glass (1975) and concludes her study saying that teachers really just want meaningful evaluations and an opportunity to defend themselves. Teachers want to know what is expected of them. This can be a challenging feat because evaluations can be very subjective. It ultimately depends on who the evaluator is and their perceptions of the teacher and the classroom. Feminist theory informs my study by determining how teachers describe their emotional responses to teacher evaluation and whether or not teacher responses differ by gender. Based on history and the changes that have taken place in evaluation through the years, it is important to understand how teachers and their experiences influence how they describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES. More specifically I determined if there are differences in emotional responses between men and women teachers concerning TKES evaluations. To do this I conducted a qualitative study which I outlined in more detail in the upcoming methodology chapter of this paper.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore teacher emotional responses to evaluation. To explore these emotional responses, I conducted a study not only to explore how teachers respond to evaluation but also to determine if their responses differ by gender. This study aids evaluators in understanding evaluation from a teacher’s perspective during a time when the evaluation process is in the midst of change. In doing so, this research helps evaluators better understand how teachers are emotionally impacted by evaluation.

Research Questions

In this study, I answered the following research questions: How do teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES? What are the differences in emotional responses between men and women teachers concerning TKES evaluations? In order to answer these questions I also focused my questions around how teachers feel about various evaluation topics and reviewed responses from male and female teachers to determine if there are differences in the way they respond to each of these topics. Each of these questions guided my study and promote open ended communication with teachers in an effort to better understand how teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation.

In addition to my research questions, a list of sub-questions can be found in Appendix B. Each of these questions serves to aid in better understanding the way teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES. The sub questions are open ended questions that gave teachers the freedom to elaborate on their feelings in reference to evaluation as a whole, the implementation of TKES, the role of the evaluator, their own experiences in the evaluation process, and the future of evaluation. Each sub question also includes areas of interest that relate to the question. For
example, understanding a teacher’s feelings about each of the ten TKES standards gave a more holistic view of how they describe their emotional responses to evaluation and which areas of evaluation provoke positive responses versus negative responses. Additionally, each of these questions allowed the exploration of gender differences, if any, in teacher responses to various evaluation components.

**Research Design**

The phenomenological approach to research studies how people view reality and how they describe their experiences based on this reality (Merriam, 2009). In this study I sought to understand how these described emotions and experiences influence how teachers respond to evaluation. I collected data to see how teachers describe their experiences and whether or not these responses were negative or positive in nature.

There are also a lot of benefits to using a phenomenological approach. One benefit is its focus on “lived experience” (Merriam, 2009, p. 24). The way teachers view evaluation can be a very subjective lived experience and phenomenology is useful in giving the researcher a better understanding of the perspectives of participants and the experiences that caused the participant to feel the way they do (Bogdin & Biklin, 2007). Phenomenology allows participants to revisit their experiences relating to evaluation and how that makes them feel rather than societal understandings of evaluation.

**Population and Sample**

This particular methodology helped me answer my research questions by enabling me to focus on teachers at one Georgia high school and the gender differences in how these teachers responded to the struggles they face in the context of teacher evaluation. Some of the struggles referenced earlier in this paper include teachers feeling stressed, burnt out, and feeling a lack of efficacy. Additionally teachers are faced with emotional rules they often feel they must follow. In the end my research shed light on the way teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation so that evaluators better understood teachers and the impact evaluation has on their emotions. To do so I conducted a phenomenological study on a sample
group from a high school in Tkesville, Georgia which has a diverse group of teachers, both male and female. This particular group also represented a broad range of experience levels from first year teachers to teachers with twenty or more years of experience. This sample group was appropriate for my research because it was important to compare teachers who work in similar environments. By using a population from one school rather than multiple schools, I ensured teachers had a common thread amongst the participants, hence increasing the validity of my study. Although these teachers inevitably had different levels of experience and come from different backgrounds, they all worked in the same environment under the same administration at the time of my study. Likewise, these teachers worked with the same types of students with the same working expectations in the classroom. Additionally, these teachers had only one of four administrators conducting their evaluations. Another reason I chose to use a high school as my sample population is because a high school generally includes several teachers from both genders. Furthermore, this particular school had approximately 80 teachers, approximately 30 of which were male. Had I chosen to sample an elementary school I would have been limited on the number of male teachers.

Data Collection

In order to collect data, I conducted a qualitative phenomenological study using observation notes, semi-structured interviews, and a focus group. Observation notes were taken from meetings I attended to gauge the overall tone of the faculty. Meetings took place at both my prior school and my current school beginning in the Spring of 2013. It was at my prior school where my research interests began but data collection took place at my current school which is Tkesville High School in Tkesville, Georgia. The observation notes were important because it allowed me to pull themes from the meeting that seemed to be causing various emotional responses amongst the faculty. These themes helped guide some of my questions in the interviews I conducted. It is important to note that during the process of my study I transitioned to a different school system. Although the interviews and focus group were done in my new school system observation notes were taken from a combination of my old school system as well as my new school system. Interviews were done prior to a focus group session. The focus group
comprised of my interview participants which included a diversified group of teachers. In order to assure I obtained a diverse group of teachers, I used a purposeful sample. This is important because I wanted to be sure to get a diversified group and without a purposeful sample it was more likely I would have teachers that were too similar in terms of experience, ethnicity, gender, etc. A recruitment email was sent out to teachers with a brief overview of the study as well as the incentives for participating in the study. Teachers were given an opportunity to participate and complete a recruitment demographics survey at a faculty meeting if they were willing to participate in both an interview and a focus group. Incentives to participate in my study included a prize drawing of all those who complete a recruitment survey. The prize for the drawing was a $50 gift card to Red Lobster. Additionally, those selected for the study were given a $25 gift card to Walmart upon the completion of the interview and focus group sessions with a thank you card for participating in my study. Using these recruitment surveys I conducted a purposeful sample to ensure the diversity of my subjects. In order to obtain a diversified group of teachers, I invited 2 male teachers and 2 female teachers making sure to select teachers from multiple content areas and teachers with various levels of experience. Had these four teachers not been willing to participate I would have had to reach out to other teachers but fortunately the four I selected were each willing to participate in my study. These participants included teachers who taught both English Language Arts and Math as well as teachers who were both new to the profession as well as teachers who were tenured with more than 15 years of experience.

After selecting the four participants, I sent a participation request to each of the four teachers asking them if they were willing to participate in interviews and a focus group. I wanted to have a minimum of two male teachers and two female teachers as participants in my study which is approximately 5% of the teacher population.

Interviews were my primary data set and took place prior to the focus group session. I conducted three part interviews with each of the four participants. Interviews focused on specific aspects of evaluation in an effort to better understand how teachers describe their emotional responses to TKES
evaluation and the feedback they receive. The first part of the interview focused on evaluation before TKES and focused on evaluation in general and how it has changed over time. The second part of the interview focused on the recent implementation of TKES and how teachers describe their emotional responses specifically to the TKES evaluation system. The third and final part of the interviews focused on the future of evaluation and how teachers describe their emotional responses to the impact it will have on them going forward. This is important because I was interested in seeing if teachers described their emotions differently throughout the various stages of the TKES implementation. Interview and focus group questions can be found in Appendix E and F.

Following the interviews, the participants in my study participated in a focus group. A focus group promoted feedback from teachers as they built off the comments of other teachers within the focus group. During the focus group session I asked questions based on my research questions and gave teachers an opportunity to share their thoughts and feelings as they answered the questions. Teachers had the opportunity to agree or disagree with other respondents and add additional commentary to the discussion.

For convenience of my participants, interviews and the focus group session took place at the school before school, during teacher planning periods, or after school. Interviews and the focus group session were then transcribed and reviewed for common themes. Data was then compared against that of prior research to determine if teacher responses align with prior studies done or if their responses contradicted prior research. Additionally, I analyzed teacher responses to determine if there were any differences in the emotional responses given that tie to a specific group such as gender, content area, or experience level.

**Researcher’s Perspective**

As a researcher, it was important for me to understand how my own reality influences my epistemological beliefs. I am a female teacher who has been teaching high school math for ten years. I am also married with two children. I know firsthand the challenges teachers sometimes face in terms of
managing a family and a teacher’s work load. For me just because the bell rings at the end of the day does not mean that my day is done. I often stay after my day is officially over to tutor students, call parents, grade papers, enter grades, etc. Even though, I still have a family to go home to and take care of. Teaching can be stressful at times but just like every other teacher I work with, I also have teacher evaluations. I try to be the best teacher I can be while maintaining a balance between my work life and my home life. My teacher evaluations are what ultimately determines whether or not I am effective at my job which brings me to the moment in my teaching career that drew me to my research topic.

Who knew that walking into what I thought would be a typical department meeting a few years ago would end up being the conversation piece of why I chose to study the role emotions play in relation to teacher evaluations and how we respond to them? I wish I had taken better notes but I remember the meeting very well. To give a little background information, the meeting was a math department meeting led by our math coach (female) and present were nine regular education math teachers (3 males and 6 female) and two inclusion math teachers (1 male and 1 female). The teaching experience of this group ranged anywhere from five years all the way to twenty-six years but overall the group of teachers have a good relationship with one another.

Initially the meeting started out like any other meeting. Everyone sat waiting on our math coach to talk to us about teaching strategies thinking we would have a department discussion of how we could implement the new strategies in our classrooms. Instead the math coach opened the conversation saying that our evaluation system was going to change and that we were going to pilot the evaluation system on some of our teachers. She did not know who these teachers would be but she expected the department chairs and a few others would be a part of the pilot and told us to be ready. At that time she did not know a whole lot about the new program. This new evaluation system is called TKES.

Interestingly enough, TKES and other evaluation systems was a topic discussed a week prior in one of my doctoral classes that semester. As a part of that class I had to read information about TKES as
well as other evaluations systems so at the time I felt pretty knowledgeable about TKES and what was to be expected in the upcoming implementation. My co-teachers on the other hand knew there was a new evaluation system coming but really did not know anything about it. When my math coach mentioned a new evaluation system I pretty much knew some of my co-teachers would be quick to share their opinions and that they did. Although I do not recall the exact words from the teachers, I do recall that some teachers were more expressive than others and what surprised me the most was that the men in the group seemed to be very passive about evaluation, whereas the women seemed much more curious about the changes and how the changes would affect them. The men in the room had a whatever type attitude and did not seem to care that they would be observed more often and although we discussed the things that would be evaluated, the men said things like, “they can observe me when they want, I am not going to put on a dog and pony show for anyone” and “this too shall pass.” The women on the other hand showed much more interest in the various components of TKES and although they did not seem worried about the observations themselves, they were worried about how the evaluations would impact them. The women were much quicker to react and were concerned with how the new evaluation system would impact them in terms of how they were determine to be effective or not. The males were much more passive and did not appear to be emotionally concerned. Some of the components that struck the most attention was that teachers would be evaluated based on student progress. The women were quick to talk about how students come to us at all levels and they were frustrated that they would be evaluated on student growth when at the high school level they cannot control what was taught prior to high school. The teachers voiced that they liked the fact that if something was not observed in their evaluation they would have the opportunity to provide documentation to show that they met a certain component of the evaluation but then quickly complained that it would take them too much time to document everything needed to meet the TKES requirements. Another complaint was that students would be surveyed as a part of the evaluation and both the male and female teachers voiced concerns about this. This is no longer a required component but at the time of this department meeting it was. Both groups mentioned that they felt this
was entirely too subjective and that student responses would be biased depending on whether or not they actually liked the teachers. There were also questions about how the students would be selected.

Evaluation as we knew it was changing. We have always been used to an administrator coming into our room for a 10-20 minute observation and then a day or so later we would get an evaluation form which told us if we were satisfactory or in need of improvement. This has changed with TKES, the evaluation system used in Georgia public schools. Observations now occur more often, are longer, require us to submit documentation of our performance in the classroom, and also require teacher/administrator conferencing. What captured my attention in this particular meeting was that the women expressed their emotions much more openly about the new evaluation system and the men seemed very passive. Although they contributed to the conversation, the men were much less bothered by the changes. Women on the other hand were alarmed by the amount of time they would have to contribute to the evaluation process. At the time I remember sitting back and my eyes bounced from one teacher to another as they voiced their opinions and their concerns and I could not help but wonder what other teachers felt and if there was a difference in how male and female teachers expressed their emotions regarding teacher evaluation. This was the turning point in my research interests and at that meeting I knew that my doctoral research would be to learn more about teacher emotion and their responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES.

Participants

In order to better understand the emotional responses of teachers regarding teacher evaluation I asked teachers to complete a recruitment survey that asked them questions such as their gender, race, grade level, subject area, years of teaching experience, overall feelings about teacher evaluation, and their willingness to participate in my study. Table 1 shows the data collected on the recruitment surveys. Those highlighted are the respondents chosen as participants in my study.
Table 1 – Recruitment Survey Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Years of teaching experience</th>
<th>Years at School</th>
<th>Overall Feelings toward evaluation</th>
<th>Level of concern regarding future of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>A lot of Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&gt;15</td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Some Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&gt;15</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Some Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&gt;15</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>A lot of Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>Terrible</td>
<td>A lot of Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Some Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&gt;15</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>No Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Some Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&gt;15</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>A lot of Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Soc Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>A lot of Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Some Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Career Tech</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&gt;15</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Some Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Career Tech</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Some Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Career Tech</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Some Concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From those teachers who responded I created a purposeful sample to identify those I would ask to participate in my study. Purposeful sampling is used when a researcher wants to focus on specific characteristics so that they can be sure to represent an entire population to the best of their ability. In this case, a purposeful sample was utilized to assure the school population was fairly represented. As you can see in the above table there were very few males who responded to the recruitment survey. Additionally there was no diversity in terms of race. In order to obtain a group of participants that would fairly represent the entire population of Tkesville High School, I wanted to make sure that I not only had an even representation of male and females but I also wanted to make sure I had a fair representation of newer teachers and more tenured teachers as well as a diverse group of grade levels taught.

In order to get a diverse sample of males, one was chosen with very little teaching experience and one with more than 15 years of teaching experience. Since the ELA teacher taught tenth grade I decided to choose the math teacher who taught the eleventh grade. This was also the driving factor in how I selected the female participants. Since the male teachers included one ELA and one math teacher I also chose one ELA and one math teacher to represent the female teachers. I decided to do this because in this
particular school evaluators are assigned by content area. This would mean the participants in my survey from the same content area would have the same evaluator but would differ in other characteristics.

In order to better understand the responses and the background of each of the participants a brief vignette on each participant is being provided. This background information is being taken from information provided on the recruitment survey as well as from the semi-structured interviews such as why they became a teacher and what they like the most and least about their job. For the purpose of this study and the privacy of each participant they were asked to give me a pseudonym that could be used to represent them in this study. The pseudonyms chosen were Sue, Sandy, Sheldon, and Hugo Tabernacle (I will call him Hugo). These names will be used to represent the participants of this survey.

The first participant’s name is Sue. Sue is a white female who teaches 9th grade ELA. She is a new teacher with only 0-3 years of teaching experience. In her recruitment survey she described her overall feelings toward evaluation as being good although she did have some concerns regarding the future of evaluation. From an early age Sue liked helping others and through special circumstances she found herself taking an early childhood class in high school. Through this class she did an internship where she was in charge of making lesson plans that would engage students. It was this experience that led her to her teaching career. “Leading students to knowledge” and the feeling you get when students have that ah-ha moment is what drives Sue in her teaching career. Sue also describes being able to connect her lessons to the real world as one of the things she likes most about her job. What she likes least though is “babysitting... students who are immature” and having to redirect them. One thing I noticed about Sue is that she is a very positive person and in terms of evaluation she has had mostly positive experiences. She also did not experience many negative experiences with evaluation in her short time as a teacher. Her joy of teaching and connecting with students was very noticeable throughout my research process.

The second participant’s name is Sandy. Sandy is a white female who teaches 11th grade Math. She is a tenured teacher with 33 years of teaching experience. In her recruitment survey she described her
overall feelings toward evaluation as being poor and that she has a lot of concerns regarding the future of evaluation. Sandy said that she became a teacher with hopes of “fight[ing] social inequality and to educate people so that they don’t turn to drugs” and so that they will “grow up and learn and be participants in society.” Her goal was to really make a difference in the lives of her students. She adores them and when “the lightbulb goes on” and all of a sudden her students understand what she is teaching them she gets a real sense of satisfaction. When asked what she likes least about teaching she said it is the paperwork required. Not classroom paperwork like lesson plans but paperwork from meetings and professional learning and things like that. One thing I also found interesting about Sandy is that throughout my data collection she stressed how much she really liked the older evaluation system and how the current evaluation system lacks the personal effect. Sandy is a very sarcastic, fun loving women who enjoys life. She enjoys her “patio time” with family and friends and has a personality that draws people in. Although Sandy is a laid back person and is typically carefree, the topic of evaluation does not make Sandy feel this way. It is during the evaluation process that her attitude shifts from being carefree to being nervous and this is not her personality. You will read about some of these experiences later in this paper.

The third participant’s name is Sheldon. Sheldon is a white male who teaches 11th grade Math. He is a tenured teacher with 28 years of teaching experience. In his recruitment survey he described his overall feelings toward evaluation as being average (neutral) although he did have some concerns regarding the future of evaluation. Sheldon describes himself as always loving school, loving math, and enjoys helping students. These are some of the reasons he became a teacher. He also likes being able to interact with his students and seeing how they improve and mature over time as well as other faculty. He holds his students to a high standard and expects a lot out of them. This is something his students will be grateful for when entering college and the work force. He is a teacher who takes his job seriously and wants nothing more than to see students succeed. When asked what he liked least about his job he said meetings because they are “kind of a waste of [his] time.” He often feels like central office wants things
changed just for the sake of changing something without getting feedback from teachers. A couple of examples of this is the way data is collected, the way students are assessed, and the way that data is analyzed. He feels as though administration does not take “into account enough of the teacher’s viewpoints or opinions about things that are changing in the learning environment.” In terms of evaluation he has some strong feelings about changes that could be made to improve the evaluation process but comes across as hopeful that as time goes the evaluation process will get better.

The fourth participant’s name is Hugo Tabernacle. Hugo is a white male who teaches 10th grade ELA. He is also a very new teacher with only 0-3 years of teaching experience. In his recruitment survey he described his overall feelings toward evaluation as being average (neutral) and that he has a lot of concerns regarding the future of evaluation. Hugo came from a family full of educators so teaching was something he felt comfortable with. Although he considered law enforcement he came to the conclusion that if he passed the GACE test needed to get into a master’s program he would become a teacher. Well, Hugo passed the test and teaching ended up being the career he went into. He likes interacting with students, particularly students at the high school age, collaborating with other teachers, and designing “cool units.” Although Hugo enjoys parts of teaching he did say that he does not plan on teaching in the long term. He said, “I’m not doing this for more than ten years… I can’t be the thirty year classroom teacher, you know, it’s just not worth it.” Although he said he likes being a teacher one of the things he likes least is that teachers are viewed as some sort of martyr in education where “they must sacrifice their entire existence.” He also described himself as a teacher who does what he needs to do but gets annoyed at the notion that teachers are “the hope for the children.” He feels there are “a lot of weird expectations around teachers” but “we’re just a profession.” Out of the four participants Hugo was the participant who shared the most. Although he has had many positive and negative experiences, Hugo seemed to be overall indifferent about the evaluation process. He tries to be as authentic as possible when being evaluated and says he does not buy into the teacher as martyr philosophy. In other words he feels that
teachers are held to high expectations in terms of making miracles happen in the classroom. For example, teachers are expected to get every student to learn and have high achievement results.

As you can see each of the participants are quite different and each one comes with their own teaching experiences. Sue’s responses to evaluation were typically positive in nature where as both Sandy and Sheldon tended to have more negative responses. Hugo certainly shared a lot of negative emotions but overall was indifferent about evaluation. Understanding some of the background of each participant will help you to better understand some of their responses to evaluation.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

In the following chapters I report the data collected during my study and how the data was collected. This report is organized by reporting data collected using observational notes during meetings, data collected during semi-structured interviews, and a focus group session. In each of these areas, I discussed research findings, gave an analysis of the researching findings, and provided a discussion of the research findings. Additionally, I reviewed prior research to see how these findings were similar and/or different from the research I collected. This served to strengthen the validity of my inferences.

The focus of my research was to delve into the emotional responses teachers had about teacher evaluation. A phenomenological study is often used when asking participants in a study to describe experiences that lead to the way they respond to something (Merriam, 2009). In order to better understand the responses of my participants I focused a lot of attention on asking open ended questions that allowed my participants to share examples of when they experienced positive and negative emotions during the evaluation process. In doing this I was able to analyze the data to get a better understanding of the emotional responses teachers describe regarding evaluations before, during, and after the implementation of TKES.

In order to analyze the data, I conducted a detailed analysis of three primary sources of data: observation notes taken during various meetings and teacher encounters, semi-structured interviews, and a
focus group. Observation notes taken during various meetings and teacher encounters were written down in a notebook when teachers discussed evaluation and obvious emotional responses were displayed. These notes were taken from occasional faculty meetings and teacher discussions during lunch, or during small group meetings such as department meetings from both my prior school district as well as my current school district. When recording these notes teacher names were not included. All that was recorded was whether or not they were male or female. When reviewing the comments made by these teachers I read through each of them and put either a (+) for positive emotional responses or a (-) for negative emotional responses. This allowed me to see whether or not male and female teachers responded to evaluation negatively or positively.

A second source of data was semi-structured interviews with each of the four participants in my study as well as a third source of data that was a focus group session with all four participants. Each of these interviews and the focus group were audio-recorded, transcribed, and coded. According to Merriam (2009), “the challenge is to construct categories or themes that capture some recurring pattern that cuts across your data” (p. 181). This certainly was a challenge for me as well but I will do my best to describe my process below. I started with a general list of codes relating to positive and negative emotions but after listening to the interviews and reading through the interview transcripts multiple times I began to add to these codes and compiled a list of codes that related to both positive and negative emotions. I also coded teacher responses to reflect participant gender and whether or not the expressed emotions related to evaluation before, during, or after the implementation of TKES. As I coded the interviews and focus group transcripts I ended up adding and tweaking codes during the process. Finally I also determined overarching themes that emerged during my analysis including themes relating to feedback, time associated with the evaluation process and more. As my codes emerged I printed a copy and had them visible during the entire coding process. As a new code would emerge I would add it to the list and continue the coding process. My codes were also color coded so that I could easily find codes relating to
gender, time period, positive emotions, negative emotions, and key themes. A list of my codes can be found in Appendix I.

Once the coding process was complete the analysis of the data began. According to Merriam (2009), “data analysis is the process of making sense out of the data and making sense out of data involves consolidating, reducing, and interpreting what people have said and what the researcher has seen and read – it is the process of making meaning” (p. 175-176). In order to organize the data I created a spreadsheet which listed each of my research questions as well as the sub questions. I used the find tool in Microsoft Word to find the codes and/or themes related to each of those research questions. I copied and pasted each of the teacher responses into the spreadsheet I had and then summarized each of the responses to craft an answer to each of the research questions which included supporting evidence directed from my data sources. This was a way for me to organize my data as well as to help me determine if I found any significant differences in the emotional responses of both male and female participants and whether or not these responses were negative emotions or positive emotions. Negative emotions may include emotions relating to stress, frustration, lack of efficacy, and more whereas positive emotions could include emotions of joy, understanding, and feelings of gratification and/or accomplishment. A detailed analysis is provided identifying the types of emotions that can be classified as negative or positive and the emotional experiences that were described relating to these emotions. I also uncovered whether or not teachers felt the need to hide their emotions and specifically what emotions they seem to describe.

Following the reporting of data collected and data analysis I described the implications of the research that was conducted as well as provided recommendations for future research and how my study could have been improved. Lastly I included a detailed reference page to support my research as well as appendices which will include copies of pertinent information such as IRB approval, county approvals needed to conduct research using teachers within the school district, a detailed demographic description of participants, copies of survey questions, interview questions, and focus group questions, cover letters
sent to teachers requesting their participation, and follow up letters sent to teachers thanking them for their participation.

Chapter Summary

In summary, I conducted a qualitative study by using observation notes, a focus group, and semi-structured interviews as a means for collecting data. Building off of Ezzy (2002) who contends that feminist methodologies emphasize experiences, I guided my questions to not only ask how teachers feel about evaluation but I also asked them to share their experiences in an effort to better understand why they feel the way they do. Additionally, I focused on how teachers describe their emotions and whether or not they are difficult or positive in nature. To do this I used feminist theory to frame my study because it allowed me to get a deeper understanding of the participants in my study and how evaluation impacts them emotionally. As I reviewed the data collected in my study I also reviewed the emotional responses of teachers as they relate to the various components of evaluation and the implementation of TKES. The results of my study informed evaluators and shed light on the emotional responses of teachers related to evaluation so they can understand how it impacts teachers and why teachers feel the way they do.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

The central purpose of this study was to explore how teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES. Throughout the data analysis process I aimed to identify both positive and negative emotional responses to as well as if there are gender differences in the way teachers reacted to TKES. The study aimed to enhance existing research on teacher emotion regarding evaluation and the implementation of TKES as well as to aid evaluators in understanding evaluation from a teacher’s perspective during a time when the evaluation process is in the midst of change. In this study I answered the following research questions:

1. How do teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES?
2. What if any are the differences in emotional responses between men and women teachers concerning TKES evaluations?

In order to answer these questions I used data that was collected and analyzed. Data includes observational notes that I recorded during faculty meetings as well as from communication with other teachers from both my previous school and current school. Additional data was gathered from semi-structured interviews and a focus group session with four teachers from Tkesville High School. During the interview and focus group sessions teachers were asked questions regarding teacher evaluation and the implementation of TKES. The responses from the interviews of each of the four participants as well as from the focus group were recorded and then transcribed. Following the transcription, the teacher responses were then coded and categorized in order to identify any common themes that emerged from the data. The themes that emerged from the data will be outlined in this chapter. The responses and the experiences shared from the teachers in my study will be used to answer the research questions of this study.
Research Question 1 – How do teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES?

Findings on research question 1 will be organized by patterns that emerged during the data analysis process. Looking across all the data collected including observation notes, interview data, and focus group data about teachers’ emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES, though the responses were wide ranging, three main patterns emerged. These patterns pertain to the expectations of TKES, the subjectivity of TKES, and the personalization of TKES.

Expectations of TKES

The expectations of TKES appear to be vague and somewhat overwhelming to teachers. As I did my research it became clearer that teachers had different reactions to what the purpose of TKES is as well as the different emotions they experience when being evaluated. Additionally, teachers described their reactions to the ten standards outlined in the TKES evaluation system as well as how they think some standards are unobtainable while others could be simplified or consolidated going forward.

The reactions concerning the purpose of TKES were two-fold. First, in a positive context, the purpose of evaluation is to determine what is actually taking place in a teacher's classroom in terms of classroom management, teaching of content, and classroom control but with the sole purpose of offering support to teachers so that they can improve in any areas they are showing weakness. Sue viewed the purpose of evaluation in a very positive light. Sue feels nervous but also says she feels confident because she views evaluation as “an opportunity for improvement.” She said, “I don’t think it’s to single people out. It’s always for improvement.” Both Sandy and Sheldon agreed that the purpose of evaluation was to “get a feel for what [a] teacher is doing” as well as for holding teachers accountable. In a negative context, according to Hugo, while the purpose of evaluation for some evaluators is to ensure quality control and to offer feedback and support, the purpose of others is to criticize teachers and to control staff.
Instead of supporting teachers, Hugo feels evaluation is to catch teachers and to say, "Got you!" Instead of being used to support teachers, Hugo said evaluation “is really just used to control staff.”

Regardless of how they defined the purpose of evaluation teachers in my study discussed a plethora of emotions they feel during the evaluation process. Some of the emotions teachers describe are nervousness, anxiousness, worry, stress, and even confidence. Sandy, a teacher of more than thirty years, describes herself as being a very confident person but when an evaluator walks in the room she says she is a totally different person. Sandy says:

As soon as someone will walk into my room I just, I get red from the neck up, I start getting nervous and stuttering, and I’m just not, I’m just not comfortable. I’m not relaxed. I have confidence. I’m over confident. Someone would probably call me cocky but all that disappears when an evaluator walks in the room.

She also says that she becomes very self-conscious and finds that she starts to talk too fast and misses basic connections that could have been made. Although Sheldon is not overly bothered by an evaluator being in the room he still says there is always a worry that they are looking for something he may be doing wrong rather than what he is doing right. He says it makes him feel stressed. Hugo describes his emotions in a similar manner as Sheldon. Hugo states that he feels nervousness and some anxiety but overall he describes himself as being very indifferent about evaluation. Hugo said:

I’ll do what I need to do so whatever score I get is kind of irrelevant to me, I mean, unless it’s like core, like corporal reviews (summative evaluations), you know those I don’t really care. Like aren’t you worried you got a needs developing here? Not really. So whatever. I do what needs to get done but I don’t put a lot of stock in the evaluation. I’m mostly indifferent. I get wanting to make a good impression, especially on your bosses and stuff and sort of to get some validation, externally that you’re doing the right thing but, I mean, it doesn’t matter as long as I feel like I’m doing the right thing. I’m good with that.
Although each of the participants described several negative emotions associated with being evaluated, Sue had a much more positive perspective. Even though she felt some nervousness she said evaluation makes her feel confident and she views it as “an opportunity for improvement.” Sue also indicated that she has never had a negative experience with evaluation and she feels positive about the feedback she gets because it helps her “know where [her] strength and weaknesses are.”

Another concern raised in relationship to the evaluation process is the rating system. In several of my observation notes as well as during my participant interviews teachers made reference to the notion that a level three on the evaluation rubric was pretty much expected whereas a level four was almost unreachable. In the evaluation rubric, for a teacher to score a level four, teachers must “continually” meet each of the performance indicators. In order to score a level three, teachers must “consistently” meet each of the performance indicators. In order to score a level two, teachers “inconsistently” meet each of the performance indicators and to score a level one, teachers would not show evidence of meeting performance indicators. (The entire TAPS rubric can be viewed in Appendix H.) Hugo said, “The whole idea of the fourth column is kind of odd to me that there’s this like heavenly tier of teaching.” He also describes it as “an unnecessary column” because administrators are trained “to not give all fours a lot” and why have a column that is some “sort of forbidden fruit?”

Although most of the research gathered for my study, including the interviews and focus group, took place at Tkesville High School, some of the observation notes I took were from the previous school district where I worked. It was when I worked in this prior school district that I began my research process. Interestingly the topic of fours being some “sort of forbidden fruit” as described by Hugo in my study is something I made note of in my observation notes from a county meeting from the previous school district where I worked. In that school district a state representative came to speak to the teachers just before the implementation of TKES as well as the four levels tied to the rubric. To describe these levels she used a swimming metaphor. A level one is a beginning swimmer who could tread water and could essentially get themselves to the side of a pool without drowning. A level two is a swimmer who
could easily swim across the length of the pool without having any trouble. A level three is a swimmer who had life guard status and could not only swim laps but could also save another person from drowning. A level four is the Michael Phelps of all swimmers. She described a level four as being something that would be used very sparingly and it would only be awarded to those teachers who were not only at the top of that specific category but had also shown the utmost level of mastery. A level four is winning an Olympic medal so to speak. This aligns very closely with Hugo’s description. Likewise after the county meeting described above the teachers of that district also voiced many concerns about the scoring process. “It sounds like a level two is your average teacher and a level three is the best,” said a female teacher. A male teacher questioned, “Why even have a level four then?” Some teachers also converted the scoring rubric to numerical values and felt like if they received a level three they were really only receiving a 75% and a level two would be a failing score of a 50%. It appeared many of the teachers had a difficult time with whether or not they would feel like they were doing a good job when they were only scoring a 75%. In later observation notes from Tkesville High School, teachers appeared to have become complacent with a three and as long as they were receiving threes they seemed to be satisfied. After all, a four is something you will never touch according to Hugo and this seems to be the overwhelming consensus based on comments made by other teachers in my study. Sheldon said that fours are so uncommon that when he gets a level four on an evaluation they tend to really stand out. He said it “made me jump for joy.”

Just this month, a few years after is first implementation, I had a mid-year conference with my evaluator and he indicated that the state has told the school districts that schools are giving threes and fours too “freely” and that these scores do not correspond to test scores. During my conference my evaluator explained how more evidence would be necessary from teachers to justify teachers receiving higher scores. Additionally, he indicated that certain standards went hand in hand such as instructional practices and having an academically challenging environment. He indicated that if a teacher were to receive a two in one of these areas they would have to receive a two in the other since they were
interrelated. I found this interesting because this is a topic that arose during the interviews and focus group I conducted several months ago. In addition to the overall scoring rubric teachers also had various reactions to which standards they felt were the most appropriate and the least appropriate. Although teacher reactions to the appropriateness of standards were different there was a common reaction to there being too many standards. Participants felt that many of these standards could be simplified by consolidating them.

Sheldon described the standards as being too wordy, too vague, and too complicated to use. In addition, Sandy felt like the standards made her feel micromanaged and that two 30-minute evaluations per year are just simply not enough to show teacher effectiveness. Sandy said, “I think the standards in TKES are I think it’s too much… I think that they can be broken down or combined to make fewer standards.” Each of the other participants agreed that there were too many standards and that they could be consolidated into fewer standards. Each of the participants seemed to find different standards more appropriate or least appropriate than the other participants. It is important to note that even the teachers in my study could not agree on what was most important when identifying which standards were most important in determining a teacher’s effectiveness. This speaks to the fact that evaluation is a subjective process. For example, Sue felt the most appropriate standard was instructional strategies and the least appropriate was personal knowledge. Sandy felt the most appropriate standard was having an academically challenging environment and the least appropriate was instructional planning. Sheldon felt the most appropriate was professional knowledge because without that you would not be an effective teacher. Communication for him was the least appropriate though because teachers do not have time to call parents when they have 150 students, especially since grades are entered into infinite campus (an online grading system). Sandy also chimed in on this questioning how administration would know if you contacted parents or not anyways. Hugo felt the most appropriate was professional knowledge because teachers must know their content in order to relay information and break down content for their students. He also felt that differentiation, professionalism, and having a positive learning environment were
important but felt that assessment strategies and uses and instructional planning were unnecessary. In the end the participants agreed that regardless of appropriateness, evaluation needed to get back to the basics of simply identifying whether or not teachers were doing their job proficiently. The teachers could be evaluated on whether or not they were doing their job; yes or no? During the focus group session, the participants went back and forth with which standards could be grouped but ultimately came up with three main categories: knowledge, instruction, and results. With agreement from the other participants, Sandy said, “we need to group the standards… [and] we need to get back to the basics.” Hugo added to her comment saying with a lot of sarcasm:

I think it, it’s like they wanted to make a cool rubric and they were like, let’s, let’s put ten standards and then they just had to come up with things to do… we need to have ten things, ten is a good number.

Overwhelmingly teacher responses from my observation notes, interviews, and the focus group indicated they were overwhelmed by the number of standards. Many teachers brought up the fact that there is no way for all ten standards to be viewed in a single observation, especially since evaluations are so short. The emotional responses regarding the amount of time spent during evaluations will be elaborated upon in the following section.

The emotional reactions of teachers varied regarding the expectations of TKES but there were also a lot of similarities described above. In addition to the emotional responses pertaining to the purpose of TKES, the emotions teachers shared regarding their experiences with evaluation, and the reactions to the TKES standards, the subjectivity of TKES is also a major pattern that emerged during the data analysis process.

**Subjectivity of TKES**

Another pattern that emerged was the subjectivity of TKES. Some key issues brought up by teachers related to the lack of experience of evaluators, fairness, evidence used, time, and a teacher’s need
to please administration. Hugo says that TKES is too much of a one-size fits all type of system but teachers should be recognized for their differences. He says, "We all have [our] own teaching personality, we all [have our] own teaching style, [and have our] own methodology and of course there's best practices." Not only do teachers not fit a one-size fits all mold but neither do evaluators. Evaluators have different teaching backgrounds, various levels of experience as an administrator, and different preferences regarding teaching methodologies.

With the exception of Sue, all other participants felt that subjectivity and evaluator bias was a key component of the lack of fairness of teacher evaluations. Sue feels like evaluations "are done as fairly as human emotion and relationships allow." The other participants, however, feel there is a huge lack of consistency in the evaluation process. For example, different evaluators could observe the same exact lesson but score a teacher differently because maybe they did not like a particular teaching strategy being used or maybe they did not like the teacher. Sandy indicated that she liked the previous evaluation system much better because a teacher was either rated satisfactory or unsatisfactory and it removed the grey area of scoring between a one and a four. To Sandy, the previous system was more cut and dry meaning teachers were judged determining either they are a “good” teacher or they are not. To Hugo, evaluator bias comes out too much. Hugo shared the following experience:

I was, we were reading a book. It was the spring semester and we were leading up to some, I think we were going to lead up to a discussion so we were, we were reading and then um, we were just reading out loud, just typical, like direct instruction, like reading I guess and I passed out the questions we were going to talk about later so they could get some answers down so it wouldn’t be like a cold read before the discussion. I remember being marked down for being like a direct instruction, like reading to the class, um you know the comment was like this isn’t a proven strategy… Having an evaluator who doesn’t like particular methodologies and that that comes out in their evaluation because I mean it’s so subjective.
In this example Hugo was marked down to a level two because the evaluator did not think his strategy was effective and Hugo felt the rating was highly subjective and was based on evaluator bias. He was also given a two on differentiation on another evaluation because his students were doing research for an upcoming speech they were preparing for. He said he likes doing speeches in his class. He described the following experience:

We were in the computer lab and they (his students) were doing research, getting ready for their speech so they had to pick a topic, so they were finding information, you know, building, getting material for those artistic proofs and the evaluator walked in… I remember getting the scores back and they were fine, I think the only one that was a two was differentiation… At first I guess I thought it was petty, um and then I was like, no I guess it kind of makes sense, and then I arrived at um it was just unnecessary. We happen to be just doing some general research when um, when they walked in to observe. The final product that they were going to be doing had, was sort of differentiated in that it had some of the requirements tweaked or changed um for certain people and that was mostly kind of doing it on the fly but the process was still really the same. They all needed to do some research, they all needed to find some information… In the end I was just sort of frustrated at first, you know the experience, and all that, just sort of frustrated and felt like that was unnecessary, um… it’s not every time, not everything in the classroom is always differentiated to the degree that evaluators wanna see. I was just more annoyed like I said, just frustrated, that the whole experience… I mean you (the evaluator) just happened to come in, which is fine, I mean, come in whenever you want but you just happened to come in and then “Oh, I don’t see this particular thing.” Alright, ok so, I mean now it’s whatever, like I’m indifferent at this point but in the moment it’s always, it sometimes, you get stuff back and it seems so unnecessary.

To Hugo these were necessary steps in working towards a bigger final product but to the evaluator they were not good proven strategies. The question lies in whether or not he would have been scored the same
had he had a different evaluator. Sandy stated, “You can have two people observed by two different administrators and teaching the exact same lesson and each get a different evaluation or number so I do not think they (evaluations) are done fairly. I think they are too subjective.” These teachers also felt as though some evaluators were looking for areas to mark teachers lower in just because they did not like them or because they wanted to find something that could use improvement. Instead of evaluation being a way to find areas of improvement, Hugo says it is sometimes used like a "dart throwing contest."

Similarly, Sandy stated “If the administrator doesn’t like the teacher or vice versa that could cause more problems.” Hugo also said that some administrators “purposefully try to find teachers in compromising situations in the classroom so that they can mark them down lower, just because they didn’t like them.”

By compromising he meant situations where they would be lacking certain criteria in on the TKES rubric. He said, “There’s no place for that kind of pettiness in a professional environment.” Another example of this comes from my observation notes. I will share a conversation I had with another math teacher. This teacher shared that she was evaluated during a class period where she had a lot of behavior challenges to deal with. She described that she had tried talking with the students, called parents, sent students to ISS (In School Suspension) for a timeout period, and had submitted office referrals but for whatever reason these students were still in her classroom and she felt nothing was being done to support her as a teacher. Regardless she still had a classroom full of students to teach. She described that one day she was observed and the students were “off the chain.” She had to redirect them multiple times and finally had to ignore their behavior in hopes of teaching the other students something. The evaluator spoke to her after class and asked about some of the students who were causing a lot of disruptions. She explained the steps she had taken and basically said she was at her wits end. The evaluator told her that typically students will act appropriately when an administrator walks in even if they do not for the teacher but these students were not only disrespectful to the teacher but the administrator as well as they showed no concern for authority what so ever. The administrator said she would talk with the students and address the situation. She did which the teacher described a short term fix but what the teacher said next was interesting to me.
She said that the administrator said they would come back on another day to do another evaluation and they did not count that particular observation at all. The teacher asked me, “Would she (the evaluator) have done that for any other teacher in the school or did she do that as a courtesy to me because she likes me?” She ended up getting a good evaluation but had the evaluator used their initial observation it would have been a very poor evaluation. This is a great example of the subjectivity and bias that can take place during the evaluation process and it is something all four teachers in my study touched on and it makes them question the validity of their evaluations.

Another issue brought up is that there are gaps in the way evaluations are done because in the case of this school you are only getting one perspective. Although there are four administrators, each teacher is assigned only one administrator to conduct their evaluations. Instead of getting feedback from multiple people a teacher is at the mercy of the perspective of one person. Additionally, what if this evaluator has a lack of experience in the classroom? Sheldon shared some concerns as follows:

Some administrators don’t spend very long in the classroom before they move on up into administration and they either haven’t had enough experience at the level their working as an administrator to really know what’s going on in the classroom. For example, if you have a teacher who taught for 3 years at the middle school level and then they go into an assistant principal position but their first assistant principal position is at the high school level, they’ve not had that experience at the high school level that they can really relate to, how teachers interact with high school aged kids. Um, and you also have some administrators that are so far removed from the classroom, they’ve been administrators for ten or more years and what guides their thought process is basically what’s being published by ASCD or you know whatever other curriculum leadership organization there is as to the next new thing in education. So, whether it’s a focus on uh understanding by design or differentiated instruction or personalized learning or whatever it is a lot of them, it’s just been their exposure through reading a book or going to a conference or talking to people from the central office. It hadn’t been talking to the teachers and
talking to the students and being in the classroom as a teacher so that they can’t really connect so
it’s not fair that, the evaluation is not as fair as it could be because that person really hasn’t
experienced. It’s kind of like, you’re not going to put somebody to be a head football coach if
they’ve never played football or if they’ve only played peewee football you know, because they
don’t have that experience and so I don’t think you could really have it done fairly unless you
have those components in place.

As you can see Sheldon has several concerns about the qualifications of evaluators. There is a question as
to whether or not those evaluating teachers are experienced enough to conduct a fair evaluation. From my
observation notes from Tkesville High School a teacher complained that she had scored a four on
communication on one evaluation but then on following evaluations she scored a three. She indicated
nothing had changed so why would she not still score a four? This made her question just how fair the
evaluation process really is. She said, “It seems like it is luck of the drawl. One day they want to give
you a four and the next just a three.” This particular teacher felt there should be more defined ways to
determine whether or not someone should earn a particular rating. It is sad Sandy says when other
teachers say things like, “Oh gosh I have Ms. Jones and she is really strict and she’s going to be looking
for bla bla bla” and then another teacher say, “I have Mr. Smith” and another teacher says, “Oh, you’re
lucky you have him because he’ll just sit there and you know make a couple notes and give you threes
and fours.” How are the scores justified from one evaluation to the next?

Evidence used in determining a teacher’s effectiveness can also be subjective. Sue said, “There’s
a lot of outlying factors that we can’t control as teachers. We can’t control where they’re (the students)
coming from, home, or if they’re in a fight with their best friend and aren’t going to do anything that
day.” Regardless student growth is a means for evaluating teachers. Sandy acknowledged that “student
growth is important” but questions whether or not it should be a component of evaluation. “I could have
different scenarios with different classes, with different kids, with um, where they moved in from another
county or whatever,” said Sandy. Additionally, Sheldon said, “Not all students are going to do their fair share with what’s expected to contribute to [their] growth.” He also acknowledged that sometimes:

You just have a student who’s going to learn it whether you’re in the classroom or not and so you know just because you have large student growth doesn’t mean you’re a great teacher. It might just mean that you have a group of students in a class that are motivated, intrinsically motivated and their working on their own and they’re gonna pick up whatever you teach them.

These are all issues that every teacher faces and teachers feel like these things influence student growth. Another form of evidence involves the students themselves. Hugo brought up a valid concern saying that when he is evaluated it feels like “two-face-ness” because he is in evaluation mode and the kids act different. He feels like kids don't act like themselves and don't participate as much when an evaluator is in the room. He also feels like he interacts more than normal and tries to show off. Although he said he tries to be as authentic as he can, it is still difficult to do when you know you are being observed. Sheldon also brought up that he feels evaluators are not “keeping track of what [his] contributions have been to the school or to [his] classroom.” Evaluators don’t appear to be looking at the whole picture and the bigger picture needs to be looked at instead of just “one five minute snapshot.”

Lastly, time is a key component identified by teachers increasing the subjectivity of an evaluation. Time can be how much time an evaluator spends in the classroom conducting an observation as well as how often evaluations are done throughout the year. Teachers expressed concerns about the amount of time evaluators are actually in their classroom. Sandy said, “I don’t think two thirty minute evaluations in a year can tell an administrator if a teacher is effective.” They feel like the short time an evaluator is observing their classroom is not enough to make decisions about a teacher's effectiveness as a teacher. Being in the classroom for 10-30 minutes a couple times a year is not enough to know what is really going on and ten standards is too much to assess in that short amount of time. Sheldon referred to observations as sometimes being only a “five minute snapshot.” It is also their timing that does not
always give a true view of what is taking place in a classroom. Sue indicated that evaluators are not in the classroom long enough and if “they’re only showing up for the last ten minutes of your lesson in a block, what are [they] observing?” According to Sandy, the evaluator is not in the room long enough to see classroom discussion or activities and if they would have stayed just another ten minutes they may have seen it. Sandy describes a time when the evaluator was about to leave the room at the end of an observation. Sandy stopped the evaluator telling the evaluator she was about to miss something from the observation that Sandy would have been lacking if the evaluator had left. She also expressed there is also no way for evaluators to evaluate things like assessment strategies and assessment uses when they are only in the classroom just a few minutes. They miss too much of the lesson and because of this they do not have a holistic view of what goes on in the classroom and whether or not a teacher is doing a great job. If an evaluator wants to know if a teacher is doing what they are supposed to be doing and if they want to monitor class control they need to spend more time in the classroom and not just thirty minutes twice a year says Sandy. The teachers in this study do not feel evaluators can give an accurate description of what is happening daily in a classroom.

Sue also indicated that evaluations are also too far apart. Teachers are expected to submit whole unit plans but then only observe one day of the entire unit. She stressed that she would like them to come in more often and pop in periodically during a whole week to get a better idea of what is going on and to see how the lesson progressed and how it was revised and adjusted during the course of the unit. Sheldon said that even those teachers getting six evaluations per year is not enough. "Anybody can do a dog and pony show for six days and say oh… they're just wonderful,” said Sheldon.

Timing in general can contribute to how an evaluator rates a teacher’s effectiveness. For example, Sue described a negative experience she had with an evaluation when she had an unplanned evaluation. This would not typically be an issue for her but she said “it was during a day when our schedule was not routine. Uh, the students were in there for a large amount of time and it was the last like thirty minutes of that large time. It was just a trifecta of how can you get an accurate view of what is
actually taking place on a daily basis when the time is just all off?” She is not the only teacher to complain of this. In my observation notes from Tkesville High School I had numerous accounts from teachers describing that an evaluator came in on the day right before a long break or the day right after a long break. One teacher also said he was observed during a class that immediately followed pep rally type of activity. The students were rowdy and he was lucky if he could even keep them in their seats let alone teach an evaluation worthy lesson. The teachers questioned why an evaluator would come on a day or during a time when they know the students are out of a typical routine and questioned how this could give them a true reflection of what a normal day in that teacher’s classroom is really like.

On the flip side, Hugo described an experience where he and another teacher were observed at exactly the right time and on the right day as well. Below is Hugo’s account of this particular observation:

We were doing a performance task sort of project, inquiry based thing and we were in a room, we were doing a mock trial. We were able to use someone’s room to make it more authentic and while we were in there, it was me and another teacher, a teacher I usually collaborate with and we’re just doing, doing the trial and kids were doing pretty good at that point and in walks in an administrator and so it was just like the perfect moment to, I don’t know, like we were doing a thing they wanna see and then it was us collaborating and then we had other classes in there and we were in another classroom, and it was cross-curricular so it was like all of the buzz words that we just happened to be doing, we were doing when they walked in and we just looked at each other and nodded like, I don’t know, sort of like take that!

Although this was not what he would do on a typical day it was good timing for him and the other teacher. Again, this raises the question by many teachers how one observation can be used to determine whether or not a teacher is effective or not. Timing can be everything and it can work in the teacher’s
favor but it can also work against them. It also leaves some teachers feeling the need to please their administration.

Some of the teachers, particularly the two females and one male in my study said they felt the need to please their administrators. I will discuss the gender differences in their responses when I answer research question two later in this chapter. For now though it was made very clear that both Sue and Sandy felt the need to please their administration. Sue said she feels the need to please administration because they are her bosses and “they have authority.” Sue says when she is being evaluated she “make[s] sure to bring [her] A game.” Hugo, with agreement from all other participants, said “It’s nice to feel validated” and to feel like “the system approves of you.” Sandy described herself as a “people pleaser” and indicated that if she had negative feelings she would not feel comfortable sharing those feelings with her evaluator because she would not want to “ruffle any feathers.” In the long run it is administration who determines how effective a teacher is and the need to please them seems important to getting a good evaluation. It appears a good bit of effort goes into pleasing your administrator but in some cases it is the teacher who does not feel pleased with their evaluator and the teachers in my study want TKES to be more personalized.

**Personalization of TKES**

Evaluation lacking personalization was another pattern that emerged during my data analysis. Some of the underlying topics I will discuss are teachers’ desires for evaluator participation in lessons, evaluation feedback, teacher support, evaluation conferences, and teachers’ reactions to sharing their emotions.

One example of this is when evaluators do not participate in a lesson or they come into the classroom with a critical look on their face. Sandy shared that she is already nervous when an evaluator comes in and is very self-conscious. When asked to share what she liked least about an evaluator and to share a negative experience about evaluation she shared that what she likes least about an evaluator is:
When they walk in the room. They sit in the corner. They have no facial expression. Kind of the opposite of positive emotions. They don’t flow with my lesson. They don’t try to participate. They don’t look like they care what I’m saying. They’re tap tap tapping on the computer and it’s like why are you even in here because you’re not, you know, with the class and you’re not being a part of the whole situation.

This goes hand in hand with the worst evaluation experience she shared saying the evaluator had a frown on his/her face when they came in and when he/she left looked very critical. She said they were not a part of her lesson and she felt like they were looking for things to pick at. In the lesson that was observed she had planned a differentiated lesson but the evaluator left before they had a chance to see it. She said it made her "feel inferior" and she was too afraid to say anything to the evaluator. Sandy likes it when her evaluator participates in the lesson because it makes her feel more at ease. She described one of her best evaluation experiences as being when her “evaluator raised their hand because they knew the answer” and they participated in her lesson rather than just sitting in the back of the room typing up their evaluation. She said this has only actually happened on one occasion and is disappointed that this does not occur more often.

Another component to personalization in TKES relates to the feedback teachers receive, both electronically and face to face. The teachers in my study like getting feedback from their evaluators. Sue as well as Hugo said that it gives them confirmation that they are doing the right thing. Sue in general had very little to say about feedback other than she likes to receive it and that “it was immediate feedback [that she] really liked.” She described an experience where she was evaluated by an outside party where she received immediate feedback. She said she “really liked that because [she] wasn’t distracted by [her] next class” and “didn’t forget about the day already.” The other teachers, however, had negative reactions regarding the feedback they receive. When asked if teachers get adequate feedback the overall consensus was no. With the exception of Sue, the other teachers in my study agreed that they do not
receive timely feedback. They commented that they often receive feedback two weeks later and by that point Sandy said “I don’t think it really matters because I’ve already moved on.”

Sheldon indicated they got more feedback under the previous GTEP evaluation system saying, “There weren’t so many canned things that you could copy and paste when [the evaluator] gave feedback to a teacher. The expectation was that [the evaluator] specifically talk about something [they] saw in the classroom that supported [a] particular standard.” For example, the evaluator would comment, “I liked the way you showed students to work through the quadratic formula” and would even give an example in their evaluation. Sheldon said, it:

Let the teacher[s] know that [the evaluator] was really paying attention and trying to follow what they were doing with the students but now administrators just copy and paste… and that just leads me to believe that they’re not really paying attention to what’s going on in the classroom.

Sheldon would like to receive more feedback and especially praise if he is doing well. Although Sandy said she felt like she receives adequate feedback she agreed with Sheldon saying she too thinks she received more feedback under GTEP. The teachers in my study feel like the feedback would be more helpful to them if there were actual examples given rather than canned statements. Additionally the teachers in my study want authentic comments. Sheldon voiced his frustration saying that comments are sometimes “copied and pasted and they haven’t correctly change the plural to singular or the tense of the words.” It is obvious to teachers that there are canned statements because the evaluators are forgetting to change tenses, singular to plural, and even his and her. Sandy stated, “They’ve just copied and pasted. It means nothing. There isn’t enough, there isn’t to me enough personalization.” Additionally, Hugo stated, “I’ve never got adequate feedback” and Sue mentioned she only gets it when she requests it. Hugo also complained that the feedback he has gotten has been “super basic.” For example, he would receive a comment that said “good job” or “I liked how your students seemed interested in their work” but the feedback is not very helpful. He also indicated that “when you ask them they do not really know how to
help.” When this is the feedback teachers get it lacks meaning and personalization to them and the
teachers in my study do not feel like the feedback they receive offers them support. An example from
Sheldon where he felt as if he did not receive adequate support from his evaluators and administration is
described in the following account of his worst teaching experience. Sheldon stated:

Whenever I was teaching AP Calculus, it was the first year I was teaching it. We had just
opened the year before and I was doing everything I thought I was supposed to do with it.
You know, trying to slug through it like everyone else does their first year teaching an AP class
and um, there was a lot of push back from students about me either doing or not doing enough for
them and teaching it and some outright said I didn’t know how to teach and I didn’t know what I
was teaching and so forth and so on and so the principal and one of the assistant superintendents
met with me and presented it as, “what can you do different, um, to make it you know more
effective for the students?” and my come back to them was, you’re asking the wrong person.
You need to be asking the students what can I do different because I’m doing everything that I
think is right and you know the students um, so many of them, didn’t even have the skills they
should have come out of coordinate algebra with so I was fighting that battle and um, whatever
the principal asked the students while I was not in the room, but when she asked the students
what I could different, none of them had an answer. And so I thought well ok, we’ll just move
forward. Well, at the change of the semester, AP Calculus was taken away from me and I was
shifted around to another class and another teacher that had taught AP Calculus at a different
school was moved into it and it was fruit basket turnover with three different teachers and three
different classes. Um, just because um, the parents of some of the students had called the central
office and um, complained a lot about it whereas it didn’t feel like I was getting any support um
from my principal. Um, you know, in teaching an AP class for the first year and so that I’ve, I
would rank right up there with the worst experience I’ve had.
Sheldon did not feel as though he was supported. Hugo has also felt the same way. He says evaluation should be more of a way to "offer assistance and support" to teachers but often this is not the case. He said that when teachers ask for help the evaluators often times do not know how to help them. Unfortunately Hugo states that some administration is pro-teacher and some is anti-teacher. He says, a "pro-teacher administration will offer feedback and actually offer support" whereas others use evaluation "as a chance to find teachers who aren’t doing well and to criticize them."

When teachers were asked about evaluation conferences there were mixed reactions. Overall though the teachers in this study were appreciative of the evaluation conferences. Sandy, Sheldon, and Sue indicated they liked the evaluation conferences because it gives them an opportunity to clarify anything that the evaluator saw or did not see during the evaluation before it gets entered into the system as a permanent record. It also gives them an opportunity to answer any of the evaluator’s questions. Hugo on the other hand does not find the conferences to be beneficial. He feels they are often times too informal and he would like to see more open ended questions such as, "what are things you've done this year?" or "what are things you've done this year that you've been pleased with?" or "what changes have you made in your classroom that you want to continue with?" He feels the conferences should be more meaningful instead of talking about things you already know and having you sign off on it and that is it. Although the other participants were happy with the overall conferencing process they still discussed ways they feel it could be better. For example, Sue said she thinks they could be more effective and instead of just “pats on the back they [could] actually provide examples of what they saw.” Evaluation, Sue said, “Needs to be more consistent and there needs to be examples.” She did however state that since she has specifically asked for examples she has started to see a shift in the feedback she has received and is getting more examples of specific things the evaluator saw during the evaluation. Sandy indicated she would like to have conferences more often and Sheldon emphasized the need for more conferencing for new teachers because it would give new teachers a better idea of what the evaluator is looking for. Even if they receive a good rating it would be great to be able to reinforce why they earned the marking so that
they can continue to do a good job. Sheldon also stated, “I think conferences are good for people that are really struggling, educators that really need some guidance that are going down the road of being on some type of professional development plan or professional growth plan.” These teachers in particular would benefit from having more evaluation conferences structured in a way to offer them support.

The teachers in my study complain that they are given very little feedback face to face and they want more of it. The teachers in my study yearn for the opportunity to have an actual conversation where they are given a chance to clarify any misconceptions or discuss things they may be struggling with or could do better on. Instead it seems like a time where the evaluator rushes through the information and ultimately just wants the teacher to sign off on the evaluation so that they can move onto the next one. I also asked the teachers how they feel when they score anything less than a three on an evaluation. Sue, who has taught less than three years, has not had a negative experience however Sandy said, “It pisses me off.” It upsets her so much because she said, “I’m just finishing up my thirty third year of teaching and evidently I got that because they didn’t see what they wanted to see and that’s because they did not come in at a time when they should have seen in.” She knows she is a good teacher and can not help it if the evaluator leaves just before she is going to do something such as a differentiated activity or assignment. She described a time when she had a menu assignment planned where she would be splitting the students into groups and using wipe boards and the evaluator left just before she did it. She said she was furious when she ended up with a two for differentiated instruction. On a separate occasion Sandy said she “stopped her (her evaluator) when she was fixing to get out of my room” saying, “oh no no, you wait, you haven’t, the dog and pony show isn’t over yet.” Sheldon did not seem as bothered by it but did say he would like an administrator to sit down with him to explain why he scored a two or a one. He wants them to “convince [him] that it is taking place instead of jumping right into the two” on an evaluation.

Teachers want face to face interaction. They want an opportunity to explain if the evaluator feels like something was lacking. Hugo said he wants to have a real conversation, “kind of like you do when you’re collaborating with another teacher.” Although Sheldon recognized how busy administrators are he
stated that he would like for the administration to take the time to talk to teachers more casually to say hello or to check in on how things are going. He does not “want [his] administrator hanging out in [his] room” but said “it would be nice to just, to have them make the effort to pop in and say hey every once in a while.” He would like to have “more collegial interaction as opposed to a supervisor interaction.” He also stated that he would much rather talk to his evaluator in person than to “spend two hours of [his] time typing [an] explanation and sending attachments and all that stuff and then well, they’re not going to look at it.” All of the participants in my study agreed with Sheldon when he said, “The human element needs to be brought back.” Sandy added, “I think we need to go back to interacting with people.”

Interestingly, teachers had very different reactions to sharing how they feel with their peers as opposed to sharing with their evaluators and/or administration. All four participants said it was acceptable for teachers to express emotions with their peers although Sue was quick to say there is "a fine line between complaining and whining." Hugo also said you should be careful who you express your emotions to because some people will talk about you behind your back. Hugo stated, “You need to find the people you can trust and that’s who you can openly confide in.” He also said that even though it is ok to express emotions he feels that it is viewed as more acceptable for females to share their emotions in the workplace. He said that for males it is usually awkward and they tend to bottle up their emotions because men are socialized to not show emotion. Hugo says, either way, it is also important to remember that we are professionals and it is a work place. He feels it is ok to express emotions but not openly complaining about people and/or be rude when walking down the hallway. There is a time and a place. Sheldon also commented that sharing emotions is a great way to vent to your peers when you are frustrated about something. He feels very comfortable sharing with his colleagues and his department.

The topic of sharing emotions with administration was a much touchier subject. For the most part the participants in this study felt it was not appropriate to show emotions to administration. Sheldon on the other hand said he did not care if administration knew how he felt and said "that's what they're getting paid to do.” He feels like if administration hears his frustrations there is a better chance they could help
him in that area. The other participants had a very different outlook on expressing emotions with administration. Sandy indicated that she did not want to “ruffle any feathers” and chooses to be “non-confrontational” with administration. Hugo stated, "It's just unprofessional to complain to your bosses" and he called it being petty.

When asked if men and women deal with emotions the same or differently the teachers responded very similarly. Sandy felt that women were typically more open about their emotions whereas a lot of men tend to keep their emotions inside. Sheldon said it depends on the types of emotions. For women, they are more apt to share emotions about warm and fuzzy topics such as anything dealing with family and kids where as men are "more vocal about petty things like sports and stuff like that." As I said previously Hugo also indicated that he feels it is more acceptable for women to share their emotions but for men it is much more awkward. In terms of the topics of evaluation and student behavior though the teachers overwhelmingly felt like men and women were pretty equal in how they shared their emotions.

In conclusion, in answering research question one, many patterns emerged during the data analysis process. These patterns included emotional responses to TKES relating to the expectations, subjectivity, and personalization of TKES. How teachers reacted to each of these issues was wide ranging which brings me to my second research question, “What are the differences in emotional responses between men and women teachers concerning TKES evaluations?” In the following section I will answer this question by identifying patterns that emerged during data analysis.

**Research Question 2 - What are the differences in emotional responses between men and women teachers concerning TKES evaluations?**

Emotional responses between men and women teachers concerning TKES evaluation had some similarities and some differences. In this section I discussed some of the similarities but I will primarily focused on those subtle differences that became apparent during the data analysis process. As you will read in this section, the way teachers share their emotions had both similarities and differences. I also
discussed the different reactions from teachers regarding the need to please administration; discomfort when an evaluator enters the room for an evaluation; the evaluator’s participation in lessons; and overall teacher concerns with the implementation of TKES. I also discussed how the teachers in my study thought about the future of evaluation.

**Sharing Emotions**

How teachers reacted to their ability to discuss emotions depended on what emotions were being displayed and to whom. Interestingly I asked each of the participants in my study if they felt men and women deal with emotions the same or differently and their responses to this question contradicted the responses throughout the rest of my study. Sandy felt that women were typically more open about their emotions whereas she felt a lot of men tend to keep their emotions inside. Sheldon commented that he thinks it depends on the situation saying that women are more apt to share emotions about warm and fuzzy topics such as anything dealing with family and kids whereas men are “more vocal about petty things like sports and stuff like that.” In terms of topics like evaluation and student behavior though the teachers in my study felt like men and women were pretty equal in how they shared their emotions. Based on their actual responses during my study though I would have to disagree with that. This is discussed in further detail in chapter 5.

Overwhelmingly though the participants felt it was acceptable to share emotions with their peers but not with administration. Sheldon on the other hand said he does not mind sharing his emotions with his peers or administration. When it comes to administration he said,

I don’t much care if the administration cares if I share how I feel or not, that’s what they’re getting paid to do and um, you know if they hear my frustration and not just brush it off then it could be that maybe it’s something they could help address to help me not be as frustrated or to help me be more effective in that area. Um, so yea, I don’t, I feel, I don’t’ feel any reservation. I don’t feel like anybody’s holding me down from sharing whenever I feel like sharing.
Need to Please

When it comes to feeling the need to please administration teachers reacted differently. All agreed that it is nice to feel validated by their administration but the female teachers in my study both felt the need to please their administration. Sandy described herself as a "people pleaser" and indicated that if she has negative feelings she would not feel comfortable sharing these feelings with her evaluator because she would not want to "ruffle any feathers." Likewise, Sue stated that she too feels the need to please her evaluators since they are her boss. The male teachers in my study did not appear to be as eager to please their administration. Sheldon felt that doing the right thing should essentially be what someone wants to do for themselves and their students and that it is not about pleasing administration. Sheldon stated, “They’re expecting too much out of teachers because we don’t have time to be there for administration necessarily. We’re here for students.” Hugo said that it really depended on the administrator for him. There are some you want to please and others where he "just do[es] the bare minimum so [he] can keep [his] job." In other words if he feels valued by his administrators he is more willing to try to please them but if he does not feel valued he has no issue "with showing negative loyalty" towards them. He also stated that he tries to be as authentic as possible when an evaluator is in the room. In summary, the female teachers in my study seemed to get more nervous and wanted to please their administrators whereas the males in my study had a more laid back response and did not allow the observations to bother them.

Reactions to an Evaluator’s Presence

There was also a notable difference in how teachers reacted to an evaluator entering their room for an evaluation. The females in this study were overwhelmingly more nervous than the men in my study. Sue struggles with “an initial feeling of nervousness” but also shared that no matter how much she feels prepared in her classroom, “sometimes their (her students) emotions for the lesson are not what you anticipate or something could just go hay wire.” She said during the actual evaluation she is nervous but
once the evaluation is over she feels relieved. Sandy also shared that she feels extremely nervous when an evaluator enters her room. She states,

I tend to talk too fast. I tend to miss just some basic things like I know connections in things that I would normally make with a regular lesson. I'll jump from one thing to another without making that bridge because I’m just so nervous that I don’t settle in and relax. I think I always feel uncomfortable when an evaluator enters my room just because it makes me very nervous and I get just antsy and fidgety and forget things and I’m not as focused because Oh No! They’re coming to see what I’m doing. Um, I still do the same thing but it’s just, I’m not as relaxed when I think I’m being observed.

Sandy in particular shared feelings of nervousness and anxiousness and she tends to get very worked up about the mere thought of someone watching her because she feels like they are going to nitpick everything she does. On the flip side of this the males in my study reacted very differently when an evaluator entered their room to observe. Sheldon said that he does not feel uncomfortable at all saying,

Mainly because I feel like I’m doing what I’m supposed to do and um I’m never trying to cover up anything. I teach the standard and I keep students engaged bell to bell and you know I’m there for them. I answer questions, you know, I’ve never been nervous when they come in, not that I recall.

Sheldon said “I’m not a dog and pony show teacher” and also stated that he has been teaching for so long that regardless of whether an administrator enters his room, he said,

I’m gonna keep doing what I need to do to teach students and be there for students so you know their just there checking the things they need to check off. Since there’s no real interaction between my evaluator during that time I just kind of ignore them and go on with what I’m doing.

Hugo admitted to having some nervousness when he knew he was being evaluated but otherwise he said he is “fully comfortable” when an evaluator enters his room. He said he feels “typical nervousness [and]
anxiety” but “that kind of comes with being a person.” He also describes that he sometimes worries when he is doing certain activities because he may get marked down for it if it is not an activity the evaluator likes. Hugo also stated:

I kind of feel like a, I feel like a two-face-ness ness or like a duplicit-ness about the process or about when I’m in the evaluation mode, cause the kids kind of act different when an administrator’s in there cause they’re used to teachers being evaluated and then depending on the class, you know, sometimes they will make a good impression you so they’re like more quiet or they ask less questions and then I feel like maybe I’m interacting more than I would or I’m like trying to show off so I try to be as balanced as, I try to depict an actual classroom experience so emotion for me is I guess is trying to stay genuine cause like trying to avoid being inauthentic for the evaluator like, like oh look I’ve, it’s the first time I’m doing group work is when you came in. How convenient. Um, I mean I do some group work, it’s not a whole class structure but um I guess that’s an emotion. I mean I kind of made it an adjective so I try to make it as, as what it is, as what it is in my classroom really as I can I think when they come in.

Evaluator Participation

Not only are the male teachers more at ease but they also do not worry as much about pleasing their administrator. Additionally one of the females in my study, Sandy, described that she enjoys it when an evaluator comes into her room and takes an active part in the lesson. She wants them to participate and interact with her class. She said it makes her feel less nervous however one of the males in my study, Sheldon, commented that he could care less if an evaluator is in the room and he would just assume ignore that they are there. He said, “I just kind of ignore them and go on with what I’m doing.”

Overall Concerns and the Future of Evaluation

In addition to the interview and focus group responses from the four participants in my study, I also made observation notes at a faculty meeting in my previous school district just prior to the
implementation of TKES. The males in this meeting were much more passive and very few men commented on anything at all. One of male teachers said, “They can observe me when they want, I’m not going to put on a dog and pony show for anyone.” Another said, “This too shall pass.” Additionally, another male teacher simply asked how it was going to affect his pay. The females in the room had several concerns and seemed very tense. They wanted to know how they would be evaluated and what would the evaluator being looking for. They were concerned about the time constraints and the need for extensive documentation, saying “There’s just not enough time.” During this particular meeting the women reacted with nervousness, stress, and worry. The men on the other hand displayed much more sedate responses.

Teachers also shared their emotional reactions to the future of evaluation. Although wide ranging, the teachers in this study with the exception of one teacher seemed to be very hopeful about the future of evaluation and potential changes that could be made to improve evaluation. Sheldon said he thinks it will eventually "evolve into some happy medium between GTEP and TKES." He feels TKES is currently too complex for both the teachers and the administrators. It requires too much time from administrators and is too confusing to teachers. Another concern he has is the amount of time it takes to go online to enter the data and do all the sign-offs. He is hopeful that it will eventually balance out because small changes have already been made since the implementation of TKES. For examples, student surveys were taken away and the number of observations were decreased for veteran teachers. Hugo on the other hand had a very negative perception of what the future holds for teacher evaluation. He thinks that is the next 5-10 years evaluations will be “more tested, it’ll only be more data, data specific and test score specific and less merit based.” He is not hopeful at all and indicated that he does not plan on being a teacher long enough to find out. He said, “I’m not doing this for more than ten years so I have not thought about it a lot because in the long term, I’m not, I can’t be the thirty year classroom teacher, you know, it’s just not worth it.” Sandy, a veteran teacher commented that she preferred the older system of evaluation better where you were either satisfactory or not. She said our current evaluation system has
not been successful and is not doing anything to help teachers be more productive. When she gets her evaluations back she is not looking at it thinking about what she can do to make changes because the feedback is not meaningful. Each of the participants commented on several things they would like to see changed about TKES. They view TKES as a number based system that has very little substance in terms of feedback and support for teachers. Sandy also refers to evaluations as a way teachers are micromanaged. What each of these teachers would like to see is for the evaluation system to move towards more of a feedback system. Instead of an evaluator coming in and looking for things to check off a list the teachers in my study would like to see these evaluators coming in and participating in the lessons and observing the finer details of a lesson such as the types of interactions taking place, the way students and teachers interact, the types of questions being asked in the classroom, etc. Teachers “all have their own teaching personality,” “their own teaching style,” “their own methodology, and of course there’s best practices,” said Hugo. He thinks TKES is too much of a one-size fits all type of system and teachers should be recognized for their differences. Sandy said she wants to move to evaluations being more “on a human level instead of a checks and balances system.” The teachers in my study want the evaluation process to be more personal and for the feedback to be more specific. Feedback should “offer assistance and support” to teachers, said Hugo. They also want face to face feedback with “an open dialogue” according to Sheldon. Additionally, Sheldon would like for administration to interact with teachers more outside the scope of evaluation as well. For example, they could pop their head into a teacher’s classroom to say hello or to see how they are doing. He would like to see “a more collegial interaction as opposed to a supervisor interaction.” Sue feels evaluation “needs to be more consistent and there needs to be examples.” She would also like to have more evaluations because she feels like a ten minute observation a couple times a year is “not an accurate description of what’s happening daily.” Ultimately the teachers in this study want evaluators to take the time to see the big picture instead of just checking off boxes and they want meaningful personalized feedback with the sole purpose of supporting teachers. With
agreement from the other three participants, Sheldon said, “I think the human element needs to be brought back.”

Chapter Summary

In closing the purpose of this study was to explore how teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES. Teachers shared their experiences and reactions to evaluation through semi-structured interviews and a focus group. Additionally data was collected from observation notes taken throughout my research process from both my previous school and my current school. During the data analysis process several patterns emerged and it was evident that teachers had both positive and negative emotional responses to TKES based on their emotional reactions and shared experiences. Additionally there were some gender differences in the way teachers reacted to TKES. In the following chapter I used Jensen (1981) as a framework to analyze these findings along with other research. I also discussed how my study applied to feminist theory. Lastly, I discussed the findings from prior research dating as early as the early 1980s and determine if the same things appear almost thirty years later and whether or not teachers area reacting differently to the evaluation process.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

In this chapter I provided a summary of my study, as well as a discussion of my findings, limitations, implications, and recommendations for future research. The central purpose of this study was to investigate how teachers describe their emotional responses to TKES evaluation. I also sought to determine if their responses differed by gender. The findings in this study can aid evaluators in understanding evaluation from a teacher’s perspective as well as to help evaluators understand how teachers are emotionally impacted by evaluation. In this study I sought to answer the following research questions:

1. How do teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES?
2. What are the differences in emotional responses between men and women teachers concerning TKES evaluations?

Summary of Study

For this study, I used phenomenology and feminist theory to investigate how teachers describe their emotions pertaining to evaluation. Using a phenomenological study allowed me to better understand teacher emotion with an emphasis on the lived experiences of each of my participants (Merriam, 2009). Feminist theory also informed my study because feminist theory “works to end the social dominance of women and supports gender equality” (Swirsky & Angelone, 2016, p. 445). Additionally, liberal feminists aim to “remove barriers,” such as “individual psyche” or other barriers in the school that prevent women from “reaching their full potential” and to secure equality among men and women (Acker, 1987, p. 423). In my study I determined differences in male and female teachers and how they react to evaluation as well as the experiences they shared that caused their emotional responses. Building on the ideas of feminism I was able to focus on how teachers describe their emotional response to evaluation,
how it impacted how they felt about themselves as well as any gender differences the teachers in my study faced because of the evaluation process and implementation of TKES. Feminism is appropriate for my study because feminism looks at gender, specifically women, and how people are oppressed and the struggles people face because of their gender (Merriam, 2009). Women are not necessarily told not to share their emotions however women have been acculturated into believing it is not acceptable to share emotions with those over them.

My study consisted of four participants (two male and two female) from one Georgia high school located in Tkesville, Georgia (pseudonym). The participants in my study were diverse in terms of not only what they taught but also their level of experience. These teachers ranged from beginning teachers of less than three years of experience to more tenured teachers with up to thirty-three years of experience. This diversity allowed me to obtain data from a variety of perspectives.

For my study, I used observation notes, semi-structured interviews, and a focus group. Observation notes were taken from both my previous school and my current school. The semi-structured interviews and focus group participants are teachers at my current school. Building on Ezzy (2002) who contends that feminist methodologies emphasize experiences, my questions not only asked teachers to describe how they felt about various issues relating to evaluation but also for them to share their experiences so that I could better understand why they feel the way they do. In the following section I will discuss my findings for each of my research questions and how these findings enhances prior research on this topic.

**Discussion of Findings**

Findings from this study will be compared to Jensen’s 1981 study, “How Teachers View Teacher Evaluation” as well as other research on how teachers feel about teacher evaluation. Although Jensen’s 1981 study is dated, it is interesting to see how nearly forty years later teachers respond to evaluation in much the same way. Here we are in 2018 and teachers are still struggling with many of the same things
they complained about nearly forty years ago. For example, teachers are still complaining that evaluators are inexperienced and possibly not qualified to conduct evaluations. Additionally teachers complain that evaluators do not spend enough time in the classroom doing the observations and they do not give adequate feedback. Teachers also complain that they are not clear on what they are being evaluated on as well as the evaluations being subjective. Even though tenured teachers in my study seemed to suggest that the previous system was better, based on what we know about the history of teacher evaluation, this positive appraisal seems more likely to be a reflection of the tenuous of human memory. Although Sandy and Sheldon suggested they preferred the previous evaluation system, Jensen (1981) suggested otherwise saying that evaluation practices are often “threatening, invalid, or unjust.” For each of my research questions I discussed what I found and discussed how it either compared or differed from that of past research.

**Research Question 1 – How do teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES?**

In analyzing the data collected from observation notes, interview data, and focus group data I found there to be three main patterns that emerged which aids in answer this research question. The three patterns that emerged in my study were how teachers shared their reactions to the expectations of TKES, the subjectivity of TKES, and the personalization of TKES. In Jensen’s 1981 study the primary themes in her study were the “purposes for teacher evaluation, the role of the evaluator, the nature of teacher evaluation, and critical factors in teacher evaluation practices” (p. 130). These themes coincide with those I specified although I grouped them a little differently.

**Expectations of TKES**

The purpose of evaluation can been defined in a multitude of ways. The teachers in my study defined the purpose of evaluation as being two-fold. The purpose of evaluation was for teacher improvement but teachers described this in both a positive and negative context. In one respect the
purpose of evaluation is to assure teachers were doing what is expected of them in terms of classroom management and teaching content as a means of offering support to teachers and in a negative context is used more as quality control to say, “Got you!” and is “used to control staff,” according to Hugo, a participant in my study. So how does this compare to that of other studies done on teacher evaluation? The results of my study closely aligned with that of prior research. For example, prior research states evaluation can be used not only to improve teaching but also as evidence to aid administration in decision making such as personnel decisions and salaries (Jensen, 1981; Toch, 2008). In Jensen’s 1981 study, 61% of teachers felt evaluations were done to judge their teaching abilities. 63% for accountability, and 72% for self-growth and improvement. Likewise, Zimmerman and Deckert-Pelton (2003) mirrored this finding writing that evaluation can be used for teacher growth and pedagogical improvement. The evaluator is often viewed as a “reinforcer with occasional suggestions” or a “perceiver of classroom events” (Jensen, 1981, p. 132-133). If used appropriately, “teacher evaluations can be powerful catalysts for teacher and school improvement” (Toch, 2008, p. 33). In my study some teachers feel the evaluator’s purpose is for teacher improvement but Hugo felt evaluation is sometimes used to “catch” teachers doing something wrong. Glass (1975) writes that although evaluation can support teacher improvement it can also hinder improvement because it stimulates teacher defensiveness and distrust. For example, Hugo stated evaluation should be more of a way to “offer assistance and support” but some evaluators “use it as a chance to like find teachers who aren’t doing well and like criticize them.” This does not create a relationship built on trust. The teachers in my study also feel evaluators are subjective and since one evaluator could rate them differently than another who observed the exact same thing it causes teachers to lose faith in the evaluation process. Additionally, teachers can sometimes feel threatened by evaluations because they feel evaluations are used to see who gets hired back (Glass, 1975). Sheldon, a participant in my study, shared similar emotions saying that he worries that the evaluator is looking for something he may be doing wrong instead of what he may be doing right. This aligned with Jensen’s 1981 study. 72%
of those in Jensen’s study said at the very least, the evaluator should come into the classroom looking for something positive instead of looking for all the problems (Jensen, 1981).

Teachers can also feel intimidated by their evaluators and often feel extremely nervous and anxious during an evaluation causing them to act differently than they normally do (Jensen, 1981). Sandy, a participant in my study, expressed that as soon as an evaluator walks into the room she immediately feels nervous. She also said she starts to talk too fast and is not herself when the evaluator is there. She also struggles with an evaluator sitting in the back of the room taking notes on the computer while she is trying to give a lesson. It is very intimidating to her and makes her a ball of nerves. This mirrors Jensen’s 1981 study where he described teachers as feeling nervous and stumbling when an evaluator took notes during an evaluation. Just as described by Glass (1975) Sandy’s self-esteem suffers because she feels as though she is being judged and that she is not good enough. A lack of self-efficacy becomes an issue (Golby, 1996; Savage, 2004; Zembylas, 2003a; Zembylas, 2003b). Teachers feel a lack of efficacy and competence due to the pressures placed on them by administration (Zembylas, 2003a). Sandy described herself saying most people would consider her to be overly confident and although she agrees, when an evaluator enters the room she is the complete opposite. She loses all confidence. Just like Sandy, Hugo, another participant in my study also described feeling nervous but for the most part he indicated he was indifferent to an evaluator being present. Although Hugo tries to be as authentic as he can, his experience also mirrored the findings in Jensen’s study saying he found that he acts differently when an evaluator is present. For example he said he felt two-faced because he finds that when an evaluator is in the room he interacts more than normal with his students and tries to show off. Although he tries to remain authentic he says this can be difficult to do when you know you are being observed. There is also a lot of pressure placed on teachers. Hugo said that teaching is viewed as a higher calling to shape the lives of children and feels that there are unrealistic expectations put on teachers to “sacrifice their entire existence” for the sake of the children.
The teachers in my study felt emotions that ranged from nervousness, anxiousness, worry, stress, and confidence. A study by Sutton, Mudrey-Camino, and Knight (2009) also found that teachers expressed feeling a variety of emotions including frustration, anger, anxiety, happiness, lack of confidence, and burnout. Frustrations related to time requirements has also been an issue for teachers (Kelchtermans, 1996). Teachers often feel they are stressed with tedious tasks relating to their job. Sheldon, a participant in my study, concurred saying it takes too much time to go online to the TKES platform to enter data, comments, and to sign-off or accept evaluator feedback. This was not an issue brought up by any of the other participants in my study. Teachers being overburdened with tedious tasks such as grading and lesson planning were not brought up as they were in Golby’s 1996 study. Likewise, teacher burnout was a key theme in several past studies but was not a major concern in my study (Golby, 1996; Savage, 2004; Zembylas, 2003a; Zembylas, 2003b).

**Subjectivity of TKES**

The teachers in my study agree with prior studies indicating the lack of evaluator experience plays a key role in the subjectivity of evaluation. For example, many evaluators have not been in the classroom for quite some time (Jensen, 1981). Another concerns is that some evaluators have not been in the classroom for an extended time and since their last classroom experiences, kids have changed (Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003). Sheldon, a participant in my study stated that some evaluators have not been in the classroom for very long before they became an administrator or they may have been a middle school teacher who got a job as an assistant principal at a high school. He felt their experience was different and that some administrators are “so far removed from the classroom.” Teachers feel that in order for an evaluator to effectively critique them, the evaluator needs to be experienced in the classroom as well (Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003). Sheldon described this saying “you’re not going to put somebody to be a head football coach if they’ve never played football or if they’ve only played peewee football you know, because they don’t have that experience.” Teachers in this study agreed with Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston (2011) indicating that teachers sometimes distrust those conducting
evaluations because of a lack of training and experience. Evaluators having a lack of experience is not the only issue brought up by teachers. It seems evaluators are also not consistent from one evaluator to another (McGreal, 1982). In terms of teacher expectations, the teachers in my study focused on TKES standards being too overwhelming because of the number of standards. Teachers indicated that there was no way for all ten standards to be assessed in a single observation because evaluations are too short. The shortness of evaluations will be addressed later in this chapter, however teachers indicated that the standards needed to be simplified and consolidated to make them more teacher friendly. The teachers in my study felt as though the standards were confusing for both the teacher and the evaluator and allowed for a lot of subjectivity in how evaluators rated teachers. Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston (2011) identified four problems with the evaluation process. These included that teachers felt principals lacked competence, teacher resistance to evaluation, lack of consistence in the evaluation process, and evaluators not having adequate training. These claims have been consistent since Jensen’s 1981 study and are still brought up by teachers today.

Evaluator bias is also a concern of many teachers. For example, the participants in my study indicated that different evaluators could observe the exact same lesson but score a teacher differently because the evaluator may like a particular teaching strategy that is being used or possibly may not like the teacher. These responses align perfectly with Sawyer (2001) in that teachers often do not know what an evaluator is looking for or what is expected of them.

Teachers also argue that using student achievement data is not a fair way to evaluate teachers because there are far too many factors teachers have no control of that contribute to student achievement and growth. In my study teachers indicated that teachers cannot control where a student comes from nor can teachers control the emotions and experiences that students come to the classroom with. For example, teachers cannot control a student’s home environment or if they were in an argument that day with their best friend. Another factor is classroom dynamic. Classes are held at different times of day and include different kids. Sometimes the grouping of students or the time of day a class is offered can
influence student growth and achievement according to the teachers in my study. Additionally, some students do not seem to have a desire to learn or contribute to their own success. Likewise, some students will learn no matter what environment they are in regardless of who their teacher is. These responses are consistent with the research of Darling-Hammond, et al. (2012) who also found that teachers complain about student achievement because of the many factors that influence student achievement that teachers do not have control of. Darling-Hammond, et al. (2012) writes that student achievement is influenced by various school factors, their home and community, student needs, their peers, prior teachers, and the types of assessments used to measure student achievement. School factors can range from the types of resources used, the type of curriculum used, class sizes, and instructional time (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2012). Just as the teachers in my study said, Darling-Hammond, et al. (2012) also states that students come into the classroom with various levels of support including emphasis put on education at home as well as financial constraints that do not allow all families to provide their children with equitable resources. Other issues include various ability levels and health conditions that could also influence a student’s academic success (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2012). The teachers in my study feel it is unfair to judge them based on student growth because of the many factors that are out of their control. Additionally, teachers feel time is another issue that causes evaluations to be unfair.

The teachers in my study agree that evaluators do not spend enough time conducting evaluations (Jensen, 1981; Toch, 2008). The teachers in my study indicated that two thirty minute evaluations in a year are not enough to determine a teacher’s effectiveness. Just like other studies, teachers referred to evaluations as a “five minute snapshot” (Glass, 1975; Jensen, 1981; Toch, 2008). Additionally, evaluations are done too far apart according to one teacher in my study. Timing was also an issue brought up. Sue, a teacher in my study, said that evaluators sometimes come at inappropriate times. For example, she described a time when an evaluator came to her room on a day when they were not on a normal schedule and the routine was disrupted for not only her but also her students. She felt the timing of the observation did not give her evaluator an accurate view of what actually takes place in her classroom on a
daily basis. Additionally in my observation notes from Tkesville High School several of the teachers commented that it is unfair for an evaluator to come on a day right before or after either a long break or a pep rally type of activity. Unfortunately teachers sometimes feel that this is done because evaluators are trying to meet deadlines in terms of getting their observations done. Likewise, Donaldson (2012) argues observations are often done at the last minute as a check off of something that has to be done. Sawyer (2001) writes, “Teachers complained that evaluation was something that was done to them rather than with their collaboration” (p. 44).

Teachers also agree that evaluators are not in their classroom long enough to see the full picture of what goes on in their classroom. How can an evaluator get an accurate description of what is happening daily in a classroom if they are only in there for five minutes? According to Jensen (1981) the evaluator is not in the room long enough to see what is going on and end up evaluating on “superficial things” that are not important (p. 133). Some teachers feel these types of classroom visits tend to be nitpicky, meaningless, hold very little value, and are a waste of everyone’s time (Toch, 2008). After all, teachers can easily put on a show for a short period of time (Jensen, 1981; Glass, 1975). Sheldon, a teacher in my study said that six evaluations per year is not enough. He said, “Anybody can do a dog and pony show for six days and say oh… they’re just wonderful.” The amount of time an evaluator spends in the classroom is superficial and teachers do not take them seriously (Donaldson, 2012; Glass, 1975). Many teachers complain about these “snapshot visits” saying they are not productive and do not show the quality of instruction in their classroom (Toch, 2008). In addition, in many cases, these short classroom visits provide a lack of feedback as judgements are being made based on an “immediate reaction” upon entering a classroom (Jensen, 1981; Toch, 2008). Feedback will be discussed in greater detail in the personalization section of this chapter. One thing that did strike me as interesting is that Sandy, one of the tenured teachers in my study mentioned on numerous occasions that she preferred the previous evaluation system that used satisfactory and unsatisfactory as a way for rating teachers. She seemed to like the simplicity of it saying it identified teachers as either being a good teacher or not a good teacher.
She indicated she did not find the current evaluation system to be meaningful. Interestingly though, in prior studies, teachers described evaluations as a checklist of behaviors and conditions that have nothing to do with “the quality of instruction” and teachers disliked the simplicity of being rated with satisfactory or unsatisfactory (Toch, 2008, p. 32). What some teachers complained about in years past, some teachers today complain about moving away from that system. Teachers today complain that the scoring rubric used in the TKES evaluation is unrealistic. For example, scoring a level four appears to be unreachable for most teachers. Hugo, a teacher in my study, said, “The whole idea of the fourth column is kind of odd to me that there’s this like heavenly tier of teaching.” He also describes it as some “sort of forbidden fruit.” Teachers get frustrated that the whole idea of getting a four is unobtainable and a three has become the new goal for many teachers. Teachers are becoming complacent with being scored with a three but at the same time some feel like they lack efficacy because they are not scoring a four. Likewise scoring a two can be extremely upsetting for teachers. Sandy in my study said that when she received a two she is “pissed off” because it makes her feel like she is not a good teacher when she knows she really is. In many cases she says it boils down to the fact that the evaluator was not in the room long enough to see whatever it is she may have been marked down on and if they had stayed just a few more minutes they would have seen it.

Even though teachers know there is subjectivity in how teachers are evaluated, it still causes teachers to feel the need to please their administrators. Ultimately three of the four teachers in my study agreed they feel the need to please their administration. My findings suggest that women are more likely to feel the need to please their administration than men. Sue said she was always “sure to bring [her] A game” when an evaluator observed her. Hugo said, “It’s nice to feel validated” and Sandy described herself as a “people pleaser.” Zembylas (2003a) writes that teachers feel a lack of efficacy and competence due to the pressures placed on them by administration. I believe this is true with those in my study as well. For example, Sandy in particular discussed in great depth how nervous she feels when an evaluator is present in her classroom. She lacks confidence and tends to stumble because she is so
worried about what they will say about her. She feels judged and feels a great deal of pressure to prove herself as an effective teacher. Hugo feels the need to please administration as well. He is not as nervous as the females in my study but does acknowledge that ultimately the evaluator is his boss and he does like to feel as though he is doing his job correctly. Hugo also stated he finds himself trying to show off when an evaluator is in the room. This is not the case with all teachers though. For example, Sheldon, a teacher in my study described himself as being nervous but he is able to ignore the evaluator while they are in his room whereas many teachers struggle with this. This brings me to the personalization of TKES. Teachers seem to struggle with the lack of personalization.

**Personalization of TKES**

The personalization of TKES was a key pattern that emerged when I analyzed the data from my study. One underlying topic that arose was whether or not teachers want their evaluator to participate in their classroom discussion/activities while they are in the room. For three of the teachers in my study this was not something they brought up but for Sandy it was. Sandy loves it when an evaluator participates in her lessons and raises their hand to join in on a classroom discussion. She said it makes her feel more at ease. She said she would much rather the evaluator participate then to sit in the back of the room typing away at their evaluation notes. Based on prior research it appears most teachers do like for their evaluator to participate in their classroom during an evaluation. For example, Jensen (1981) said that 74% of the teachers in her study said they would like the evaluator to interact with kids to see what they are learning and for them to get involved in classroom discussions. On the flip side though the same study indicated 63% of teachers wanted an “inconspicuous and unobtrusive evaluator” (Jensen, 1981, p. 135). Some of the teachers in Jensen’s study said the evaluator should blend and not say anything while in the classroom whereas others said it was acceptable for the evaluator to talk quietly to students as long as they were not a distraction. Sheldon in my study did not comment specifically on this however he did indicate that when the evaluator was present he ignored them which tells me he did not try to include them in his
classroom discussions. Ultimately it is a teacher’s preference. There were mixed emotions from teachers nearly forty years ago and the same is true of teachers today.

Feedback, or the lack thereof, is a topic brought up nearly forty years ago and likewise it is still a concern of teachers today. The teachers in my study like getting feedback but overall the teachers in my study (3 out of 4) felt as though they do not receive adequate feedback. One of the chief complaints was that the feedback was not meaningful and it was not personalized for the teacher. For example, Sheldon, a teacher in my study, stated that the evaluator often uses canned statements that are copied and pasted to the point where they forget to change the gender pronouns. Additionally, the teachers in my study want specific feedback where evaluators give them specific examples of what they saw during an observation and what they liked or disliked about their lesson. Both tenured teachers in my study indicated that they received more feedback under the previous evaluation system. Interestingly, Donaldson (2012) and Jensen (1981) states that teachers feel feedback is not given in a meaningful way and is often vague. Likewise, Toch (2008) states that evaluators rarely take the time to give feedback to teachers or to discuss the results. I suppose not much has changed over the years. It is evident to me that teachers want feedback but more specifically they want meaningful feedback.

In the past teachers indicated they wanted a chance to discuss their results with their evaluator and an opportunity to defend themselves (Jensen, 1981; Toch, 2008). “Teachers complained that evaluation was something that was done to them rather than with their collaboration” (Sawyer, 2001, p. 44). Thankfully this is something that has changed since the implementation of TKES. The teachers in my study openly said they appreciated evaluation conferences which is part of the TKES evaluation process because these conferences give them a chance to clarify anything the evaluator saw or did not see during the evaluation before it gets entered into the system as a permanent record. They also like that it gives them an opportunity to answer the evaluator’s questions as well as ask questions themselves.
Although the teachers in my study like being able to clarify any misconceptions about their evaluation they still complain that the conferencing and/or communication about their evaluation lacks meaning and that there is little to no support offered to them afterwards. Hugo indicated the conferences were too informal and he would like to see more of an open dialogue with more open ended questions. Sheldon did not feel as though he is offered support from his evaluator and he would like to see evaluation move to a means of “offer[ing] assistance and support” to teachers, especially new teachers. Sadly, Sheldon says that when teachers ask for support often times the evaluator does not know how to help them. Hugo mirrored Sheldon saying that a “pro-teacher administration will offer feedback and actually offer support” instead of looking for ways to criticize teachers. Teachers feeling a lack of support is not new to research on teacher evaluation. Sawyer (2001) also stated that evaluators give little to no feedback and teachers do not know how to proceed. Teachers do not know what is expected of them (Sawyer, 2001). The teachers in my study yearn for an actual conversation and even though they are given an opportunity to talk and clarify any misconceptions they still complain that they feel the conferencing is a time where the evaluator rushes through the information just wanting the teacher to sign off on the evaluation so that they can move onto the next teacher. Teachers have to be proactive and have a voice for themselves but all too often teachers are not as open as they should be.

Most of the teachers in my study – male and female - appear to have a difficult time sharing their emotions with their evaluators. Three of the four participants in my study felt it was inappropriate to show emotions to administration. Teachers are expected to express emotions of “empathy, calmness, and kindness” but must control emotions such as “anger, anxiety, and vulnerability” (Zembylas, 2002, p. 200-201). This emotional rule for teachers seems to be applied equally to male and female teachers in my study. Sutton, Mudrey-Camino, & Knight (2009) define this attempt to modify one’s emotions as emotion regulation. Though both male and female teachers in my study appeared to adhere to the unspoken emotional rules for classroom teachers, the women in my study were much more adamant about keeping their negative emotions hidden. Sandy in particular said she chose not to confront her bosses
because she did not want to “ruffle any feathers” and does not want to be confrontational with administration. When women express forms of frustration they are often accused of being irrational (Zembylas & Fendler, 2007; Boler, 1999; Blackmore, 2004). Could this be why the women in my study appeared to want regulate their emotions more often than men in my study? I am not so sure I can answer that question but I can say that Sheldon indicated he felt administration needed to hear his frustrations because if they did there would be a better chance they could help him in his areas of frustration. He also said, “That’s what they’re getting paid to do.” However, the other three teachers in my study did not feel it was appropriate to share negative emotions with their evaluators. Hugo said it is just not professional to do so. This corresponds to prior research that says that many teachers control their emotions because they do not want negative attention (Zembylas, 2003b; Zembylas, 2007; Zembylas, 2006; Cukur, 2009). Boler (1999) says that teachers must self-policing themselves. For the most part the teachers in my study seem to do a pretty good job at this but Sheldon does not seem to hold back his emotions. Just as Cukur (2009) and Zembylas (2003b) indicated, teachers run the risk of getting negative attention when they cannot control their emotions. Sheldon has experienced this as well and sometimes feels he is tuned out when he has things to say that he feels are for the better good of the rest of the staff. He feels administration does not always take him seriously and he is sometimes ignored by administration, especially in a larger group setting. What teachers have to be careful with though is whether or not their negative responses could be used against them in determining whether or not they get a contract the following year. Often times negative emotions that are shared can loom over them because administration often remembers the negativity expressed by teachers (Zembylas, 2003a; Zembylas, 2002). In other words an evaluator may remember the negativity that was displayed by a teacher and it could influence an evaluator’s judgements about a teacher later. Hugo in my study stated that even if he thought nothing would happen he would not share his negative emotions with his evaluator because “it introduces too [many] nuances to the already super, overly subtle evaluation process because then all that’s in the back of their (the evaluator’s) head” is whatever it is you might have said.
Although most of the teachers in my study did not feel it was appropriate to share emotions with their evaluators they did feel it was acceptable to share emotions with other teachers although it was still important to remember that this is a work place and no one wants to hear someone complain all the time. Either way though they felt it was helpful to be able to vent to their co-workers as long as they remained professional. So when I read across the data the big thing that had me start thinking is the way evaluation affects a teacher’s sense of self.

**Research Question 2 - What are the differences in emotional responses between men and women teachers concerning TKES evaluations?**

**Sharing Emotions**

Describing a person as being emotional tends to be mostly associated with women because women are traditionally viewed as more emotional than men (Zembylas, 2003a). Those in my study agreed and disagreed with this statement depending on the topic or situation. For example, Sandy shared that she felt women were typically more open about their emotions whereas men tended to keep their emotions inside. This conflicts with how Sandy actually responded in my study though. Although she indicated she felt women were more open about their emotions than men this was not the case in my study. Even though Sandy and Sue may have experienced more negative emotions than one of the men, Sheldon, such as nervousness and stress, they were also more reluctant to share their emotions with their evaluator than Sheldon. Both Sandy and Sue indicated that they would not share their emotions with their administrator. Sandy went on to say that she would not share her emotions with her administrators because she did not want to have any conflicts. Hugo also did not feel it was appropriate to share negative emotions with administration and indicated that he felt it was “unprofessional to complain to your bosses” saying it was “just petty.” Hugo said:

I wouldn’t openly talk about it (his evaluation) even if they were like hey, this is, you know, even if they told me that like nothing would happen. I’m not going to do that because it introduces too
much nuances to the already super, overly subtle evaluation process because then all that’s in the back of their head is like, “Oh, Mr. Ronald said this in a meeting” and even if they’re not trying to do anything about it, it’s still sitting in their head, so, it’s just not a good idea.

**Need to Please**

Along with Hugo, Sue and Sandy emphasized their desire to please their administration. Sheldon did not have a problem sharing his emotions with his evaluators and does not hide his emotions. Sandy on the other hand said she would never tell her evaluators of the negative feelings she has because she would not want to “ruffle any feathers.” Sue also said that she felt the need to please her evaluator because they were her boss and it just is not appropriate to vent and let all of your emotions out to your boss. My findings suggest that women feel the need to please administration more so than men. Additionally, my findings suggest that women are less likely to share their emotions with their evaluator, especially negative emotions. This aligns with liberal feminism in that women have a “reluctance to confront power and patriarchy” (Acker, 1987, p. 419). Feminist theory also addresses “the question of women’s subordination to men” and that women can achieve their full potential without altercations (Acker, 1987, p. 421). In terms of subordination to men, the women in my study felt a subordination to their evaluator and they chose to not address their negative emotions. Sandy was very clear that she did not want to “ruffle feathers” but it was not just the women in my study who felt this way. Hugo also stated that he did not feel it was appropriate to share negative emotions with an evaluator.

The teachers in my study stated that in terms of evaluation, they felt men and women were pretty equal in how they share emotions. This contradicts Zembylas (2003a). Zembylas (2003a) says women tend to be viewed as more emotional than men, meaning they are more apt to display their emotions. For example, women may be more likely to cry when they feel frustrated. Based on the actual responses of the participants in my study I would have to disagree with their thoughts that emotions are shared equally between genders. My findings suggest the opposite. During the interview process the males were much
more apt to share their experiences and freely responded to my questions whereas the women in my study gave much shorter direct answers. To put this in perspective each the female interviews lasted approximately 22 minutes each whereas the interviews with the male teachers lasted approximately 28 and 47 minutes. I noticed the males gave more detailed accounts of the experiences they had related to evaluation and the women responded much more succinctly. Teachers often feel they must control their emotions based on unwritten emotional rules because they do not want to be viewed as weak (Zembylas, 2006; Zembylas, 2003a, & Niesche & Haase, 2012). Even though the researcher is not an evaluator it could be that the females were less willing to share the details of their experiences because subconsciously they felt the information could get back to an evaluator.

Reactions to an Evaluator’s Presence

In prior research the researchers focused on teachers as a whole and did not separate them by gender. Some of the areas where there were notable gender differences in my study were not found in any of the other research I read. For example, the women in my study appeared to be much more nervous and anxious when they were being evaluated. The males in my study were much more passive about an evaluator being in the room and were able to ignore the evaluator. Sheldon and Hugo both said they were not uncomfortable at all when the evaluator entered their room and both tried to remain as authentic as they could although Hugo admitted to sometimes showing off when they were present. The women on the other hand described being extremely nervous. Sue described being nervous because she never knew what was going to happen or how the students would behave. Sandy in particular was so nervous that she said she just was not the same person. She would be a ball full of nerves. Her nervousness would be very evident to her evaluator. These findings suggest that the women were concerned about being judged for their effectiveness and recognizes the social hierarchy defined by feminist theory (Swirsky & Angelone, 2016).
Evaluator Participation

Another example of where gender differences were not described in prior research was how teachers feel about their evaluator participating in their lessons. Like I said previously, the male teachers in my study were much more passive about the evaluator being in the room and chose to ignore their presence so that they could continue on with what they were doing. This suggests that female teachers are much more nervous when the evaluator sits in the back of the room taking notes about the evaluation and when the evaluator participates in their lesson the women do not feel as judged. Sue did not mention this during her interview but Sandy said she loves it when the evaluator participates in her lesson because it makes her feel less nervous. She does not want for the evaluator to be awkward for herself or her students. When an evaluator is a participant in a lesson it makes the observation feel like less of an evaluation. In turn the teachers feel as if the evaluator is there to participate rather than evaluate them. The feeling of social imbalance, called patriarchy, is less of a threat (Swirsky & Angelone, 2016).

Summary of Findings

In terms of evaluation and identity, I will share my findings for research question 1. To my findings and to my discussion of the role of gender, one thing I noticed that I would want to learn more about it is that the women in my study were more impacted in terms of their sense of self than the men. There seems to be a greater impact on women than on men in terms of how much more nervous and concerned the women are when being evaluated. Liberal feminists believe one of the barriers that prevent women from reaching their full potential is their individual psyche (Acker, 1987). The idea of being judged by an evaluator causes many women to feel nervous. Even though, it does not necessarily mean the men were not affected. It could just be that they did not want to tell me that out loud.

Many of the complaints from prior research are things teachers still complain about today. Nearly forty years later teachers are still looking for improvements. Some of the issues teachers still complain about include not receiving adequate feedback and that evaluators do not spend enough time
observing teachers to determine a teacher’s effectiveness. Teachers also complain that what they are being assessed on is not always clear and that evaluations are highly subjective. Based on the results of my study, not a whole lot has changed but my study does not come without limitations. These limitations will be discussed in the following section.

**Limitations**

There are several limitations that existed with my study. The findings of this study were limited to four participants from a single high school in Tkesville, Georgia (pseudonym). Findings may have been different had my study been conducted in middle school, an elementary school, or even another high school in another part of the state. My participant group consisted of only four participants (2 male and 2 female). Because this group was so small it would be difficult to generalize the results of this study to the teachers across the state of Georgia. All four participants were also white because the only recruitment surveys received back were from white teachers. The results of this study could have been very different had it included teachers of color. Additionally, the participants in my study included two English Language Arts teachers and two Math teachers. The findings could have been very different if I had interviewed teachers from the social studies department, the science department, CTAE courses, or other elective courses. Additionally, this particular school assigns evaluators by department therefore findings from the interviews and focus group in my study were based on teacher perspectives of only two out of the four evaluators in this particular school. The participants in my study also included two teachers with less than three years of experience and two teachers with approximately thirty years of experience. My study did not include teachers from anywhere in between. Another limitation is that the interviews and focus group took place at the end of a school year which is after final evaluations and evaluation conferences would have taken place. The findings could have been different had I collected data at any other point during the school year. Another limitation is that the researcher was a teacher in the school where the research was done. It is possible that the participants in this study could have answered questions based on what they thought would be acceptable to the researcher. The participants in this
study could have also had concerns about whether or not their responses would truly be confidential during individual interviews as well as the focus group since other teachers along with the researcher were present. Lastly, as the researcher, I am a teacher in the same school where this study was conducted and it is possible that data could have been misinterpreted based on prior knowledge I had regarding both the participants in my study as well as the evaluators from this school.

**Implications**

Teacher evaluation is an inevitable part of assuring teachers are held accountable. Ultimately evaluations are used by schools to encourage teacher growth and improvement but also to aid administration in personnel and salary decision making (Jensen, 1981; Toch, 2008; Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003). Not only does the law require evaluation but after No Child Left Behind (NCLB) the demand for highly qualified teachers became critical (Danielson, 2001; Hazi & Rucinski, 2009).

The purpose of my study was to determine how teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES. Additionally I also wanted to determine if there were any differences in these responses based on gender. This research adds to existing research on teacher evaluation and can be used to better understand the emotions teachers encounter during the evaluation process. Teachers need to understand that they are not alone in the evaluation process and their emotions are not taboo. Additionally, evaluators could benefit by knowing teachers respond to evaluation and the implementation of TKES so that they can better understand the evaluation process and how it impacts teachers. This study also sheds light on some of the frustrations teachers have as it relates to the evaluation process as well as the power struggles teachers face in how comfortable they feel sharing their emotions with their evaluators without the fear of retribution.

When I read across my data I learned more about the ways in which evaluation impacts a teacher’s identify or their sense of their own efficacy as a teacher. What I found is that evaluation seems to have a greater impact on women than it does on men. For example, Sandy was impacted so greatly that
she felt extremely nervous and it impacted how she taught her class while an evaluator was present. Sheldon and Hugo on the other hand were much more passive and did not let the evaluator’s presence change how they conducted their lesson. They were able to ignore the evaluator’s presence whereas the women were not. There was definitely more nervousness among the women than there was among the men. Even though women felt nervous they did not feel it was appropriate to share these emotions with their evaluators. This goes back to my notion that the women want to please their administration. Sachs & Blackmore (1998) state, “To display emotions in the workplace for women is often seen as weak and nonrational and portrays women leaders as vulnerable.” Emotions teachers should control include “anger, anxiety, and vulnerability” (Zembylas, 2002). Women may be more nervous because they see the evaluation process as something that impacts their sense of themselves more so than the men. The men did not care what anyone else thought of them. These findings could lead to another study where someone could collect data on more men and women to see how evaluation impacts how they view themselves and whether or not it impacts their sense of self and self-efficacy.

Lastly, three of the four teachers in my study were hopeful for the future of evaluation. Several changes have already been made such as eliminating student surveys as part of the evaluation process. Going forward Sheldon said he expected improvements to continue. Likewise Sue and Sandy also had several suggestions for how TKES could be improved and appeared hopeful as well. My study will provide stakeholders with teacher feedback on how they would like to see the evaluation process evolve into something better in years to come.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

As the researcher in this study I would like to make several recommendations for any future research done on teacher emotional responses to evaluation. The first recommendation I have is that the researcher would include a larger sample of teachers from various schools and from various grade levels to include elementary, middle, and high school grade levels. The second recommendation I have is for
participants to be a more diversified group. For example, teachers should include teachers of different ethnicities. Additionally, teachers should not only come from varying grade levels but teachers should be represented from different levels of experience and content areas taught as well. A third recommendation I have is for the interviews and focus group to be conducted at varying times during the school year. For example, the research could collect data at the beginning of a school year, in the middle of a school year, and at the end of a school year. A fourth recommendation I have would be for the researcher to conduct their research from schools other than their own so that the participants in the study would not know the researcher. Additionally the research would not have prior knowledge about the participants or the evaluators from a particular school. A fifth recommendation I have would be for a researcher to conduct a study that includes more quantitative data as this study was qualitative. I believe this would provide a different perspective that could be backed up with numerical data. A sixth recommendation I have would be to include two groups of participants (teachers and evaluators) to get perspectives from both sides of the evaluation process. Lastly I would recommend that this study be replicated multiple times to get different perspectives after TKES has been implemented after five years, ten years, and so on.

Replication improves the reliability of a study because even though the results may be different it allows researchers to determine if the results of their study align with previous studies done and whether or not the results make sense (Merriam, 2009). In other words it helps a researcher authenticate their results.

TKES implementation took place during the 2012-2013 school year and the interviews and focus group data I collected was during the 2016-2017 school year, four years after implementation. Considering there has not been much of a change in teacher responses over the last forty years, it would be interesting to see if teachers respond the same way over a longer stretch of time since the implementation of TKES. It would also be interesting to see how teachers respond as TKES is amended over the years to see if teachers feel as though their voices are being heard and to ultimately move to an evaluation system that satisfies most teachers and evaluators.
Closing Remarks

The purpose of my phenomenological study was to investigate how teachers at one Georgia high school emotionally responded to TKES, a new high-stakes evaluation system. Although TKES was first implemented in Georgia school during the 2012-2013 school year, some schools did not fully implement it until one or two years later. Tkesville High School did not implement TKES until the 2013-2014 school year. In my study, I also sought to determine whether or not there were gender differences in how teachers responded. I analyzed written observation notes taken during the course of my research, teacher interviews, and a focus group consisting of four teachers.

This study revealed that the women in my study took their evaluations much more personally and showed more emotions during the evaluation process. The males in my study were much more willing to share their experiences that led to their emotional responses. Additionally this study revealed that even after nearly forty years teachers still struggle with the same things pertaining to evaluation. What teachers complained about decades ago they are still complaining about today. Since Jensen’s 1981 study evaluation has changed and specifically to Georgia, TKES was implemented in an effort to improve evaluation. The tenured teachers in my study, Sandy and Sheldon, suggested the previous system was better. They thought the previous system was more clear cut; either a teacher was a good teacher or they were not. With TKES Sandy and Sheldon think it is too complex and do not like the idea of scoring a four being so unreachable. Prior research though indicates that teachers had many complaints about the prior system as well and as I have already indicated, many of these complaints are the same as those teachers complain about today. I suppose the grass is not always greener on the other side.
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Appendix A

Taps Performance Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Professional Knowledge</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructional Planning</td>
<td>The teacher plans using state and local school district curricula and standards, effective strategies, resources, and data to address the differentiated needs of all students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Differentiated Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Of And For Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Assessment Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assessment Uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Positive Learning Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Academically Challenging Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionalism and Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(GADOE, 2016)
Appendix B

Main Questions:

- How do teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES?
- What are the differences in emotional responses between men and women teachers concerning TKES evaluations?

Sub-Questions:

- How do teachers describe their emotional responses regarding evaluation as a whole?
  - Purpose of evaluation
  - Need to please administration
  - positive experiences and how those experiences made them feel
  - negative experiences and how those experiences made them feel
- How do high school teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation after the implementation of TKES?
  - changes in the process and implementation of TKES
  - feelings about each standard outlined in TKES
    - Standard 1 – Professional Knowledge
    - Standard 2 – Instructional Planning
    - Standard 3 – Instructional Strategies
    - Standard 4 – Differentiated Instruction
    - Standard 5 – Assessment Strategies
    - Standard 6 – Assessment Uses
    - Standard 7 – Positive Learning Environment
    - Standard 8 – Academically Challenging Environment
    - Standard 9 – Professionalism
    - Standard 10 - Communication
  - evidence used in evaluation
  - evaluation ratings, subjectivity, and fairness
  - communication and feedback provided
  - time spent during the evaluation and number of evaluations
  - evaluation conferences
  - evaluator interaction and attitudes
  - teacher relationship / comfort level with the evaluator
  - Do you feel free to share how you feel about evaluation to your peers and/or administration?
- What feelings do high school teachers have regarding the future of evaluation?
Appendix C

Recruitment Email

Teachers,

How would you like a chance to win a $50 gift card to Red Lobster and a $25 gift card to Walmart just by answering some questions??

I am looking for teachers to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to determine how teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES (Teacher Keys Effectiveness System). I will also determine if there are differences in these responses based on gender and how these differences are connected to the struggles teachers face in and out of the classroom.

Participation in this study involves:

- An individual interview with a time commitment of 30-60 minutes
- A focus group with a time commitment of 30-60 minutes
- A $25 gift card to Walmart for chosen participants
- A chance to win a $50 gift card to Red Lobster just for filling out a recruitment survey and being willing to participate in this study. Completing a recruitment survey does not guarantee you will be chosen to participate in this study.

For more information about this study, please contact me, Kristina Hirsch, by email at kristina.hirsch@henry.k12.ga.us or by phone at 770-557-4309.

Thank you,

Kristina Hirsch
Researcher

Study Title: A Phenomenological Study of Teachers’ Emotional Responses to TKES, a New High-Stakes Evaluation System
Appendix D

Recruitment Survey

Name: ______________________________ Email: ______________________________

Gender:
□ Male □ Female

Race:
□ White □ Black or African American □ Hispanic or Latino □ Asian □ Other

What is the primary grade you teach?
□ 9th Grade □ 10th Grade □ 11th Grade □ 12th Grade □ Other __________

What subject(s) do you teach?
□ Science □ Math □ ELA □ Social Studies □ Career Tech / Elective

Total work experience as a teacher:
□ 0 – 3 years □ 4 – 7 years □ 8 – 11 years □ 12 – 15 years □ More than 15 years

How long have you taught in this school?
□ 0 – 3 years □ 4 – 7 years □ 8 – 11 years □ 12 – 15 years □ More than 15 years |

How would you describe your overall feelings towards evaluation?
□ Great □ Good □ Average □ Poor □ Terrible

What level of concern do you have regarding the future of evaluation?
□ No concern □ Some concern □ A lot of concern

Would you be willing to participate in a research study on the emotions teachers have regarding evaluation? Participation in this study would include an individual interview as well as a focus group discussion.
□ Yes □ No
Appendix E

Interview Questions

1. Why did you become a teacher?
2. What do you like most about your job?
3. What do you like least about your job?
4. When I say the word evaluation what emotions do you feel? Why do you feel this way?
5. What types of emotions do you have when you are being evaluated?
6. Do you experience more positive or negative emotions in terms of evaluation? Why?
7. Describe an example of when you experienced positive emotions about the evaluation process.
8. Describe an example of when you experienced negative emotions about the evaluation process.
9. Describe the best experience you have had with evaluation in teaching. What made this the best evaluation? How did this experience make you feel?
10. Describe the worst experience you have had with evaluation in teaching. What made this the best evaluation? How did this experience make you feel? How did you handle it?
11. How do you feel about the changes that have been made to evaluation and the implementation of TKES?
12. Do you think it is fair to use student growth as a means for evaluating teachers?
13. What do you think the purpose of evaluation is? Why?
14. Do you feel evaluations are done fairly? Why or why not?
15. Do you feel your receive adequate feedback from your evaluations? Why or why not?
16. What are your feelings about evaluation conferences? Why?
17. Do you feel the standards assessed in TKES are appropriate for determining a teacher’s effectiveness? Why or why not? Which standards do you think are the most appropriate and the least appropriate? Why?
18. Do you feel the need to please administration?
19. Have you ever felt uncomfortable when your evaluator entered your room? If so, what made you feel uncomfortable?
20. Do you feel it is acceptable in the work place to express your emotions? Which emotions are acceptable / unacceptable?
21. Do you feel free to share how you feel about evaluation to your peers and/or administration? Why or why not?
22. Do you believe that men and women deal with their emotions the same or differently? Why or why not?
23. What feelings do you have regarding the future of evaluation?
24. If you could change one thing about evaluation, what would it be and why?
25. If you could tell evaluators how evaluation could be improved what would you say? Why?
Appendix F

Focus Group Questions:

1. How has evaluation changed since you have been teaching?
2. Has the implementation of TKES made you feel better or worse about being evaluated? Why or why not?
3. Are there any standards you would remove from TKES? Why or why not? Does everyone agree?
4. Do you think there are any gaps in how evaluations are done?
5. Do you think evaluation is meant to help the teacher? Why or why not?
6. How do you think the evaluation process could be improved?
Appendix G

INFORMED CONSENT

My name is Kristina Hirsch and I am a graduate student at Georgia Southern University. I am conducting this study for my dissertation which is part of my doctoral program in Curriculum Studies.

The purpose of this research is to determine how teachers describe their emotional responses to evaluation and the implementation of TKES. I will also determine if there are differences in these responses based on gender and how these differences are connected to the struggles teachers face in and out of the classroom. In order to obtain this information I will be conducting a phenomenological study using a feminist theory lens.

Participation in this research will include completion of a demographics survey, a semi-structured interview, and a focus group discussion with interview participants.

Discomforts and Risks: Participants will be asked to describe their emotions regarding several topics relating to teacher evaluation and will also be asked to describe their experiences that led to these emotions. Doing so could cause a participant to feel a variety of emotions. It is also possible that the participant could also feel embarrassed by some of their responses because they do deal with their emotional responses, however, these responses will be kept confidential. Pseudonyms will be used to maintain confidentiality of each participant however it is possible that because of the experiences shared another member of the school’s faculty/administration could determine a participant’s identity if they are familiar with whatever experiences are shared during the interview/focus group process.

Benefits: The benefits to participants include being a part of a research project that will be informative to school administration as well as those at the state and local level who develop the evaluation process. The benefits to society include understanding the emotional responses teachers have regarding evaluation and the implementation of TKES and the experiences with evaluation that led to these emotional responses.

Duration/Time required from the participant: Each participant will be asked to participate in an interview that will last approximately 30-45 minutes. Participants will then participate in a focus group session that will last approximately 30-60 minutes. Notes will be written during the interview and focus group session. An audio tape of the interview and focus group session will be made and stored in a secure location for a minimum of 7 years. The only people with access to these recordings will be myself (Kristina Hirsch) and the member of my committee. If you do not want to be taped, you will not be able to participate in the study.

Statement of Confidentiality: Data collected will be maintained in a secure location for a minimum of 7 years. Deidentified or coded data from this study may be placed in a publically available repository for study validation and further research. You will not be identified by name in the data set or any reports using information obtained from this study, and your confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain secure. No names of teachers, schools, or the system will be mentioned in the final report. Subsequent uses of records and data will be subject to standard data use policies which protect the anonymity of individuals and institutions.
Right to Ask Questions: Participants have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. If you have questions about this study, please contact the researcher named above or the researcher’s faculty advisor, whose contact information is located at the end of the informed consent. For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, contact Georgia Southern University Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs at 912-478-5465.

Voluntary Participation: Participation in this study is voluntary. I understand that I will not be paid for my participation. I may withdraw and discontinue participation at any time without penalty or retribution. Additionally, I do not have to answer any questions I do not want to answer.

All information will be treated confidentially. There is one exception to confidentiality that we need to make you aware of. In certain research studies, it is our ethical responsibility to report situations of child or elder abuse, child or elder neglect, or any life-threatening situation to appropriate authorities. However, we are not seeking this type of information in our study nor will you be asked questions about these issues.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If you consent to participate in this research study and to the terms above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. To contact the Office of Research Integrity for answers to questions about the rights of research participants or for privacy concerns please email IRB@georgiasouthern.edu or call (912) 478-5465. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GS IRB under tracking number H17371.

Title of Project: A Phenomenological Study of Teachers’ Emotional Responses to TKES, a New High-Stakes Evaluation System

Principal Investigator: Kristina Hirsch
932 Besse Way
Locust Grove, GA 30248
(770) 557-4309
kristina.hirsch@henry.k12.ga.us

Faculty Advisor: Michelle Reidel
P.O. Box 8013
Statesboro, GA 30460
(912) 478-5806
mreidel@georgiasouthern.edu

Participant Signature __________________________ Date ________________
I, the undersigned, verify that the above informed consent procedure has been followed.

Investigator Signature __________________________ Date ________________
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Georgia Department of Education – TAPS Performance Standards and Rubric

**Performance Standard 1: Professional Knowledge**
The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the requirements for Level III</td>
<td>Level III is the expected level of performance</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently demonstrates understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</td>
<td>The teacher inadequately demonstrates understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and student needs, or does not use the knowledge in practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher continually demonstrates extensive content and pedagogical knowledge, enriches the curriculum, and guides others in enriching the curriculum. (Teachers rated as Level IV continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</td>
<td>The teacher consistently demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Standard 2: Instructional Planning**
The teacher plans using state and local school district curricula and standards, effective strategies, resources, and data to address the differentiated needs of all students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the requirements for Level III</td>
<td>Level III is the expected level of performance</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently uses state and local school district curricula and standards, or inconsistently uses effective strategies, resources, or data in planning to meet the needs of all students.</td>
<td>The teacher does not plan, or plans without adequately using state and local school district curricula and standards, or without using effective strategies, resources, or data to meet the needs of all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher continually seeks and uses multiple data and real-world resources to plan differentiated instruction to meet the individual student needs and interests in order to promote student accountability and engagement. (Teachers rated as Level IV continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</td>
<td>The teacher consistently plans using state and local school district curricula and standards, effective strategies, resources, and data to address the differentiated needs of all students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Standard 3: Instructional Strategies**
The teacher promotes student learning by using research-based instructional strategies relevant to the content to engage students in active learning and to facilitate the students’ acquisition of key knowledge and skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the requirements for Level III</td>
<td>Level III is the expected level of performance</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently uses research-based instructional strategies. The strategies used are sometimes not appropriate for the content area or for engaging students in active learning or for the acquisition of key skills.</td>
<td>The teacher does not use research-based instructional strategies, nor are the instructional strategies relevant to the content area. The strategies do not engage students in active learning or acquisition of key skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher continually facilitates students’ engagement in metacognitive learning, higher-order thinking skills, and application of learning in current and relevant ways. (Teachers rated as Level IV continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</td>
<td>The teacher consistently promotes student learning by using research-based instructional strategies relevant to the content to engage students in active learning, and to facilitate the students’ acquisition of key skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Standard 4: Differentiated Instruction**
The teacher challenges and supports each student’s learning by providing appropriate content and developing skills which address individual learning differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the requirements for Level III</td>
<td>Level III is the expected level of performance</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently challenges students by providing inappropriate content or by developing skills which address individual learning differences.</td>
<td>The teacher does not challenge students by providing appropriate content or by developing skills which address individual learning differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher continually facilitates each student’s opportunities to learn by engaging him/her in critical and creative thinking and challenging activities tailored to address individual learning needs and interests. (Teachers rated as Level IV continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</td>
<td>The teacher consistently challenges and supports each student’s learning by providing appropriate content and developing skills which address individual learning differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Standard 5: Assessment Strategies**
The teacher systematically chooses a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and student population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the requirements for Level III</td>
<td>Level III is the expected level of performance</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently chooses a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies or the instruments are sometimes not appropriate for the content or student population.</td>
<td>The teacher chooses an inadequate variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies or the instruments are not appropriate for the content or student population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher continually demonstrates expertise and leads others to determine and develop a variety of strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and student population and guides students to monitor and reflect on their own academic progress. (Teachers rated as Level IV continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</td>
<td>The teacher systematically and consistently chooses a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and student population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Performance Standard 6: Assessment Uses

*The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses relevant data to measure student progress, to inform instructional content and delivery methods, and to provide timely and constructive feedback to both students and parents.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the requirements for Level III, the teacher continually demonstrates expertise in using data to measure student progress and lead others in the effective use of data to inform instructional decisions. (Teachers rated as Level IV continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</td>
<td><strong>Level III is the expected level of performance.</strong> The teacher systematically and consistently gathers, analyzes, and uses relevant data to measure student progress, to inform instructional content and delivery methods, and to provide timely and constructive feedback to both students and parents.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently gathers, analyzes, or uses relevant data to measure student progress, inconsistently uses data to inform instructional content and delivery methods, or inconsistently provides timely or constructive feedback.</td>
<td>The teacher does not gather, analyze, or use relevant data to measure student progress, to inform instructional content and delivery methods, or to provide feedback in a constructive or timely manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Standard 7: Positive Learning Environment

*The teacher provides a well-managed, safe, and orderly environment that is conducive to learning and encourages respect for all.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the requirements for Level III, the teacher continually engages students in a collaborative and self-directed learning environment where students are encouraged to take risks and ownership of their own learning behavior. (Teachers rated as Level IV continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</td>
<td><strong>Level III is the expected level of performance.</strong> The teacher consistently provides a well-managed, safe, and orderly environment that is conducive to learning and encourages respect for all.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently provides a well-managed, safe, and orderly environment that is conducive to learning and encourages respect for all.</td>
<td>The teacher inadequately addresses student behavior, displays a negative attitude toward students, ignores safety standards, or does not otherwise provide an orderly environment that is conducive to learning or encourages respect for all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Standard 8: Academically Challenging Environment

*The teacher creates a student-centered, academic environment in which teaching and learning occur at high levels and students are self-directed learners.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the requirements for Level III, the teacher continually creates an academic learning environment where students are encouraged to set challenging learning goals and tackle challenging materials. (Teachers rated as Level IV continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</td>
<td><strong>Level III is the expected level of performance.</strong> The teacher consistently creates a student-centered, academic environment in which teaching and learning occur at high levels and students are self-directed learners.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently provides a student-centered, academic environment in which teaching and learning occur at high levels or where students are self-directed learners.</td>
<td>The teacher does not provide a student-centered, academic environment in which teaching and learning occur at high levels, or where students are self-directed learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Standard 9: Professionalism

*The teacher exhibits a commitment to professional ethics and the school’s mission, participates in professional growth opportunities to support student learning, and contributes to the profession.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the requirements for Level III, the teacher continually engages in a high level of professional growth and application of skills and contributes to the development of others and the well-being of the school and community. (Teachers rated as Level IV continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</td>
<td><strong>Level III is the expected level of performance.</strong> The teacher consistently exhibits a commitment to professional ethics and the school’s mission, participates in professional growth opportunities to support student learning, and contributes to the profession.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently supports the school’s mission or seldom participates in professional growth opportunities.</td>
<td>The teacher shows a disregard toward professional ethics or the school’s mission or rarely takes advantage of professional growth opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Standard 10: Communication

*The teacher communicates effectively with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, and other stakeholders in ways that enhance student learning.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level IV</th>
<th>Level III</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Level I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to meeting the requirements for Level III, the teacher continually uses communication techniques in a variety of situations to proactively inform, network, and collaborate with stakeholders to enhance student learning. (Teachers rated as Level IV continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</td>
<td><strong>Level III is the expected level of performance.</strong> The teacher communicates effectively and consistently with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, and other stakeholders in ways that enhance student learning.</td>
<td>The teacher inconsistently communicates with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, or other stakeholders or communicates in ways that only partially enhance student learning.</td>
<td>The teacher inadequately communicates with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, or other stakeholders by poorly acknowledging concerns, responding to inquiries, or encouraging involvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(GADOE, 2016)*
Appendix I – List of codes used for data analysis

1. Gender (GE)
   1. MAL  Male
   2. FEM  Female

2. Positive (PE)
   1. APR  Appreciation
   2. JOY  Joy / Humor
   3. FUL  Fulfillment
   4. SAT  Satisfaction / Acceptance
   5. HAP  Happiness
   6. HOP  Hopefulness
   7. CON  Confidence
   8. ENC  Encouraged

3. Negative Emotions (NE)
   1. ANX  Anxiety / Nervousness / Concern
   2. EXH  Exhaustion / Burnout / Overwhelmed
   3. FRU  Frustration
   4. ANG  Anger
   5. SLF  Self-doubt / self-efficacy / need to prove one’s self
   6. NOT  Not Satisfied / disappointed / unsupportive
   7. SAR  Sarcasm

4. Neutral Emotions (NU)
   1. NON  Nonchalant / Indifferent

5. Point in Time (PT)
   1. PST  Past
   2. PRE  Present
   3. FUT  Future

6. Key Themes (KT)
   1. TIM  Time evaluators spend conducting evaluations
   2. COM  Communication and feedback
   3. PUR  Purpose of evaluation
   4. EVD  Evidence used in the evaluation process
   5. RAT  Evaluation Ratings, subjectivity, fairness
   6. EVL  Evaluator interaction and attitudes
   7. REL  Teacher relationship / comfort level with the evaluator
   8. EMT  Expressing emotions
   9. CHG  Changes in the process and implementation of TKES
  10. STD  TKES Standards
  11. HIS  History and/or personal information about teachers
  12. GEN  General Comments about evaluation