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ABSTRACT

The objective of conducting the present research is setting performance standards (performance merits) of Tehran’s high school educational headmasters and presenting the appropriate model. This research is applied in terms of objective and is a descriptive-survey research in terms of methodology. In this research, first, its theoretical principles and review of the related literature are investigated based on the library studies and then according to the obtained results, a series of performance merits of the educational headmasters are set in four formats of the main merit component and thirty subcomponents. The study statistical population includes all experts of management field of Tehran in 2008-2009 that their number was 70 persons. Simple random sampling was used to select the statistical sample and the sample size was selected 60 persons based on Krejcie-Morgan Table. In this research, self-made validity-measuring questionnaire based on Likert scale in order to examine educational management experts’ view concerning the suggestive model of standardizing educational headmasters’ performance that its reliability was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (0.96). Collected data were analyzed at two levels of descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean, variance and standard deviation) and inferential statistics t-test, Chi-square and Kendall correlation coefficient). The research findings showed that the model of standardizing high school headmasters’ performance includes five main sections as follows:

A) Philosophy and objectives,
B) Theoretical principles
C) Implementation stages
D) Feedback system and assessment
E) Perceptive frameworks

Furthermore, according to the educational experts’ view, the proportion of the suggestive model in order to standardize high school educational headmasters’ performance is 0.83.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In the present age, increasing change rapidity, science and technology development, complexity and speed of communicative equipments, world competition of ideologies, culture and economy globalization, conflict of values, population growth and so forth all emphasize on the role of human resources in steady development. The changes of the present century have affected education internal and external addressees’ needs and expectations. It is evident that the achievement of ideals, aims, strategies and educational and academic programs and appropriate response to the education addressees’ expectations and needs is impossible without the existence of cognizant, expert and creative educational managers and leaders. Generally, education experts believe that the quality of educational activities management is the most important index of the efficiency and effectiveness level of total educational programs. The performance of education system that educational headmaster are responsible for not only is of great importance in terms of economic and social progress and its effect on the job movement, work market’s expectations and the distribution way of expert human force in the society, but also is considered to be the best tool in creating change in values, beliefs, norms and behaviors [1].

Education is the axis of steady development in each society. If each society wants to achieve its ideals, cultural, economic, political and social aims according to its dominant values and social philosophy, it is necessary that an noticeable part should be considered for human force investment and performing its educational projects and programs in designing development programs [2].

The achievement of education missions and ideals requires that its constituting subsystems set administrative strategies and policies of educational system according to the society’s training philosophy, social conditions and learning psychology and deal with educational and academic planning based on the set strategies and policies. Therefore, educational organizations particularly schools, as subsystems responsible for performing educational and academic programs through teaching-learning processes, are of great importance [3].
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Realities show that educational headmasters’ performance regulations do not satisfy education need and are affected by tastes in practice. The created phenomenon indicates that education-requesting society’s expectations are not in accordance with regulations and structures in which educational headmasters should respond to those expectations. Thus, schools’ headmasters in many cases do many specialized works without being expert in that field according to their attitude hoping for expectations that do not know.

Headmasters-related inadequacies and problems indicate that in spite of the existence of duties description and performance assessment system for high school educational headmasters, there are not “performance standards” in accordance with educational headmasters’ performance indices in the country and human resources management in the educational system lacks an appropriate “model” for educational headmasters’ standardization in order to set “performance standards” in respect to internal and external interested ones’ expectations, aims and needs and according to the educational headmasters’ worldwide standards based on it.

The present research attempts to deal with setting high school educational headmasters performance standards (performance merits) and present an appropriate model for standardizing high school educational headmasters [4].

Since schools’ headmasters as educational leaders play a crucial role in creating appropriate condition for effective performance of teaching and learning processes, it is necessary that HRM in education determine necessary personal and professional characteristics for charging the post of educational headmaster by setting an effective performance assessment system and then set educational headmasters’ performance quality limit (performance standards) by presenting an applied, effective and measurable framework. Conducted studies and researches show the existence of various faults in educational headmasters’ performance assessment process. Among existing faults in the employees’ performance assessment process, the nonobjective nature of indices can be mentioned that the very issue does not provide the measurability of indices accurately. The design of effective assessment system evaluates human resources in three dimensions of knowledge, attitude and performance with the minimum error is of steps possible along with the achievement of standard. In addition, behavior adjustment and congruency of consumed energy by educational headmasters with knowledge and creativity in the direction of reaching comprehensive system objectives and performance priority determination and providence of the ground for presenting educational headmasters’ effective performance are of other necessities of educational headmasters’ performance standardization [5].

2. Research Objective

2.1 General Objective
High school educational headmasters’ performance standardization of Tehran and presentation of an appropriate model

2.2 Partial Objectives
1- Setting high school educational headmasters’ performance standards of Tehran
2- Presenting an appropriate model in order to standardize high school educational headmasters’ performance standardization of Tehran
3- Examining proportion of the suggestive model in order to standardize high school educational headmasters’ performance from the viewpoint of educational management experts

3. Theoretical Principles
3.1 HRM and Employees’ Performance Evaluation
Today, HR is considered among the most importance assets of organizations. According to the position and role of human force in organization, Human Resource Management (HRM) is suggested as one of the management functions. The objective of HRM is the efficient use of humans to achieve organization’s strategic aims and satisfy employees’ personal needs. Stone suggests the following activities as the constituting core of HRM:
1- Job analysis
2- Employees’ motivation
3- HRM planning
4- Employees’ service compensation
5- Employee-finding
6- Benefitting employees
7- Employee selection
8- Creation and management of industrial communications
9- Employees’ performance evaluation
10- Training and developing employees
11- Management of variety and contrasts
12- Job planning and employees’ promotion
13- Designing and performing health programs [6].
In fact, performance evaluation is one of the tasks of performance management. Performance management is part of HRM that its task is creating a relationship among employees’ management and in the process of performance evaluation, considers individuals’ innovations and creativities. Performance evaluation is a critical and exploring estimation of different activities of an organization. Performance evaluation is both preventing and distinguishing. Performance evaluation system results in improving individual’s performance. Generally, the components of performance evaluation concept can be shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Components of performance evaluation](image)

**3.2 Objectives of educational headmasters’ performance standardization**

**3.2.1 HR Planning**
Planning human force for performing educational and academic policies and programs is among HRM’s tasks in education. The necessity of this issue is identifying human force in quantitative and qualitative dimensions. HRM presents a real picture of human abilities and inadequacies through performing quantitative standards of performance and therefore, human force planners can attempt to satisfy the out-of-system need or optimize and develop in-system human force performance.

**3.2.2 Designing Efficient System of Performance Evaluation**
Among existing faults in the process of employees’ performance, the nonobjective nature of indices of employees’ efficient performance can be mentioned that the very issue does not provide the measurability of indices accurately. This problem exists concerning educational headmasters. Designing efficient system of performance evaluation with the minimum error evaluates HR’s Merits in three dimensions of knowledge, attitude and performance, which is achievable through standardization of educational headmasters’ performance.

**3.2.3 Optimization and Development of Educational Headmasters’ Performance**
One of the aims of standardizing educational headmasters’ performance is finding headmasters’ merits level and performing educational programs for eliminating knowledge, value and performance vacancies and improving their performance [8]. This issue finally results in the development of merits and increase of headmasters’ performance efficiency level.
3.2.4 Examination of Charging Conditions for the Post of Educational Management
In most countries, selection and charging educational headmasters is conducted through examining charging conditions of applicants and candidates of management post. Setting performance standards and creating interaction between performance components and charging post components clarify the examination of charging conditions of volunteers for the management post of educational management.

3.2.5 Granting Professional Certificate to Educational Headmasters
Setting educational headmasters’ performance standards provide this possibility that every several years, educational headmasters’ merits are investigated through holding standard tests and other performance evaluation methods and professional certificate is granted to them again.

3.2.6 Making Better Relationship with Addressees
One of the main tasks of standards is creating a relationship and interchanging thoughts between interested parties. In fact, standard is considered a common language for creating relationship and can be in the form of a characteristic, code, word, term or regulation. Since objectives, expectations and needs of educational headmasters’ addressees (superiors, colleagues, students and their families, cultural and social institutions and so on) are taken into account in setting educational headmasters’ performance standards, headmasters’ awareness of these expectations and wishes create greater interaction between headmasters and addressees and the final product of this constructive interaction is creating responsive management in the educational organization.

3.2.7 Productivity Promotion
Performance standards create greater understanding and insightfulness in schools’ headmasters of the quality of organization’s human, financial, material and informational resources. This identification lays the ground for efficient employment of resources in achieving social, organizational and individual aims and prevents from repetitions and wasting resources and improves quality of performance and finally results in greater productivity and efficiency of educational organization [9].

5.3 Educational Headmasters’ Addressees and their Expectations
In setting educational headmasters’ performance standards, we should be aware of the expectations of educational headmasters’ addressees using scientific data collection methods and polls. These addressees the society (economic, cultural, political and social subsystems), comprehensive system (country’s political, economic, social and cultural macrosystem), reference system (education ministry and its provincial and regional subsystems), executive system (educational, official, and service employees of educational organization), applicant system (students, students’ families and other relevant institutions with school organization)[10].

5.4 Merits of educational managers
Among relevant studies to the theoretical principles and literature related to educational headmasters’ professional merits according to comprehensiveness of theories and their content relation, several theories are mentioned as follows:
Yoki has presented managerial role in the frame of roles of human relationships, network-making, traditional management roles, decision-making and informational roles.
“Armstrong” has suggested coaching skills, relations, space management, constant improvement, control and coordination, culture of cooperation, counseling, creative thinking, crisis management, vesting authority, organizational growth, empowering, efficient development, innovation, negotiation, goal setting, organizing, performance management, planning, change management, power and policy as the needs for managers.
“Drucker” in his studies has added two skills of design and problem-solving to perceiving, technical and human skills presented by Kats.
Orard and Morris express the tasks of schools’ headmasters in determining aims, planning, organizing resources, controlling managerial processes as well as setting and developing organizational standards [11].
Roo and Derrick have presented a three-dimension model of educational headmaster training for promoting educational headmasters’ merits including dimensions of headmasters’ skills, education and management, education and basic sciences, general education and educational experience.
Cohen and March consider the position of educational leadership and two skills namely educational process leading and organizing educational process among the most important educational headmasters’ tasks.
Schrouder considers five components of learned ones, abilities, motivation, values and management style as the components of managers’ merits by presenting managers’ development model.
MirKamali in his studies regarding educational headmasters’ abilities mentions three groups of general, puberty and leadership abilities [12].
Ghafarian, by presenting managers’ merit model, mentions six merit components including professional credit, general credit, professional knowledge, skills, personal characteristics and attitude as well as insightfulness.
New York Educational Board (1998) has determined eight standards of educational leadership, professional development, organizational management and leadership, student support services, making relationship between parents and school as well as technology for schools’ headmasters and for each standard, some components are set at three levels of A) values and beliefs, B) knowledge, C) performance indices. Hoyle, English and Streffy in their studies have mentioned skills of aware leadership, policy and management, communications, organizational management, planning and developing educational programs, educational management, employees’ evaluation and HRM, employees’ progress and development, educational research, evaluation, planning, values and moral principles of leadership for successful leadership in schools. Educational department of Delaware State (1998) has set educational leadership standards at two levels of knowledge and performance including systematic leadership, educational leadership, political and social leadership, organizational leadership and interpersonal leadership as well as moral leadership [13].

4. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Khajeyi (2001) in one research titled “Evaluation of Elementary School Headmasters’ Skills and Qualifications of Tehran for Designing an Appropriate Management Model” has attempted to present a model for appropriate management for the study population by appropriate assessment of school’s headmasters’ coordination rate of qualifications and professional skills in relation with their job skills. Headmasters’ dimensions of skills and qualifications and relevant components to each of them in the conceptual Khajeyi model are as follows:

1- Human skills: components related to the human skills include leadership, cooperative management, conflict management, organizational sociability, team management, extra-organizational relations.
2- Perceiving skills: components related to the perceiving skills include decision-making skill, identification of theories, crisis management, crisis management, time management and creativity.
3- Technical skills: components related to the technical skills include planning, organizing, academic progress assessment, supervision, budgeting and financial management, HRM, coordination and goal setting.
4- Qualifications: components related to the qualifications include age, gender, management record, assistance record, other educational records, physical ability, and mental ability.

Ghaforian in one study mentions components relevant to the performance indices of educational headmasters as work life quality, educational progress, entrepreneurship, official and administrative affairs, academic planning, educational supervision, educational leadership and extracurricular affairs.

Education department of Virginia has considered educational headmasters’ standards in four axes of “planning and evaluation”, “security and organization’s management for learning”, “educational leadership” and “expertise” and for each of axes, performance evaluation Indices are set.

Education department of Alaska has set standards of organization leadership, educational leadership, supervision and guidance, academic planning, employees’ professional development, decision-making, communications, implementing policies and laws, social communications and parents’ cooperation facilitation for evaluating educational headmasters’ performance.

North Central Regional Technology in Education Consortium (NCRTEC) has presented the newest standards of educational leaders’ performance in the following sections:

A) Leadership and vision
B) Learning and teaching
C) Productivity and professional practice
D) Support, management and operations
E) Assessment and evaluation
F) Social, legal and ethical issues

5. METHODOLOGY

This research is applied in terms of objective and descriptive-survey in terms of methodology. The study statistical population includes all experts of educational management field of Tehran in 2009-2010 that their number was 70 persons. To select the statistical simple random sampling method was used and sample size was selected 60 persons based on Krejcie-Morgan Table. In this research, self-made validity-measuring questionnaire based on Likert scale in order to examine educational management experts’ view concerning the suggestive model of standardizing educational headmasters’ performance tat its reliability was calculated using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (0.96). Collected data were analyzed at two levels of descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean, variance and standard deviation) and inferential statistics t-test, Chi-square and Kendall correlation coefficient.)
6. RESULTS

1- What standards can be set for evaluating high school educational headmasters’ performance?
In the present research, according to the theoretical principles and research literature as well as the results of comparative studies, four main components of performance merit (standard) are identified for high school educational headmasters. Each of the main components is constituted from some subcomponents and totally, merit main components (standards) of educational headmasters have thirty subcomponents. In the following figure, the conceptual model of educational headmasters’ performance standards is shown.

Figure 2: Conceptual model of educational headmasters’ performance standards

2- What model can be presented for standardizing high school educational headmasters’ performance?
According to the results of the comparative studies and findings obtained from examining the research literature, a model consisting of five main sections is presented as follows:

A) Philosophy and objectives
B) Theoretical principles
C) Implementation phases
D) Feedback and evaluation system
E) Perceiving framework

The results of implementing statistical methods relevant to each of the main sections of the model are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of philosophy and objectives</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating efficient evaluation system</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance quality promotion</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating self-control and self-evaluative system</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimization and development of merits</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational headmaster’s addressees’ participation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestication of standards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision and synchronization of standards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All components</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The score mean of experts regarding components of philosophy and objectives is between 3.94 and 4.71 and total mean of all components of philosophy and objectives is 4.33.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of theoretical principles</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory of managerial roles</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of managerial skills</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headmasters’ training model</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive quality management</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headmasters’ merit model</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of headmasters’ optimization and development</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-based management</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of 360 degree feedback</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of performance standards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of performance standardization</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of performance evaluation system</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All components</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The score mean of experts regarding components of theoretical principles is between 3.48 and 4.35 and total mean of all components of theoretical principles is 3.85.
Table 3: Mean distribution and standard deviation of experts’ answers to components of implementation phases section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of administrative phases</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forming standardization headquarter</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and feasibility standards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting standards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting standards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing standards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating standards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision and synchronization of standards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All components</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The score mean of experts regarding components of implementation phases is between 3.89 and 4.17 and total mean of all components of implementation phases is 4.12.

Table 4: Mean distribution and standard deviation of experts’ answers to components of evaluation and feedback system section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of evaluation and feedback system</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pivotal addressee in evaluating headmasters' performance</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating self-evaluation and self-management system</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laying the ground for revision and synchronizing standards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final feedback</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All components</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The score mean of experts regarding components of evaluation and feedback system is between 3.75 and 4.46 and total mean of all components of evaluation and feedback system is 3.85.

Table 5: Mean distribution and standard deviation of experts’ answers to the all suggestive model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestive model</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the above table, the score mean of experts regarding the total suggestive model is 4.05.
Figure 3: High school educational headmasters' performance standardization model
3- What is the proportion rate of the suggestive model for standardizing high school educational headmasters’ performance from the viewpoint of experts of educational management?

Table 6: Examination of agreement rate among experts’ views concerning dimensions of performance standardization of educational headmasters through Kendall test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of educational headmasters' performance standardization model</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy and objectives</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical principles</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative phases</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and feedback system</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the above table, the highest mean is related to the dimension of theoretical principles with 7.70 mean and the lowest one is relevant to the dimension of evaluation and feedback system with 2.89 mean.

Table 7: Calculation of reliability coefficient of each dimension of educational headmasters’ performance standardization model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of educational headmasters' performance standardization model</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy and objectives</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical principles</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative phases</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and feedback system</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General framework</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of table 7 show that high school educational headmasters’ performance standardization model with total reliability 0.93 and mean 4.25 from 5 and greater agreement 0.83 is confirmed by educational management experts.

7. Conclusion

According to the obtained results of data analysis, it can be expressed that the suggested model for standardizing high school educational headmasters includes five sections A) philosophy and objectives, B) theoretical principles, C) administrative phases, D) feedback and evaluation system and E) perceiving framework. Furthermore, the model of high school educational headmasters’ performance standardization was confirmed by educational management experts with total reliability 0.93 and mean 4.25 from 5 and congruency greater than 0.83.

The studies and investigations obtained from the research findings show that HRM in education should set a series of standards or performance merits for educational headmasters based on the needs, purposes and expectations of educational headmasters’ addressees (comprehensive system, reference system, executive system and applicant system) and based on the process of science production and growth of human knowledge.

Managerial merits are characteristics and behaviors that result in educational headmasters’ efficiency in its work environment. In respect to the fact that the process of performance standardization of human resources has greater complexity in relation to the standardization methods in the industry and production, the results of the research findings show that in setting performance standards of human resources, listing a series of components and subcomponents is not enough, but a series of behaviors showing standard as “performance indicators” should be set and presented in order to evaluate and judge the achievement of standards in individuals’ organizational performance.

8. Suggestions

- The results show that charging conditions of educational headmasters’ duty description are not the result of a clear and scientific job analysis system. It is suggested that HRM in education revise charging conditions and educational headmasters’ duty description based on the process of scientific job analysis.
- It is suggested that HRM should set a series of performance standards (performance merits) based on the job analysis process of high school educational headmasters and be presented after passing credit-measuring phases in the frame of an applied model for evaluating high school educational headmasters’ performance.
- If we look at educational system, educational organizations and human resources by systemic approach, standardization cannot be achieved in one part and other parts act in a nonstandard and traditional way and in such conditions, setting, distribution and implementing system of standards will encounter with many problems, therefore, it is suggested that country’s educational experts and guiders should find setting and implementing a standard educational system in all human, financial, material and informational dimensions.
Since setting performance standards (educational headmasters, teachers, students and so on) is not along with executors’ training vision, it may prevent from creation and innovation of human resources, it is suggested that executors and guiders of educational system in setting standards of human resources act in a way that does not obstruct the growth of individual abilities and capacities of employees and the manifestation of creativity and innovation in them.

Cultural, economic and social conditions dominant on the society should be taken into consideration in setting performance standards of educational headmasters. Domestication of standards is a strong support for implementing standards and their promotion in the society.

It is suggested that educational headmasters’ performance standardization first should be implemented in a pilot study and after evaluation and reforming the weaknesses, should be developed gradually.
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