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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to determine teachers’ perceptions on the practice of performance appraisal and its associated challenges in secondary schools of Bole sub-city Addis Ababa. The objectives of the study was to assess teachers’ perception on the purpose, standards and procedure of performance appraisal system; And also to identify major problems that are encountered in the process of teachers’ performance appraisal.

The research adopted a descriptive research design targeting all the 603 teachers and 18 principals of the secondary schools of Bole sub-city. Stratified sampling was used to classify schools in their type to select nine secondary sample schools from the sub-city. Random sampling was also employed to select 194 teachers sample schools. Moreover, all principals and vice principals of the nine schools participated in the study. Questionnaire was designed to be completed by teachers and interview were scheduled with principals and vice principals to acquire necessary data. Observation Check list was also employed as data collection instrument. Before the actual data collection procedure, a pilot study was conducted in one secondary school at Yeka sub-city to test the reliability of the data instruments. Data obtained was both qualitative and quantitative. Quantitative data was coded and entered into SPSS application software and analyzed. The results of data analysis were presented using frequency distribution tables, percentages, mean and standard deviations.

The findings of the study established that performance appraisal has positive impacts on teachers’ activity towards their professional development, teaching and learning processes and student academic achievement. However, some of the teachers specially who work in public schools were not motivated by the appraisal system so as to work hard to improve quality of education as there was no reward directly attached to it. The study recognized that the major challenges experienced during Performance appraisal were personal bias of evaluators, teachers’ negative attitude towards appraisal made by students, technical errors committed by principals who rate teachers higher or lower than their actual performance. Moreover, teachers perceived that principals have a tendency to avoid extreme rating by rating all teachers at the middle.

Finally, the study recommends that in order to improve the effectiveness of performance appraisal at secondary schools, performance appraisal standards should be developed collaboratively and orientation should be given to teachers, evaluators and students on the purposes, standards and processes of performance appraisal so as to enhance their positive participation and support to the system.
CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction
This chapter treats brief background explanation of the study and states the problem. It also covers objectives, significance and scope of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study
The introduction of performance appraisal in the 1920s and 1930s was limited mainly to managers and how to identify those amongst them who had potential for development. In the 1950s the potential usefulness of appraisal as tool for motivation and development was gradually recognized and the number of companies using performance appraisal programs has risen since then (Fletcher and Williams, 1992). In addition Hale and Whitlam (2000) claimed that as with many human resource systems, performance appraisal systems evolved out of a perceived requirement to institutionalize and centralize good human resource management practice.

The importance of appraisal in any organization cannot be overemphasized. The literature on staff appraisal, covering a wide spectrum of fields such as commerce and industry as well as the private and the public sectors including schools, identifies three main purposes of appraisal: To serve as a basis for modifying behavior to realize more effective working habits; to provide adequate feedback to each employee on his/her performance; and to provide managers with data with which to evaluate future assignments and determine compensation (Kermally, 1997:90; Mullins, 1996:640).

Staff performance appraisal stresses on developmental and growth plans for employees. Staff performance therefore helps the employers to maintain accurate objective records of employee performance in order to defend themselves against possible charges of dissemination in connection with human resource actions such as discharge, promotions and salary practice (Sherman, 1988).

Staff performance appraisal development focuses on the attitude of workers that have increased influences on work related decisions such as salary allocations, promotions based on performance appraisal outcome. Performance appraisal centers on the underutilization or mismanagement of human resource resulting in increased costs, low production and diminished organizational performance hence appraise the employees’ performance against objectively set job related standards is important (Sherman, 1988).
Although there are many similarities in the purposes of appraisal across organizations, the nature of the organization dictates the type of appraisal to be followed. The literature on teacher appraisal shows that it can be very complex, involving a number of factors than can either impede or support teacher effectiveness (Malongwa, 1995:153; Bartlett, 2000:26; Camp-bell, Kyriakides, Muijs, & Robinson, 2003:356).

In the formation of the character of the learner, the teacher is in a pivotal position to play a powerful role than do other schools personnel (Daniel, 2009). To understand whether teachers are playing or not this pivotal role, performance appraisal is one of the most important instruments. The performance appraisal system can have a significant impact on the attitudes and behaviors of teachers, which in turn affect the performance of teachers and the learning outcomes of students.

Teacher appraisal is receiving attention world-wide as governments become aware of the need to examine educational provision critically to ensure that it is relevant and appropriate to the needs of the youth (Motswakae 1990:6). There-fore, teacher appraisal is of great importance since its main objective is to improve individual performance and motivation (Bartlett, 2000:25; Danielson, 2001:12; Donaldson&Stobbe, 2000; Lam, 2001:161; Painter, 2001:61;Wanzare, 2002:213). Poster and Poster (1992:1) maintain that if employees are to perform effectively they must be well motivated, understand what is expected of them and have the ability and skills to fulfill their responsibility.

Researchers and practitioners have been interested in measuring human performance for a long time (Miller, 2009). Performance appraisal has therefore gained popularity in schools as a systematic process of determining the merit, value, and worth of a teacher's current performance and estimating his/her potential level of performance with further development (Mwangi, 2006). Studies on performance appraisal by researchers such as Lawton, Hickcox, Leithwood, and Musella (1989) and Hyde (2001) highlight some far reaching effects that performance appraisals can have on people. Performance appraisal of teachers is increasingly viewed as a critical process in schools for raising the competency of teachers and thereby the quality of education (Stiggins and Bridgeford, 1985). The performance appraisal system can have a significant impact on the attitudes and behaviors of teachers, which in turn affect the performance of teachers and the learning outcomes of students.
Timperley et al. 1998, revealed in their study that appropriate appraisal schemes have the potential to improve the professionalization of teaching, the effective management of schools, the quality of education provided for the students, the effectiveness of teachers as well as satisfying legitimate demands for accountability.

One of the main factors that have been found to influence the outcomes of performance appraisal is the perception that teachers have about the appraisal system (Monyatsi, Steyn & Kamper, 2006). Performance appraisal can only have the desired outcomes if teachers have a positive attitude towards the appraisal system. As research has found out, teacher appraisal process often faces problems associated with lack of agreement on appropriate appraisal criteria, concerns over the validity and reliability of evaluation methods, and the negative perceptions of teachers towards the appraisal system (Peterson, 2000).

In addition, Lawton et. al. (1989) found that “one of the major reasons for the difficulties associated with personnel evaluation is the intensity of the human interaction and the possibility of an adverse judgment about an individual’s performance, a judgment that may damage a career or cause debilitating personal distress” (p. 13).

According to Ethiopian educational framework, the goal for improving the quality of general education is: “to improve the quality of general education in order to motivate children complete primary and secondary school and provide them with the knowledge, skills and values to become productive and responsible citizens” (MoE, 2015:35). To attain this goal great emphasis has been vested to performance evaluation on ESDP IV in strengthen Performance outcome based on evaluation processes of teachers in addition to monitoring and review process.

According to Yilma (2007:46) in Ethiopia, performance evaluation started in the 1930s, and its main purpose was to control and inspect the institutional process. Later on it continued to operate by changing its name to supervision and its function was largely remained unchanged.

Berhanu (2006:7) reported that, since 1995, in addition to administrative evaluation, students and parents’ evaluation of teachers’ performance had been in effect at elementary and secondary government schools. In 2004, result-oriented teachers performance appraisal was introduced in line with Federal Civil Service Commission (FCSC). However, there have been problems in the implementation, thereby, many teachers complain and do not have a positive attitude towards result-oriented teachers performance appraisal (Yilma, 2007).
In addition to this, more recently, a new form of teacher performance measurement was also introduced which is known as Balanced Score Card (BSC) system. Depending on the results of performance appraisal and year of teaching experience, teachers have got the opportunity of going up through nine stages of career ladder: -beginning teacher, junior teacher, teacher, higher teacher, associate lead teacher, lead teacher, higher lead teacher I, higher lead teacher II, and higher lead teacher III. But this is implemented only in government schools so far creating discontent on teachers working in private schools.

According to education statistics annual abstract 2008E.C (2015/16) of MOE, Addis Ababa has the highest proportion of non-government teachers in secondary schools, with 38% of teachers working in these institutions. It is therefore worthwhile to determine the perception of those teachers on the performance appraisal practice and related challenges of their respective schools.

In Ethiopia, according to Wondoson, (2007:27.) the appraisers’ bias, un relatedness of performance criteria to teachers’ job and negative attitude of appraisee to accept negative feedback from their appraisers are some of the problems related to teachers performance evaluation. A survey study conducted in Amhara Region on 130 school teachers reported that teachers had negative attitude towards teachers’ performance appraisal criteria (Tilahun and Shanbel, 2014:29).

The study was carried out in Bole-city. The sub-city is one of the ten sub-cities of Addis Ababa. It borders Oromia regional state on East, Yeka sub-city to the North, Kirkos sub-city to the west, Nifas silk Lafto sub-city to the south west and Akaki-kaliti sub-city to South.

Thus, this research tries to assess the perception of teachers on practice and related challenges of performance appraisal in the secondary schools of the aforementioned sub-city. It also attempts to disclose perception of teachers on procedures, methods, standards and attitudes towards the objectives of performance appraisal and obstacles discovered in teachers’ performance appraisal.

Moreover, the existing teachers’ perception will be analyzed in line with the theoretical grounds of the characteristic of effective appraisal practices. The researcher is prompted to undertake this research on the grounds of different research conducted by different researchers.
on performance appraisal in which it is revealed that as there are serious problems with regard to teachers’ perception of performance appraisal in schools. Peterson, (2000) found out, teacher evaluation process often faces problem associated with lack of agreement on appropriate appraisal criteria, concerns over the validity and reliability of evaluation methods, and the negative perceptions of teachers towards the appraisal system.

In general, the study helps to identify the way teachers perceive the existing practices and also generate a means to alter if the research comes with prejudiced perception and also to solve problems brought into being by the research.

1.2 Statement of the Problem
The need for detailed information about teacher performance is essential to principal who are planning, organizing, communicating, and coordinating instructional programs (Harris, 1986:6). Every action of these officials is based on assumption that they have relevant knowledge about the operations that teachers control. But as Harris (1986) stated the information most readily available to them tends to be least relevant and least reliable.

As pointed out by Monyatsi, et. al (2006), perceptions of teachers about performance appraisal has a significant influence on the outcomes of the exercise. Considering that performance appraisal is an exercise involving high intensity of the human interaction and the possibility of an adverse judgment about an individual’s performance (Lawton et. al.1989), it is important that those charged with the responsibility of appraising teachers promote positive attitudes towards appraisal.

Teachers’ who had a positive perception were more motivated to perform their work whereas employees who had negative perception consider the system as bias, not properly implemented, and is not an appropriate way to evaluate teachers towards work performance (IrikMargaret,2010:25). Teachers’ negative perception on performance appraisal system affect their perception towards work performance, demonstrated, and cause poor performance. Some teachers consider that the appraisal systems are bias, not fairly implemented, and develop a negative perception towards the system.

Ineffective teacher performance appraisal can affect students’ academic achievement, and these prevailing conditions would definitely show a negative influence on the instructional
quality in schools, which may translate to poor academic performance, attitude and values of secondary school students (Blank stein 1996:27-30). From literature analysis it became clear that the most significant factor in determining performance appraisal system effectiveness is the acceptance of its users.

Although there are researches conducted by Melaku (1992) Mulu, (2001) and Worku (2017) about performance appraisal in different high schools especially in the area of practice and efficiency of appraisal, yet the researchers, except the later one, couldn’t come across any study done on secondary level incorporating both the private and public schools. In addition, most of the above studies have been conducted prior to the introduction of Ethiopian General Education Quality Improvement Program (GEQIP, 2008) which came up with different educational structure, management, and performance appraisal systems that are quite different from the previous system on which the studies were based.

Having this in mind and being a member of school administration in one of the schools in Bole sub-city the researcher observed dissatisfaction of teachers in the overall process of teacher performance appraisal. Thus the researcher believes that assessing the perception of teachers on performance appraisal practice and relating challenges in secondary schools operating in the sub-city is a vital one in addressing the schools objectives. It is also critical for school management to know how the teaching staff perceives the performance appraisal implementation. In this regard, this study sought to determine the perceptions of teachers about the practice and relating challenges of performance appraisal in secondary schools at Bole Sub-City in Addis Ababa. To this end, the following basic questions are to be answered.

1. How do teachers perceive the purposes of performance appraisal conducted in their school?
2. What are the perceptions of teachers towards the procedures implemented in the process of performance appraisal in their schools?
3. How do teachers’ perceive the criteria set for performance appraisal of the schools?
4. What major problems are realized by teachers in the process of performance appraisal practice of their schools?
5. Who is responsible to carryout teachers’ performance appraisal in secondary schools of Bole sub-city?
1.3 Objective of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective of the Study

The general objective of this study was to investigate teachers’ perception on the performance appraisal practices and related challenges in secondary schools of Bole Sub-City in Addis Ababa.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives of the Study

Based on the general objective, the research has the following specific objectives:

- To assess perception of teachers’ on the purposes of performance appraisal systems of their respective secondary schools at Bole Sub-City.
- To identify the perceptions of teachers towards the procedures adopted in the process of performance appraisal of their respective secondary schools at Bole Sub-City.
- To evaluate teachers’ perception on performance appraisal criteria of their respective secondary schools at Bole Sub-City.
- To identify major challenges that were faced by teachers in the process of teachers performance appraisal practice of their schools.
- To see the responsible person to carryout teachers’ performance appraisal in secondary schools of Bole sub-city.
- To see measures which were taken following teachers performance appraisal of secondary schools operating in Bole sub-city.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The study attempts to investigate the perception of teachers on practice and related challenges of performance appraisal in secondary schools at Bole Sub-City in Addis Ababa.

In Ethiopia performance appraisal is perhaps the policy direction believed to lead to substantial gains of education quality in schools. The Ministry of Education (2015) in its ESDP V program intended to fill all levels of general education with academically qualified, motivated and ethically fit teachers, in accordance with the teacher development program.

In 2011/12, the licensing directorate began to function and supports the ongoing efforts to ensure suitably qualified and capable teaching staff. Its growing system of licensing and
relicensing assesses professional competencies on the basis of pre-determined standards (MoE.2016). Thus, the Ministry was seeking ways to restructure the processes through which teachers are mentored, evaluated, certified and compensated in order to increase student achievement. So, the teachers’ holistic perception on performance appraisal operation in their schools should be examined to correct miss conception and foresee for future implementation of performance appraisal for the purpose of the academy and the licensing tasks. Thus, this research may therefore serve the licensing section established in all levels of education structure.

In addition the study may contribute to the implementation of career ladder developed by the ministry of education not only for teachers in government schools but also for teachers in private schools. The study may help the principals to identify whether the performance appraisal is attaining the intended purpose or not to take the necessary actions. The teachers can also make the necessary suggestions on how the performance appraisal systems can be improved and structured to motivate them to perform effectively in improving the quality of education in secondary and other levels.

It helps the principals of the school to look in to the solutions that could improve the performance appraisals process in order to enable quality teaching and learning process. The study proposed to the schools on areas that need improvement in teacher appraisal process and also provides important information especially to government policy makers as to what need to be changed or enhanced for effective teacher performance appraisal in both private and government schools.

The findings pointed out the areas of weakness in the teacher evaluation system and thereby suggest ways through which future educational leaders ought to manage performance appraisal. Moreover, the study contributes to the wider knowledge, both in research and academics specifically on the area of performance appraisal of teachers.

Generally, the study helps policy makers, school principals and supervisors to look in to the solutions that could improve the performance appraisal systems of schools in order to achieve better and effective teaching and learning in both private and public secondary schools.
1.5 Delimitations of the study
The study intended to find out the perception of teachers on performance appraisal practice and related challenges in secondary schools. The study confined itself to secondary schools within Bole Sub-City. Views are collected from teachers and principals in secondary schools at Bole Sub-City. It is obvious that the role of students, parents and education offices could have an impact on the practice of teachers’ appraisal. However, the study doesn’t include these parties since the study targets to examine the perception of teachers on performance appraisal practice.

1.6 Limitation of the Study
Due to time and financial limitations, the study confined itself to a sample of schools in Bole sub-city. The study was limited by the fact that performance appraisal data was collected through a self-assessment questionnaire for teachers, and some teachers could have given responses that are socially desirable responses because, as Webster, Iannucci & Romney (2002) established, respondents tend to overrate themselves on positive traits. To overcome this, the researcher looked for any contradictory data among responses.

1.7 Definition of key Terms
The operational definition of terms is defined based on related references and entire study of secondary schools of Bole sub-city.

**Performance Appraisal** The systematic process of determining the merit, value, and worth of a teacher’s current performance and estimating his/her potential level of performance with further development.

**Purpose** In this study purpose refers to the reasons of teachers’ performance appraisal.

**Procedure** refers to the teachers’ performance appraisal processes of the schools under study

**Standard** In this study it means a job responsibility or expectation used to appraise teachers’ performance

**Performance indicators** are those elements tied to goals and objectives to serve simply as measure by which the degree of success in teaching and learning.

**Perception** In this study perception refers to teachers’ interpretation and impression towards the performance appraisal system within the schools. This perception is constructed on the teachers’
background, knowledge and several other factors related to their performance towards performance appraisal.

**Feedback** refers to information given to the teachers on their achieved levels of performance, while mentioning the issues which should be enhanced after evaluation.

**Effectiveness** refers to the objective attainment of teachers’ performance appraisal.

**Secondary school** refers to both first and second cycle of public and private secondary schools which enables students to prepare for higher education and for the world of work.

**Principals** refers to both principals and vice principals of the schools understudy.

**Teachers** refer teachers teaching in secondary schools of Bole sub-city.

**Professional development** is any activity to enhance professional career growth and teaching competency.

### 1.8 Organization of the Study

The study comprises five chapters. The first chapter provides a general introduction to the study. It includes the introduction and background, the problem statement, research questions, objectives of the study, as well as the significance of the study. It also covers the definitions of key terms. Chapter 2 provides a more extensive background for the following chapters and reviews the range of core theoretical foundations, concepts, characteristics, approaches and classifications necessary to understand and evaluate perception on practice of performance appraisal of secondary schools of Bole Sub-city. Chapter 3 provides for the methodology to the study. The data collection procedures and method, population covered by the study, sampling method and data collection instruments are presented. Chapter 4 provides the purpose, standard, procedure, challenges of performance appraisal, responsible person to evaluate teachers and measures taken following performance appraisal of secondary schools of Bole Sub-city. It deals with the empirical study, analysis and interpretation of the results of the study.

Chapter 5 provides a synthesis of the study and a factual evaluation on the perception of teachers on performance appraisal of the schools under study. Conclusions are drawn, based on the findings of the study and proposals are made for possible future research arising from this study.
CHAPTER TWO

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a more extensive background review the range of core theoretical foundations, concepts, characteristics, approaches and classifications necessary to understand and evaluate performance appraisal practices.

2.2 The Concept of Teacher Performance Appraisal

Teacher performance management is a continuous process for identifying, evaluating and developing the work performance of teachers, so that the goals and objectives of the school are more effectively achieved, while at the same time benefiting teachers in terms of recognition of performance, professional development and career guidance. Teacher appraisal is a mechanism for improving teaching and learning. We all agree that teachers’ professional competence and conscientiousness are the keys to the delivery of quality education in schools. In a well-designed staff appraisal system, the instruments and procedures can constitute valuable professional development for teachers and enable the school management to assess teachers’ performance. The teacher appraisal system assists in recognizing and encouraging good performance, identifying areas for development, and improving overall performance of teachers. Also literatures on performance appraisal agree on its paramount importance for quality of teaching, its implementation seems challenged to produce those benefits. Regarding this, Campbell (2014) reflects:

*Teacher evaluation is one of the most controversial topics in education. A number of teachers and school administrators have confessed to either not seeing the benefit or purpose of evaluation or just not having the necessary knowledge and skills to perform the task of evaluation. (P. 41)*
Harris (1986) describes this situation: 

*Because teacher evaluation is complex, threatening, and not well understood, much of current practice involves “games” rather than systematic professional evaluation. The games are nonproductive, at best, and counter-productive in some forms. Evaluation as judging, punishing or rewarding, and controlling is simply inconsistent with the needs of all who are involved or concerned. Evaluation is a process for guiding decisions for improving teaching requires concepts that focus on teaching, knowing, diagnosing, collaborating, and developing people.* (P.30)

It can be argued then that if teachers do not have the skills, attitudes and knowledge essential for the accomplishment of goals, the schools will not be successful. Teachers’ evaluations are indispensable to the planning and operation of a good school. In this regard Iwanicki (1990) shares:

*When school improvement is a purpose of teacher evaluation, a focus must be set for the school-improvement process so that teachers can address improvement needs in a coordinated manner. This focus may be set by involving staff in a system-wide educational planning process.* (p.161)

Different organizations have different ways of performance appraisals to measure the performance of their employees based on the stated objectives of the organizations. Scholars and professionals give different names to performance appraisal; it is also called employee evaluation, performance review, employees rating, performance evaluation and result appraisal. As most researchers agree that the term appraisal in this sense means the evaluation of the performance or potential of employees.

Teacher appraisal is a complex process. It is considered by many as a series of activities and actions that are interconnected and related to a specific purpose. Since teachers deal with complex problems, they are evaluated as professionals, meaning that their peers develop the standards and their evaluation focuses on the degree to which they solve professional problems competently. In the school environment these problems are associated with the entire teaching and learning situation. Harris (1986) shares this definition:

*Evaluation is viewed as a process for studying an operation to more clearly understand it, in order to guide changes, while retaining and supporting these components of the operation which are judged to be desirable* (p.20).
This definition clearly places the focus on evaluation on a specific operation such as teaching unlike research; however, evaluation is concerned with understandings that can guide decisions towards change or maintenance of practices.

Teacher evaluation maybe defined as a structured formal interaction between a subordinate and supervisor, that usually takes the form of a periodic interview (annual or semi-annual), in which the work performance of the subordinate is examined and discussed with a view to identify weaknesses and strengths, as well as opportunities for improvement and skills development. Danielson and McGreal(2000) concluded in their research, Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice, that teacher evaluation is not only important but a necessity. Evaluation systems designed to support teacher growth and development through an emphasis on formative evaluation techniques produced higher levels of satisfaction and more thoughtful and reflective practice while still being able to satisfy accountability demands. The most common types of evaluation methods are teacher interview, competency testing, classroom observation, student ratings (student evaluations), peer review, student achievement, self-evaluation, portfolio and other reflective method. But out of which classroom observation is the most commonly used.

2.3 Purpose of Teacher Performance Evaluation

According to OECD (2009), teachers’ appraisal has typically two major purposes. First, it seeks to improve the teacher own practice by identifying strengths and weaknesses for further professional development—the improvement function. Second, it is aimed at ensuring that teachers performance at their best to enhance student learning—the accountability function. Teacher appraisal for improvement focuses on the provision of feedback useful for the improvement of teaching practices, namely through professional development. It involves helping teachers learn about, reflect on, and improve their practice. This typically occurs with account of the school context so professional development opportunities of an individual teacher are aligned with the school development plan.

The accountability function of teacher evaluation focuses on holding teachers accountable for their performance associating it to a range of consequences for their career. It seeks to set incentives for teachers to perform at their best. It typically entails performance-based career advancement and/or salaries, bonus pay, or the possibility of sanctions for underperformance. Teacher appraisal for accountability is summative in nature and usually involves evaluating
performance at nodal points in a teacher's career. It also works as a means to provide recognition to teachers. In the school system Performance appraisal has several purposes. According to Girma, (2012) it provides legal and formal organizational justification for teachers decision to promote outstanding performances, to weed out marginal or low performers and to train, transfer and discipline others and to justify merit increases. It also provide feedback to the teachers as hereby serve as a vehicle for personal and career development and help to achieve educational goals.

Richmon City Public school (2012), well explains the primary purposes of a quality teacher appraisal system into three interdependent aspects which are explained from the plan implementation and evaluation point of view. The goal and objective of the appraisal is mentioned in the overall planning of the school which the appraiser and appraisee are familiar with before any action. Understanding the objective and plan of the appraisal, well preceded by effective processing of the appraisal to bring effective instruction and classroom management.

Moreover, the performance evaluation outcome should be implemented in the sense that it promotes a positive working environment and continuous communication between the teacher and the evaluator that promotes continuous professional growth and improved student outcomes. Furthermore, the school stressed that appraisers should confirm as the performance evaluation ultimately facilitate self-growth, instructional effectiveness, and improvement of overall professional performance and students learning and growth.

In the view of Nelson (2012), “teacher evaluation has aspiration purposes regarding teacher performance. In essence, the evaluators have the conscience that the primary purpose of teacher evaluation is to enhance teacher performance, and it is to improve the teaching and learning processes”. Also it is aimed to ensure teacher and school accountability, since students achievement is perceived as the heart of the objectives of teacher evaluation. The main purpose of teacher evaluation is to ensure that the teacher performs supposed work and the students learn well. The role of teachers’ evaluation is a significant means of enhancing teacher performance and ensuring accountability (Danielson, 2000).

Fletcher (1999) Further explained the purpose of performance appraisal in more detailed manner such that appraisal is used as a vehicle for motivating staff, to improve performance through setting objectives and targets of achievement, to assist in employee performance, as a
payment reward for efforts of last period, for development purposes, identifying training needs and personal development and to suggest way of managing shortcomings of performance. Many researchers have shared what they believe the purpose of teacher performance evaluation should be. From the literature, the many purposes of teacher performance evaluation can be placed within two major umbrellas, accountability and professional growth.

Stronge (2006) states, “There is room in teacher evaluation systems for both accountability and performance improvement purposes. In fact, evaluation systems that include both accountability and personal growth dimensions are both desirable and necessary for evaluation to productively serve the needs of individual teachers and the school and community at large.”

Stronge (1995) also states more of this unity between accountability and professional development as the two key purposes of teacher performance evaluation,

Performance improvement and accountability purposes are not competing, but supportive interest – dual interests that are essential for improvement of educational service delivery. These two roles are inextricable intertwined in the total evaluation process. Moreover, a conceptual framework for (teacher) evaluation should emphasize the dynamic relationship between individual and institution where the needs and interests of one fuse with and support the other. (p.13)

In general Performance Appraisal is mainly used for two purposes: judgmental and developmental. The judgmental purpose focuses on assessing the relative value of each employee to the department in order to make sound administrative decisions. These decisions entail salary increases, promotions, Probation and lay-off. The developmental or coaching purpose focuses on providing feedback on past performance, discussing strengths and weaknesses, clarifying future performance expectations, establishing future goals and assessing training needs (Schweiger and summer, 1994)

2.3 Approaches to Performance Appraisal

There are two major umbrella classifications of teacher evaluation types; summative and formative. Duke (1995) described two approaches of evaluation. The first one is formative evaluation while the second one is summative evaluation.
2.3.1 Formative Appraisal

A key objective of formative teacher evaluation is to identify areas of improvement for individual teachers, leading to the preparation of individual improvement plans which take into account the overall school development plan (Danielson, 2001:12).

The formative evaluation is an ongoing evaluation designed to provide feedback to the person being evaluated for the purpose of self-improvement. Formative evaluation helps to develop communication skill between the subordinates and the supervisor and thereby take corrective action and recommendations on the short comings revealed in the performance process. (Webb and Norton (1992:379).Formative evaluation serves a development function. Its purpose is to help an individual employee improve his or her effectiveness on the job by providing feedback and coaching. Formative evaluation is used to sample the process of learning or improvement, and to help in the decision making concerning how the outcome might be improved. At this stage many systems engage the teacher in goal setting and planning. Additionally, Administrators may seek help for teachers who may need such assistance in the formative part of the school year. Formative evaluation helps the teacher to improve their own teaching. It directs the learning process on the part of the teacher. Formative evaluation can help ineffective teachers become better teachers and effective teachers become excellent teachers. It is described by many proponents as a helpful, caring process that provides data to teachers for making decisions about how they can best improve their own teaching techniques, styles, or strategies. Barber (1990) elaborates:

*Formative teacher evaluation is a set of procedures designed to assist teachers in improving their own teaching. Formative teacher evaluation can help an ineffective teacher become a better teacher or an effective teacher becomes an excellent teacher. Formative evaluation is a helping, caring process that provides data to teachers for making decisions about how they can best improve their own teaching techniques, styles or strategies. (p. 216 -217).*

Formative evaluation is used to sample the process of learning or improvement, and to help in the decision making concerning how the outcome might be improved. Many times formative evaluation is done in the early part of the school year. “In the teaching analogy, all activities leading to the final test were formative.”(Manning 1988).The formative phase continues and is primarily concerned with teaching observation and the collection
of data. It is during this formative assessment phase that supervisors supply information and feedback, which can be written or oral. They also assist in integrating these new aspects into teachers’ routines of planning, respond to questions, provide guidance as teachers assimilate these new ideas into their repertoire, and focus on changes that will enhance the teachers instructional effectiveness. This will serve as an ongoing process to paint a picture of the teacher’s capabilities and effectiveness in dealing and performing in the school’s culture and his/her handling of the total teaching and learning process.

The Coach or Counselor role of the instructional supervisor during the formative phase of assessment is ongoing. The purpose of the formative phase is to help teachers improve or upgrade their teaching skills and/or add to their teaching repertoire. Supervisors need to collect information that is bias-free and valid and then present it in meaningful ways that cause teachers to reflect on the teaching-learning process. (P. 250-251) (Beach and Reinhartz, 2000).

2.3.2 Summative Appraisal

Evaluation of teacher performance can also be used to determine career advancement, award performance rewards or establish sanctions for underperforming teachers. It constitutes an opportunity to recognize and reward teaching competence and performance, which is essential to retain effective teachers in schools as well as to make teaching an attractive career choice (OECD, 2005). Summative evaluation, represents measurement of what has occurred. This appeals to those who collect information—information upon which to base decisions. The purposes of summative procedures in teaching are analogous to the summative procedures used in teacher performance evaluation—the need to grade, place or promote. These are what Manning (1988) refers to as status decisions. Summative evaluation is mainly carried out at the end of the school year and this is the one that many or most schools and teachers are used to. This evaluation is the one that most decisions of promotion, retention, and dismissal are made. Many teachers dread this process. Valentine (1992) shares:

The summative conference is different from the formative conference in intent and process. Its purpose is to discuss the summative judgments made for each criterion... The teacher’s attitude, which can usually be predicted from previous interactions, will obviously affect the degree to which the conference is collaborative or authoritative. (pg. 138-139)
Principals for years have expressed how time consuming this can be and therefore the process has suffered great inefficiencies over the years. Mannings states, “When there is not adequate time, the process has a tendency to become perfunctory. It is probable that teachers who have previously demonstrated competence may not need yearly summative evaluations...one school system uses both summative and formative processes, evaluates most teachers summative on a triennial basis. This plan is designed so that one-third of the teacher is evaluated each year.” (Mannings 1998 p. 5).

Manning (1988) elaborates on the design and purpose of summative evaluation:

Summative evaluation is designed for ensuring that the minimum acceptable standards are met. Those who evaluate summatively must make decisions which determine status, and these decisions are based upon the requirements to meet minimum standards. Most often, the principal is the person who conducts summative evaluation. The principal is the first-line administrator who must recommend tenure, retention, promotion, and who must make other status decisions. For these reasons, he or she should be the primary evaluator. It is proposed that, in most cases, the principal be clearly identified as the summative evaluator. (p.153)

Summative evaluation refers to assessment carried out for the accountability purposes. This type of evaluation is usually conducted annually or semiannually, and the results are used to make decisions about individuals, such as whether to grant tenure, to seek termination or transfer, to place an individual on a career ladder or to make salary adjustment. Most summative evaluation process involves completing a checklist and giving teachers a score/grade. Danielson and McGreal (2000) explain:

Most evaluation systems depend on a single dichotomous scale, such as “satisfactory,” “needs improvement,” and the like. Some systems on the other hand have attempted to incorporate “rating scales,” that is scales from “1” to “4” or levels . . . . . Though offering a promise of greater objectivity and specificity than a simple checklist of whether certain behaviors were observed or not, it does fall short of its potential, as there is little agreement as to what constitutes an “outstanding” or “standard”. What is one person’s “outstanding” is another person’s “standard” (p.4)

At the end of the school year, the summative phase is then conducted and this provides the opportunity to examine all the data previously collected during the formative observations and feedback sessions held. The data is then interpreted and a judgment is
made about the teachers’ overall performance. Many times teachers are given a final grade, point or place on a predetermined scale.

Beach and Reinhartz (2000) say that: *In this phase the supervisor collects all pertinent information, reviews teacher progress, reflects on changes, discusses findings with the teacher, and make a decision concerning the teacher’s performance. The summative phase also serves as a means of identifying areas of concern the teacher is experiencing, and generates recommendation for improvement and corrections.* (P. 251)

### 2.3.3 The Relationship between Formative and Summative Evaluation

The very meaning of formative and summative evaluation is a point of contention in many schools. Gordon (2006) examines them in this way, “formative evaluation as the basis for professional development and summative evaluation as the basis for personnel decision” (p.269). Barber (1990) describes the basic dynamics of each:

*Teacher-evaluation systems are not inherently formative or summative. How the data are used determines if an evaluation system is summative or formative. If the data generated by the system are given back to teachers for their use in improvement of their teaching techniques or styles, and never used to make judgments about them by one who can alter placement, salary, status, tenure or working conditions, then the system is formative. If the data generated by the system are used in any way to make judgments about placement, status, salary or conditions, then the system is summative. Some believe that if people who can determine status, salary, conditions, even have access to the data, then the teacher-evaluation system should be considered summative.* (p 217)

Summative and formative evaluations serve different purposes but are indirectly tied to each other. In the true sense, formative and summative evaluations cannot be separated, because they each contain aspects of the other. In most teacher performance programs, formative evaluations lead up to the summative phase. “Formative evaluation provides a mirror to those being evaluated so they can see how to become better teachers. Formative evaluation obtains information and data and provides nonjudgmental feedback to teachers being evaluated.” (Barber,1990). This period of support happens mostly before the summative process. The summative evaluation done at the end of the year depends on a scale rating which includes “outstanding”, “above standard”, “standard”, and needs improvement. Though offering a
promise of greater objectivity and specificity than a simple checklist of whether certain behaviors were observed or not, it does fall short of its potential, as there is little agreement as to what constitutes “outstanding” or “standard”. What is one person’s “outstanding” is another person’s “standard”? In other words, evaluators do not have, “the equivalent of the anchor papers or benchmarks used in evaluating student work against rubrics.” (Danielson and McCreal, 2000)

Peterson (1985) tries to differentiate between the two levels of evaluation. He notes that “The distinction between formative and summative evaluation is important because very often different techniques, and even personnel, must be used according to the intended purpose...for example, the stated goal of evaluation to improve practice (formative) is seriously weakened by the overriding goal of summative judgments to control teachers.” (p.53)

Whether or not the goal of summative evaluation is to control teachers, it is necessary to make it clear that most evaluation processes and systems, including the systems used in Ethiopia, depend on the results of summative evaluation to make decisions.

Other proponents describe the summative evaluation as carrying weight based on its use to make personnel determination about individual teacher. “The final summative evaluation of a staff member carries considerable weight and importance.”(Danielson and McGreal, 2000, p.97)

There has been an ongoing debate concerning the two main umbrellas of teacher performance evaluation –formative and summative. Some researchers feel that they should be separated and that the respective purposes and uses are not complimentary. Fite (2006) declares:

*Formative faculty evaluation to improve teaching and performance should be separated from summative faculty evaluation used to make personnel decisions. Faculty members who participate in good faith in faculty evaluation to improve their teaching, research, and service must not find that criticism made for formative purposes are subsequently used against them when applying for retention, tenure, and promotion. Both formative and summative faculty evaluation are very important but should be kept separate. An institution should not introduce a faculty evaluation system whose purpose if formative and then gradually transform it into a summative uses for personnel decisions. (pgs. 196-197)*

Others believe that both can work together in unison to provide both accountability in the areas of personnel decision making and that of professional development. One such researcher
who advises that a teacher performance evaluation system should focus on both is Sally J. Zepeda. Zepeda (2006) states:

*There are several inherent tensions between the fields of instructional supervision and teacher evaluation. The primary tension includes the belief that the same person cannot provide both formative support (e.g. supervision and coaching) and then later evaluated the overall performance of the teacher for purposes of continued employment. Another tension with the supervision-evaluation or formative-summative tug-o-war is the fact that in many schools, evaluation is practiced as instructional supervision; however the purpose of evaluation and supervision needs to not be in direct opposition.* (p.108)

Teacher evaluation works best when it is a dialogue between equals. Many proponents encourage collegiality in the process, where trust both the process and the evaluator will be built. Yatvin (2012) in looking at the need for partnership in teacher performance evaluation noted, “As for the evaluation process itself, it needs to be yearlong, with evaluators working alongside teachers and observing many different lessons. Thus, they will see what good teachers do: grading papers at lunchtime, coming in early to tutor a struggling student, staying late to meet with a worried parent, inspiring students to learn more than required.”

Sawa (1995) writes:

*Evaluators should know the subject matter, pedagogy, and classroom characteristics of the teacher being evaluated (McGeachy, 1992), as well as take into consideration the fact that experienced and excellent teachers are capable of pedagogical performances that educational theory and research can neither explain nor predict (Shulman, 1987).* (p.3)

What is therefore needed is a form of evaluation that helps the teacher in his/her aim for higher creativity and excellence. Evaluation works better when administrators and teachers have access to comprehensive evaluation models that capture the complexities of teaching. “Traditional summative evaluation models are not necessarily structured to support dynamic, regenerative school environments. Evaluation procedures that focus on complying with regimented sets of behaviors do not encourage teacher involvement in their self-development or in the development of collaborative school cultures.” (Weiss and Weiss 1995)

Weiss and Weiss (1995) maintain that evaluation should be more than just merely placing a check mark beside a set of predetermined standards:
Principals and teachers are becoming frustrated with conventional evaluation practices used to determine teacher effectiveness and thus, tenure and promotion. These evaluation practices stress accountability and frequently are based upon teacher-directed models of learning such as lecture, demonstration, recitation, and modeling designed primarily to transmit knowledge and cognitive skills to students. (p.1)

Peterson (1995) describes a good teacher performance evaluation system as fair and just. It should meet demonstrated needs of the client, answer the questions of interested audiences, and be cost effective and free from unjustifiable side effects. He describes a good evaluation system as one which should be technically sophisticated to encompass the full range and types of duties. It should also be research based and like any good assessment seek to ensure validity and reliability. He concludes with a description of what is said in many arenas as a good teacher evaluation system, he noted:

Most current teacher evaluation consists of a principal’s report of teacher performance, usually recorded on checklist form, and sometimes accompanied by a brief meeting. These reports are based on informal and formal classroom visits. More advanced systems as “clinical supervision” components, including pre observation conference, agreement on elements to be observed, post observation conference and direct link to in-service training...checklist for teacher evaluation are based on a wide variety of suppositions about what good teaching should look like.” (p. 15)

2.4 Challenges to Successful Implementation of Performance Appraisal

Implementation difficulties may arise as a result of a wide range of factors. (OECD, 2009:22), a defensive culture of evaluation: little tradition of peer evaluation, feedback and sharing of teaching practices. This might lead to some resistance to application of teacher evaluation by particular groups in the school system.

Technical challenges to implementation: The effective operation of teacher evaluation depends to a great extent on the skill of school leadership on the concept and practice of appraisal in schools. This include limited professional expertise of those with responsibility to evaluate; insufficient preparation of schools to implement evaluation procedures; limited understanding by teachers of the purposes and uses of evaluation; a sense of unfairness by those teachers being
evaluated; the excessive workload inherent to the evaluation process; and the reluctance of many teachers to accept the legitimacy of the evaluators.

**Lack of resources:** Like aspects of the teacher evaluation procedures, particularly the time needed for developmental work, observational evaluation and feedback. While comprehensive teacher evaluation models – e.g. with the multiplication of instruments and evaluators are more likely to provide a solid basis to evaluate teachers, limited resources make trade-offs inevitable. As explained by Isoré (2009), comprehensive teacher evaluation procedures imply greater direct and indirect costs at every stage of the process: reaching agreements on the design of the system requires time for discussions and consultations with all stakeholders (Avalos and Assael, 2006); training evaluators is expensive and requires time (Danielson, 1996, 2006); conducting evaluation processes induces additional work load for both teachers and evaluators, unless offsetting is made by reducing workload with other responsibilities and aligning broader school reforms such as professional development opportunities requires more educational resources (Heneman, 2007.)

**2.4.1 Challenges to Address the Implementation of Performance Appraisal**

It is essential to analyze the challenges of implementation of teacher evaluation. This includes reconciling the diverging interests of stakeholders, carefully analyzing policy alternatives and their likely impact and discussing them with stakeholders to aim towards consensus.

Adverse effects are particularly prone to occur when consensus has not been reached on the objectives for teacher evaluation, its importance for the performance of the school system, and the practical options for implementation. Consensus is all the more precious to reach since local actors such as teachers and school leaders may be in the best position to foresee unintended consequences or judge what is feasible in practice, and since the effectiveness of teacher evaluation heavily depends on their cooperation.

**2.4.2 Expertise Role on the Effectiveness of Teacher Evaluation Practices**

Teacher evaluation is eminently a technical matter and has a lot to benefit from worldwide evidence on best policies and practices. Some countries bring together educational researchers and distinguished teachers into an advisory group to monitor and guide the implementation of teacher evaluation. Such group is in a good position to recognize good evaluation practices, to
keep abreast of relevant research developments and, as a result, to provide advice based on sound evidence.

2.4.3 Gaining the Full Support of Teachers
Teacher evaluation and the resulting feedback, reflection and professional development will only work if teachers make it work. To a great extent it is the motivated teacher who ensures the successful implementation of reforms in schools. Hence, it is imperative to find ways for teachers to identify with the goals and values of teacher evaluation arrangements and practices (OECD, 2009). Teachers must be supported in understanding what the evaluation expects from them to be recognized as good teachers and in preparing adequately for the evaluation process.

2.4.4 Personal Perceptions and Attitudes towards Appraisal
Teacher’s attitudes about the appraisal process will influence how a teacher will benefit from the appraisal process (Wagoner & O’Hanlon, 1968: 471-473) a favorable attitude will allow for greater benefits from the appraisal by allowing the teacher to become aware of specific strengths and weaknesses. Ideally, teachers will improve teaching performance as a result of a positive appraisal experience. Teachers may find the appraisal process produces a threatening feeling while others see the appraisal as a challenge to receive an award. Teacher perception about teacher appraisal will play a huge role on the success or failure of policy implementation that show educational accountability (Tuytens & Devos, 2009:126).

Teacher attitudes and perceptions about teacher appraisal tend to be positive when teachers are allowed to be a part of planning, designing, implementing and creating follow-up processes for evaluation tools (Clark, 1996). Teachers should also play a role in identifying a profile of the responsibilities and duties of the teaching staff. This will allow the teachers reflect and identify what is needed to provide quality instruction for increased student achievement. Negative perceptions about teacher appraisal may have detrimental effects on how a teacher handles the process of appraisal.

Tornero and Taut (2010), in the study they conducted came across the teachers whose perceptions and attributions led them to actively refuse to participate in the teacher appraisal process. How a teacher perceives and feels about teacher appraisal can affect the results of the
appraisal process. A negative attitude established by the extra work, feelings of someone looking over your shoulder, and having your values and beliefs questioned may cause a person to have a negative perception of an appraisal system. Poor attitudes and perceptions may cause feelings of displeasure, fear, and a sense of unfair practices. When individuals are not feeling safe and secure they tend to hold ill feelings towards the individuals performing teacher appraisal.

A study revealed that teachers with extremely poor attitudes were willing to lose their teaching position instead of undergoing the appraisal system (Tornero & Taut, 2010). According to Kimball & Malinowski, (2009) attitudes and perceptions may be very positive when teachers understand the necessity of an appraisal process and are allowed to participate in designing and implementing appraisal. Teachers with positive attitudes are willing to accept constructive criticism in order to enhance instruction which will in turn increase student achievement. Thus, principle and fact based appraisal as well as Merit pay and other incentives appear to give teachers a reason to develop a positive attitude towards the appraisal.
CHAPTER THREE

3. Research Design and Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The method of a research study emerges out from the nature of the research problem. The study will employ descriptive survey design since the purpose of this study is to assess current perception of teachers on performance appraisal practice. The descriptive survey design permits a researcher to gather information or opinion from large sample of respondents quickly and inexpensive and help to assess the recent practice and make generalization (Best and James, 2004). In addition, Robson (1993:128-129) lists the advantages of descriptive survey design as follows:

a) It provides for a relatively simple and straightforward approach to the study of values, attitudes, beliefs and motives.

b) It may be adopted for the collection of generalizable information from almost any human population.

c) It allows anonymity, which can encourage frankness when sensitive areas are involved.

Descriptive methods help us to understand the way things are, (Welman and Kruger 2004:192).

Thus, this research design is believed to help the researcher to find and describe facts associated with the current teachers’ perception on the practice and its associated challenges of performance appraisal in secondary schools of Bole sub city in Addis Ababa.

3.2 Source of Data

In this study both primary and secondary sources were used. The primary data sources are teachers and school principals of secondary schools of Bole sub-city. Documents such as standards, plans and performance reports, annual reports, directives, journals, published and unpublished documents, Policy manuals, Education bureau and related researches undertaken in this area were reviewed as source of secondary data.

3.3 Sample and Sampling Techniques

The research has been conducted in secondary schools of Bole sub-city administration. According to the sub city education office report, there are eight public secondary schools in the sub city out of which six of them are first cycle secondary schools (grade 9 and 10), one is only
second cycle secondary(preparatory) school and the other is both first and second cycle secondary school (grade 9 to grade 12). As the same report shows, there are 25 private secondary schools out of which 17 of them are both first and second cycle secondary schools (grade 9 to grade 12) and the remaining eight are only first cycle secondary schools (grade 9 and grade 10). The population of the study consists of 603 teachers.

The study targets nineteen secondary schools which incorporate both first and second cycle secondary schools. Out of the 19 schools of the population, 15 of them are private schools, 2 of them are owned by religious institutions and 2 of them are government owned.

Using stratified sampling method, 9 representative schools were selected which consists of all school types in the focus area. In keeping the proportion of different types of schools, 2 from public, 2 from religious institution owned and 5 from private were taken as research focus area. These schools are Beshale, AyerAmba, Gedamesitawian, BoleKalehiwot, School of Tomorrow, Kidist Mariam, Deliverance, Ethioparents and Youth Roots.

The number of teachers in these nine sample schools is 379, which is larger than the remaining secondary school teachers in the sub-city. That is, the sample schools constitute (63%) of teachers in secondary school of the sub-city. With regard to teacher respondents, out of 379 teachers a total of 194 teachers were selected by employing Yamane’s sample size formula with Level of Precision or Sampling Error of +or-5%. This is also in line with Krejcie and Morgan (1970) recommendations.

Based on quota sampling technique, 194 teacher respondents are distributed into the selected nine schools by 51% in order to give equal chances to all schools and to select the available number of respondents from each selected schools as follows:
Table I: Name of Selected Secondary Schools, Total Population and Sample Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sample Schools</th>
<th>Total Population of sample schools</th>
<th>Quota by percent (%)</th>
<th>Sample Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beshale</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ayer Amba</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gedamesitawian</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bole Kalehiwot</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>School of Tomorrow</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kidist Mariam</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Deliverance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ethio parents</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Youth Roots</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, 51% of the total sample population was taken as respondents. Thus a total of 194 teachers were chosen using random sampling method and all 18 Principals (both principals and vice principals) were involved in the study.

3.4 Instruments of Data Collection

Questionnaires and interview were primary sources of data collection and check lists for secondary sources. The primary data were collected through questionnaires and interviews of teachers and school principals. Therefore, in this research, questionnaire, interview and check lists were served as instruments of data collection.

Regarding questionnaire, Key (1997) mentioned that, questionnaire is a means of eliciting the feelings, beliefs, experiences, perceptions or attitudes of some sample of individuals. Questionnaire allows a wider coverage, than other methods. In addition, they offer less opportunity for bias or errors caused by the presence or attitude of the interviewers.

3.4.1 Questionnaire

The questionnaires were developed based on the research basic questions, the available literature and prior researches. In addition, it is chosen as an instrument to allow the respondents
the opportunity to answer the questions at their convenience and in the comfort of their offices. The questionnaires have both open-ended and close-ended questions and are in two sections; Section (A) and section (B). Section A focuses on the general information of the respondents and the schools while section B focuses on teachers’ perceptions of performance appraisal practices and related challenges. This section has four parts. The first part had items related to purpose of performance appraisal, the second part has items related to performance criteria, the third part focuses on the procedure of performance appraisal and the forth part has items related to problems of performance appraisal.

The collection of data for this study incorporate behavior questions, feeling questions, opinion questions, knowledge questions and demographic questions. For closed-ended questions five points Likert scale is adopted denoting, Strongly-agree (5), Agree (4), Undecided (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1). This is thought to be suitable for the study as it allowed the researcher to gain insight into the perception of teachers on the situation.

At the end of the questionnaire there are open-ended items that will give a chance for the respondents to give their suggestions, opinions or comments. A total of forty four structured questionnaires are prepared for teachers.

3.4.2 Interview
Interview questions were involved for principals and vice principals to obtain qualitative information so that to triangulate the responses of teachers. The six basic questions were used as interview guide questions for principals and vice principals.

3.4.3. Check List
Through check lists the researcher tried to access document sources to understand and provide interpretation of the subject matter under study. Official reports collected from the schools were analyzed and interpreted.

3.5 Validity
To improve the validity of questionnaires a pilot study was conducted after which responses to each item were analyzed to identify any misunderstandings and ambiguity. Items that were found to be misunderstood or ambiguous were modified thereby improving face validity. All
amendments such as spelling errors, abbreviation and grammars were made clear based on the feedback obtained from the pilot respondents. Based on the analysis of the pilot study, some vague and confusing items were modified to make the questionnaire clear and understandable. Leading questions were avoided and the wording of questions was made simple and unambiguous. Expert opinions, literature searches and pre-testing of questions were used to improve content validity. In addition, the instruments were constructed with guidance from university research Advisor.

3.5.1 Reliability
Reliability is an extent to which a questionnaire, a test observation or any measurement procedure produces the same result on repeated trials. Or in other words, it is the stability or consistency of scores over time or across raters. When a measurement is prone to random error, it lacks reliability. To check the reliability of the items, twelve teachers from Kebena Adventist School were used for reliability test and their responses were entered in to Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0 and analysis of reliability test was done by employing coefficient alpha. According to Korb, coefficient alpha (otherwise called Cronbach’s alpha) is the preferable statistics to calculate reliability. Test for each part of the questionnaire items and the alpha values were found to be 0.794 for items related to procedures of performance appraisal, 0.765 for items related to purpose of performance appraisal, 0.829 for items related to problems of performance appraisal and 0.896 for items related to criteria of performance appraisal; Which are above the moderate value as explained by Smith and Glass (1987). Charles (1988:167) argues that a correlation lower than 0.7 cannot be used to make accurate predictions. The questionnaire was hence considered reliable.

3.6 Methods of Data Analysis
Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, means and standard deviations. Quantitative data analysis required the use of a computer spreadsheet, and for this reason the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used. Martin and Acuna (2002) states that SPSS able to handle large amounts of data, and given its wide spectrum of statistical procedures purposefully designed for social sciences, it is also quite efficient. Qualitative data were analyzed qualitatively using content analysis based on analysis of meanings and implications emanating from respondent information and comparing responses to
documented data on performance appraisal in relation to quality of teaching and learning. Qualitative data were analyzed thematically, whereby similar responses were tallied to come up with frequency counts and then percentages calculated based on the total number of responses.

3.7 Ethical Consideration
The research participants were fully informed about the procedures and threat involved in research and has been achieved their consent to participate. They are briefed as almost all items in research was made guaranteed the participants confidentiality. They are assured that identifying information will not be made available to anyone who is not directly involved in the study. The respondents were told as the stricter standard is the principle of secrecy which essentially means that the participant will remain anonymous throughout the study even to the researchers themselves. Increasingly, the researcher has given great emphasis on ethical consideration that cannot be problem to respondents’ personal rights.
CHAPTER FOUR

4. Data Presentation, Analysis, and Interpretation

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings of the study regarding teachers’ perception on practice of performance appraisal in the secondary schools of Bole sub-city. This chapter presents the major findings of the study in relation to each of the research questions posed. The research applied descriptive research design and stratified sampling method to select sample schools and simple random sampling method to select participant teachers. The analysis was obtained from the structured and open ended questionnaires, interview and observation checklists. The analysis was done based on the data from 188 teachers and 18 principals and vice principals.

All questionnaires were returned, out of which six of them were disregarded due to irregularities made by respondents. The analysis of the data consists of two parts, the first part is the characteristics of the respondents and the second part deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data on performance appraisal practice.

4.2 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The demographic characteristics of respondents were discussed under gender, age, qualification and years of work. These were analyzed to ascertain the demographic characteristics of the respondents used for the current study.

The various findings related to the respondents’ demographic characteristics are presented and discussed on table 2.
Table 2: Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-25years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30years</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35years</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 years and above</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Educational Level | Teachers |                  | Principals |                  |
|                  | Frequency | Percent | Frequency  | Percent          |
| First degree     | 158       | 84.0    | 4         | 22.2              |
| Second degree    | 30        | 16.0    | 14        | 77.8              |
| Total            | 188       | 100.0   | 18        | 100.0             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of teaching service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10years</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 26 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 indicates the number of respondents involved in this research with respect to their gender, age, qualifications and service year. The table shows that out of the 188 teachers involved in this study, 166 (88.3%) were male while the remaining 22 (11.7%) were female. The results may suggest that secondary schools have more male teachers than female. Regarding principals and vice principals 17 (94.4.%) are male and only 1 (5.6%) is female; this indicates that females involvement in secondary school leadership positions is minimal. Regarding the age
of teachers, the table reveals that 6 (3.2%) were within the age group 21-25 and 99 (52.7%) were between 26-30 years. This indicates that the majority of respondents were in this age group. One can infer from this that most of the teachers of the secondary schools were between the age of 26-30 years. It can be noted here that this age group represents the most productive working force in any economy. In the other side the number of teachers with the age of 41 and above is only 21(11.2%); which indicates that veteran teachers who can mentor and guide the novice ones are not available in sufficient number in secondary schools of Bole sub-city.

**Qualification and Service Year**

The study also considered the qualification and year of service the respondents have within the teaching profession. Table 2 also displays respondents’ qualification and service year.

Regarding qualification, as shown above, the majority, 158(84.0%) of the teachers were Bachelor’s degree holders. The other proportion 30(16.0%) of the teachers in the study were master's degree holders. In the other side, only 4(22.2%) principals and vice principals were first degree holders. The remaining 14(77.8%) own master's degree. This means most principals qualification at secondary schools of Bole sub-city were in line with the requirements of the Ministry of education of Ethiopia (MoE) which urges the principals to have masters’ degree. Table 2 also displays the frequency of responses with respect to the number of years respondents spent in teaching. From the figure it is obvious that 33 (17.6%) of the teachers’ have spent 1-5 years in teaching profession. Moreover, significant proportion 102 (54.3%) teachers had an experience of 6-10 years and 35 (18.2%) teachers had 11-20 years experience in teaching. But only 18(9.6%) teachers had 21 and above years of work experience. This signifies that most teachers had passed at least once with the appraisal system, so, logically poor performance may not emerge out of lack of appraisal experience or exposure. Concerning principals and vice principals as it is indicated in the table 10 (55.5%) of them were in the profession for 21 and above years. As can be seen from the table there is no principal with less than 10 years of experience.

**4.3 Analysis of Teachers’ Perception on Performance Appraisal Practice**

This is the second part of this chapter that deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data on the teachers’ perception on performance appraisal practice. Except for table 7 for the
others the midpoint of the scale is a score of 3. Therefore, any score above 3 denoted that the respondents agreed with the statement, while scores below 3 signified that respondents disagreed with the statement. In regard to the degree of agreement and disagreement the range of mean value was designated as Low (below 2.50), Average (2.50 -- 3.49) and high (3.50 -- 5.00).

To this end, responses on the purposes, criteria, procedures, benefit and challenges of performance appraisal were analyzed.

4.3.1 Teachers’ Perception on the Purpose of Performance Appraisal

The study investigated teachers’ perception towards the purpose of performance appraisal of their schools. To do so 9 major indicators have been identified in the study and the responses of teachers were presented, analyzed and interpreted under table 3.

**TABLE 3: Teachers’ Response on the Purpose of Performance Appraisal.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>F &amp; %</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To identify strength and weakness</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To improve teaching</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To improve communication and relationship with principals and colleagues</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To increase satisfaction in the teaching job</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To identify training needs</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To penalize teachers</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To enhance students academic achievement</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>To promote teaching learning process</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>To reward teachers</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that; SA-Strongly agree, A-agree, U-undecided, D-Disagree and SD-strongly disagree.
As indicated in Table 3 with respect to item 1, 98 (52.1%) teachers strongly agreed that the purpose of teachers’ performance evaluation is *to identify strength and weakness*. Moreover, 75 (39.9%) respondents agreed. Hence, one can realize from the table 173 (92.0%) of teachers considered the purpose of performance appraisal was *to identify strength and weakness*. The mean value of the respondents also indicates the reality with a significance value of 4.46. On the contrary, only 2 (1.1%) teachers oppose about the purpose of performance appraisal for *identifying strength and weakness*.

According to table 3 item 2, 106 (56.4 %) strongly agreed and 61 (32.4%) agreed on the purpose of performance appraisal *to improve teaching*. That is, those who accept the purpose of performance appraisal as *to improve teaching* constitute 167 (88.8%) respondents with mean value of 4.46. This implies that teachers believed or practically observed as their performance appraisal practice contributed or improved their teaching by constructive comments and suggestions given from their appraisers. This may imply that teachers had obtained information that helped them to improve teaching, solving past problems they encountered and anticipating future opportunities for performance improvement.

Table 3 item 3 indicates that 72 (38.3%) and 68 (36.2%) respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively for the statement “*to improve communication and relationship with principal and colleagues*”. As the mean value 4.03 also shows majority of teachers believe that performance evaluation can improve communication with principals and colleagues. This may be due to the discussion after appraisal in the form of feedback.

As it can be seen from table 3 item 4 the teachers gave their response to the statement “*to increase satisfaction in the teaching job*” 60 (31.9%) of the respondents agreed and 50 (26.6%) of respondents strongly agreed. Jointly those teachers who disagreed with the above statement were 33 (17.6%) with mean value 3.6 this indicates that majority of teachers believe that performance appraisal may increase job satisfaction. Regarding this one principal said” teachers who perform well like to be seen and get appreciated”. The role of teacher appraisal in motivating teachers was also emphasized by many scholars. For instance, Poster and Poster (1992:1) agree with this by contending that the main objective of teacher appraisal was to improve individual performance and motivation in order to enhance the “learning opportunities for all students”. This view is supported by Mullins (1996: 640) who maintained that “one of the
purposes of an appraisal system is to motivate employees so that they learn and achieve more” in their duties such as teaching and facilitating students’ learning.

Regarding item 5 of table 3, about 66(35.1%) strongly agreed and 74(39.1%) with mean value 3.94 respondents agreed on the purpose performance appraisal of the schools to identify training needs and promote further education for teachers. On the contrary, some respondents which are 25 (13.3%) disagreed with the above statement. One vice principal suggested “some teachers became disappointed when they miss masters program opportunity in the competition due to their performance appraisal results”.

As it can be seen from table 3 item 6, the respondents gave their response to the question “to penalize teachers”. The above table shows that 45 (23.9%) of the respondents chose undecided. On the other hand, about 42(22.3%) and 30(16%) of respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. Jointly 71 (37.8%) teachers reject the purpose of performance appraisal to penalize with mean value of 2.86.

The respondents were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with the statement that the purpose of performance appraisal was to promote teachers and teaching learning process. As revealed under table 3 item 8, 93 (49.5%) respondents strongly agreed with the statement that the appraisal purpose improved their teaching and learning activity. Accordingly, 63 (33.5%) teachers agreed that the appraisal had some positive impact on their teaching. The combined response explained that 156 (83%) teachers agreed on the statement with mean value 4.24. In another way, 7(5.4%) teachers were disagreed with the statement. This explains that most teachers had found a number of elements that assisted them in accomplishing their teaching duty in the way that the purpose of performance appraisal looks for.

From the interview conducted, most principals and vice principals of the schools confirmed that performance appraisal enhanced teachers professional efficiency and effectiveness. All asserted that performance appraisal resulted in the production of qualitative and quantitative work and improvement of results. This is also supported by the assertion made by Donaldson and Stobbe (2000) that appraisal involves the teacher’s professional knowledge, understanding and skills to improve the quality of teaching and student learning in the classroom. Through interview, some of the vice principals indicated that they were promoted because of their finest performance appraisal result. This implies that teachers that were appointed for principals or related position were based on their performance valuation. This implies teachers’ promotions to
higher position as well as the promotion of teaching learning process were well attached with performance appraisal and this also seems well recognized by the schools’ teachers.

As the table depicts for item 9, the purpose of performance evaluation as “to reward teachers”, the majority of respondents 110(58.5%) agreed and strongly agreed with mean value of 3.54. In line with the purposes mentioned above, the interviews conducted with the principals revealed that they believed the purposes of performance appraisal were to improve quality of education, to enhance professional competence of teachers, to provide feedback to teachers, to decide on teachers’ promotion and to take disciplinary actions.

4.3.2 Perceptions on the Criteria of Performance Appraisal

This part discusses at the analysis of performance appraisal criteria as required in secondary schools of Bole sub-city. To this end, respondents were asked to rate the items and the responses were presented, analyzed and interpreted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>F &amp; %</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Criteria are relevant to improve teachers' performance</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60 87 28 9 4</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>31.9 46.3 14.9 4.8 2.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Criteria are appropriate to raise professional development</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>58 84 28 16 2</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>30.9 44.7 14.9 8.5 1.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Criteria can help to enhance teachers' motivation to work</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>51 80 28 19 10</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>27.1 42.6 14.9 9 5.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Criteria are suitable to improve poor performance</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40 74 39 25 10</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>21.3 39.4 20.7 13.3 5.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Criteria measure what intended to measure</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37 85 35 27 4</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>19.7 45.2 18.6 14.4 2.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The criteria are adequate to measure good performance from poor</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34 93 32 17 12</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performance</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>18.1 49.5 17 9 6.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The criteria measure good teaching</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>49 77 37 19 6</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>26.1 41.0 19.7 10.1 3.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that; SA-Strongly agree, A-agree, U-undecided, D-Disagree, SD-strongly Disagree

There is more than enough evidence to suggest that the schools have appraisal criteria. This was established based on the finding that about 184(97.9%) answered yes to the statement that sought
to find out whether there is an appraisal standard or criteria in their schools. This condition was also clearly seen through document investigation using check list.

In the above table 4 item 1, respondents were asked about “the relevancy of performance appraisal criteria to improve teacher’s performance”, about 60(31.9%) and 87(46.3%) respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively with mean value 4.01. This means that performance appraisal helped teachers to come out their problems so that they can put into effect their teaching activities.

As it can be seen from the table, on item 2 the respondents gave their response to the question for criteria are appropriate to raise professional development the table showed that 84 (44.7%) of respondents agreed and 58(30.9%) of respondents strongly agreed. In aggregate 142 (75.6 %) agreed with mean value 3.96. This indicates that teachers knew that a performance appraisal criterion has clear fundamentals to enhance professional competence of teachers.

With respect to item 3 on the same table, 51(27.1%) teachers strongly agreed and 80(42.6%) strongly agreed. This indicates the majority, 131 (69.7%) teachers with mean value 3.78 agreed as performance appraisal criteria can help to enhance teachers’ motivation to work. On the other hand about 29(14.3%) respondents disagreed on the statement mentioned above. This response signifies what has been forwarded on the purpose of the schools performance appraisal on table 3 item 4.

According to item 4 in table 4 the teachers response on the statement Criteria are suitable to improve poor performance, 40 (21.37%) respondents strongly agreed and 74(39.4%) agreed on the statement. In combination about 114 (60.7%) respondents with mean value 3.58 agreed with the item. This means majority of teachers improve their teaching as per the expectation of the criteria.

According to item 5 in the same table, respondents’ response about the relevance of the criteria for the statement “Criteria measure what intended to measure” 85(45.2%) and 37(19.7%) agreed and strongly agreed respectively. Though significant amount of respondents agreed on the issue with mean value of 3.66, some respondents 31(16.5%) do not appreciate the relevance of evaluation criteria. In this regard a teacher replied for the open ended question by saying “some criteria do not consider the situation of our work load and it is expected that we should conduct action research twice a year. This is very difficult due to the teaching load that we have”.
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For the item 6 on the same table, *the criteria are adequate to measure good performance from poor performance* the majority of respondents 93(49.5%) and 34(18.1%) agreed and strongly agreed respectively with mean value of 3.64. this indicates that respondent teachers believe that the criteria can discriminate good performer and weak performer. On the other hand 32(17%) of respondents cannot decide and 29(15.4%) of respondents do not agree on the issue.

Regarding item 7 of the same table, “*the criteria measure good teaching*” 47(26.1%) and 77(46%) of respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively with mean value of 3.80. This shows that the respondents believe about the criteria is not to find fault of the teacher but to check how he or she teaches properly. This kind of perception helps the teacher to see performance evaluation as a development function. On the other hand 37(19.7%) of respondents did not decide on the issue and 25 (13.3%) of respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed on the issue.

### 4.3.3 Teachers’ Perception on the Process of Performance Appraisal

This section examines the appraisal process or procedures taking place on secondary schools of Bole sub-city. The examination was to be able to identify components of the performance appraisal process in the schools and how this helped or affected the appraisal process. Findings with respect to the specific area of investigation were indicated in table 5.
TABLE 5: Teachers’ Responses on Performance Appraisal Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>F %</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>F &amp; %</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St.Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orientation is given prior to the appraisal for the appraised</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teachers evaluation process takes place in regular basis</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Post appraisal discussion takes place between appraiser and appraise</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is practice of feedback to the appraise</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teachers' performance appraisal process reflect teachers' actual</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>3.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performance</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teachers performance appraisal feedback provides constructive idea</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teachers' performance appraisal process is west of time</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The appraisal process is used as a tool for victimizing some workers</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Appraisers measure teachers each other rather than with the standard</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/criteria</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Appraisers avoid extreme rating(high or low), by rating all the</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers at the middle</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Appraisers evaluate based on past records only</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that; SA-Strongly agree, A-agree, U-undecided, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly Disagree
In table 5 item 1, 15 (8%) of the respondents generally disagreed and 13 (6.9%) respondents strongly disagreed on the idea. Generally the aggregate of those who disagreed and undecided on the idea constitutes 65 (34.6%) teachers with mean value 3.73. Orientation on the process of appraisal facilitates the understanding of the process, implementation and achievement of performance appraisal objectives.

The reaction from a principal in the interview questions explained that “we declare that the presence of the appraisal in the appraisal weeks or months on the notice board or on meetings to the teachers. Otherwise, there was no any instant that the teachers are told formally about the contents and the way appraisal takes place”. The idea was more or less supported by other schools principals in an interview response they have given for the researcher, one principal explained that, “We only tell them the duration of appraisal so that teachers prepare before beginning of an appraisal process”.

In the contrary, 44 (23.4%) and 79 (42%) respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively. This shows that the presence of orientation in majority of schools. A key finding depicted on the above table is the fact that adequate orientation prior to the appraisal process for the appraised considered to be a prime activity to the appraisal process.

Regarding the regular appraisal process of performance, 31 (16.5%) respondents strongly agreed on and 95 (50.5%) agreed on its regularity with mean value of 3.73.

In the open ended question, principals indicated that formal appraisal of teachers take place two times a year to the maximum.

On table 5 item 3 teachers were asked about post appraisal discussion between the appraisers and appraised. Accordingly, 76 (40.4%) respondents agreed and 38 (20.2%) strongly agreed on the statement with mean value 3.6. In addition, almost all interviewed principals and vice principals revealed as they promote post appraisal discussion in collaboration with department heads on each strong and weak point of appraised teacher. Furthermore, some principals confirmed as there are also written comments which can be kept in the record with an agreement between the teacher and appraisers. The researcher also observed agreement signature of the appraised teacher and appraisers on documents that indicate post appraisal discussion held in some schools. As depicted on item 4, table 5, agreed and strongly agreed respondents in aggregate rated 137 (72.9%) on the feedback of performance appraisal with mean value 3.9.
whereas 28(14.9%) respondents undecided and total of 23(12.3%) disagreed and strongly disagreed on the statement. 

According to Timerly,(1998) “appraisal and feedback have strong positive influence on teachers and their work, it increases their job satisfaction and, to some degree, their job security, and it significantly enhance their development as a teacher”. This indicates performance appraisal helped teachers in identifying their strength and weakness. Jubenkanda (2004) notes that, “performance appraisal provides guidance and assistance to teachers so that they can develop their strengths and overcome their weakness”.

Regarding the statement “Performance appraisal processes reflect teachers’ actual performance” 35 (18.6%) and 60(31.9%) respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively. Whereas 67(35.6%) undecided on the statement and 19(10.6) and 6(3.2%) respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed on the opinion. Respondents’ opinion on the statement showed high difference with standard deviation of 3.051. This might be due to the different standards and system of performance appraisal procedures adopted in each school. This should be given attention because the appraisal is not only statement of subordinate performance, but a mirror of their personality and concept of adequate performance.

As can be seen in the table 5 item 6, the teachers’ responses on the feedback provided constructiveness, 79 (42.21%) respondents agreed on the statement and 52(27.74%) respondents strongly agreed. In sum 131 (69.95%) agreed with the total mean value of 3.87. This attitude is so important that the greater the trust on the importance of the feedback, the greater the change in teachers to improve their teaching. To the opposite 37(19.7%) respondents undecided and 20(10.6%) disagreed on the constructiveness of performance appraisal feedback. Feedback is considered by McNamara (2000) “as an important way of ensuring the workers know their true weakness on acceptable manner so that it will be effective”. This infers that, a constructive performance feedback process created the environment to effectively identify teachers’ strengths and weakness to enhance their career.

As it is explained on the above table item 7, 53 (27.3%) disagreed as performance appraisal is waste of time. Moreover, 33(17.6%) respondent strongly disagreed. In combined 86(44.9%) disagreed and 44(23.4%) undecided on the statement with total mean value 2.80. This shows that majority of the teachers consider the performance appraisal deeds were very
significant and do not see it as time wasting. In the other hand, 58(30.9%) respondents think the process as west of time.

As the same table shows for item 8, ”The appraisal process is used as a tool for victimizing some workers” 27(14.4%) and 66(35.1%) respondents strongly agreed and agreed with mean value of 3.19. This prevails that the majority of teachers believe that some workers will be victimized through the process of performance appraisal. This might be related with the orientation before the appraisal and readiness of the teacher for the appraisal. On the other hand, 62(33%) respondents oppose the statement by disagreeing and strongly disagreeing.

On the same table item 9, the majority 28 (14.9%) and 71(%37.8) respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively and support the idea “Appraisers measure teachers each other rather than with the standard /criteria” with mean value of 3.39. Accordingly the same table depicts for item 10, which is “Appraisers avoid extreme rating (high or low), by rating all the teachers at the middle” 49(26.1%) respondents strongly agreed and 64(34%) agreed on the issue .This means a total of 113(60%) respondents support the statement with mean value of 3.68. whereas 46(24.5%) undecided on the statement and the remaining disagreed.
For item 11 of the same table which say” Appraisers evaluate based on past records only” respondents showed their indifference with mean value of 3.18.

4.3.4 Performance Appraisal Challenges

Below is a brief discussion of some of the challenges of performance appraisal in secondary schools of Bole sub-city. Table 6 below reveals the challenges as perceived by the respondents.
TABLE 6: Teachers’ Responses on problems of Performance Appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>F &amp; %</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA (5)</td>
<td>A (4)</td>
<td>U (3)</td>
<td>DA (2)</td>
<td>SDA (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personal bias of evaluators are problem of performance appraisal</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Appraisers lack of the necessary knowledge, skill and experience.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Students aren't mature enough to rate their teachers</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of transparency</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poor administration of the overall Appraisal process</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>the inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lack of favorable perception of teachers about teachers' performance appraisal</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shortage of time to appraise teachers performance</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that; SA-Strongly agree, A-agree, U-undecided, D-Disagree, SD-Strongly Disagree

As shown on item 1 in table 6 on personal bias of evaluators 36 (19.1%) respondent chosen undecided, about 26(13.8%) and 71(37.8%) of them strongly agreed and agreed on the statement respectively while 44(23.4%) and 11(5.9%) disagreed and strongly disagreed with mean value 3.30. Even though there is no common agreement on the statement by teachers, it is clear that personal bias is one of the problems of performance appraisal of teachers in Bole sub-city. According to Lathan (2004) “the school head’s ability to appraise objectively and accurately may adversely affected by social differentiation”.
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In table 6 item 2 respondents were asked if Appraisers lack the necessary knowledge, skill and experience. In this regard 66 (35.1%) of respondents agreed. In addition, 8(4.3%) respondents strongly agreed with the statement. Jointly 74(39.4%) respondents with mean value 3.02 accepted the idea. On the other hand 49(26.16%) respondents were unable to decide. It is clear that, there is problem of competency with the evaluators as perceived by the teachers.

According to table 8 item 3 respondent were asked if Students aren't mature enough to rate their teachers, a higher proportion 60 (31.9%) and 48(25.5) of respondents strongly agreed and agreed. Jointly 108(57.4%) respondents agreed with shared mean value of 3.46.While 41 (21.8%) teachers disagreed and 14(7.4%) respondents strongly disagreed on the statement. Most teachers’ response on the open ended question also showed that students’ appraisal has lower acceptance with teachers. A private school teacher replied on the issue by saying “The focus given to student might be ok but proper orientation should be given to students on how to rate their teachers because some students tend to give low for teachers who are strict on the school rules”. Another teacher also suggested on the issue by saying “If students have to evaluate us a proper orientation should be given to them about the purpose of the evaluation”.

Regarding item 4 in table 6, teachers were asked if there is lack of transparency. About 62 (33 %) respondents agreed and 25 (13.3%) strongly agreed. Together 87 (46.3%) teachers agreed with mean value 3.10.This shows that teachers in Bole sub-city secondary schools believe lack of transparency in the appraisal process is a problem.

According to table 6 of item 5, on the statement Poor administration of the overall Appraisal process, 58(30.9%) teachers disagreed and 55 (29.3%) of them agreed on the statement. Whereas 38 (20.2%) of them chosen undecided with mean value of 3.10.It indicates that there is problem in over all administration of performance appraisal process.

As it can be seen on item 6 on the same table, 46(24.5%) respondents disagreed and 70(37.2%) agreed with the statement with mean value 3.30.Which shows appraisal criteria lack appropriateness.

For item 7 table 6, 52 (27.7%) teachers agreed on Lack of favorable perception of teachers about teachers' performance appraisal Similarly 22 (11.7%) respondents strongly agreed. Jointly, 74 (39.4%) agreed on the idea with mean value 3.06. But 46 (24.5%) of them were unable to decide. This indicates that teachers’ perception about performance appraisal is one of the problems.
In general the appraisal process has challenges as perceived by teachers. Negative perception about teachers’ performance appraisal may have detrimental effect on how principals and teachers handle the process of appraisal. Negative attitude and perception may cause feeling of displeasure, fear, and a sense of unfair practice and finally has a great impact on work condition of the schools. According to Tornero& Taut (2010), a negative attitude established by the extra work, feelings of someone looking over your shoulder, and having your values and beliefs questioned may cause a person to have a negative perception of an evaluation system. When individuals are not feeling safe and secured they tend to hold ill feelings towards the individuals performing teacher evaluations. One study found teachers with extremely poor attitudes were willing to lose their teaching position instead of undergoing the evaluation system (Tornero& Taut, 2010). “This, attitude erodes the fairness and transparency of the evaluation process, acceptance of the performance result and future improvement strategies”

On item 8 table 6, teachers’ perception was asked if there is **Shortage of time to appraise teachers’ performance** 53 (28.2%) teachers agreed and 19 (10.1%) respondents strongly agreed. In aggregate 71 (38.3%) respondents agreed. Whereas 58(30.9%) and 28 (14.9) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. And 30(16.0%) respondents were unable to decide. Generally teachers disagreed on the statement with mean value of 2.88. This shows that as teachers perceive, shortage of time is not as such a significant problem of performance appraisal in secondary schools of Bole sub-city

Here is a short discussion on performance evaluators in secondary schools of Bole sub-city. The table below shows who carries out performance appraisal of teachers in the sub-city secondary schools.

| TABLE 7: Teachers’ Response on the Evaluators of Teachers’ performance |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                             | Student evaluation | Self evaluation | Vice principal | Department head evaluation | Principal evaluation | Parent Evaluation |
| Frequency                   | 133              | 16               | 182             | 182              | 156             | 50             |
| Percentage                  | 70.7%            | 8.5%             | 96.8%           | 96.8%            | 82.9%           | 26.6%          |
As clearly seen from the table teachers’ performance evaluation is done mostly by department heads and vice principals that is showed by 182(96.8%) respondents reply. Following department heads and vice principals, teachers’ evaluation is done by principals 156(82.9%) respondents replied for the principal. As the table depicts students participation in evaluating their teacher is also high 133(70.7%). Whereas parents’ participation is low (26.6%) and the culture of self evaluation is weak 16 (8.5%).

4.3.5 Measures Taken Following Performance Appraisal

This part tries to find out what measures are taken following teachers’ performance appraisal. The following table shows the measures taken after performance appraisal in secondary schools of Bole sub-city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures taken</th>
<th>Frequency responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciates me</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warn me</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide and Advice me</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend me for further training</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides me necessary resource for improvement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 8 shows “Appreciates me”, was chosen by most 80 (31.5%) for the question what measures are taken following performance appraisal.” Guide and counsel me "also chosen significantly 68(26.5%) followed by “Recommends me for further training”42(16.5%) and “Provides me necessary resource for improvement”40(15.7%). Whereas “warn me” was chosen only24 (9.4%) of the respondents. This indicates that most teachers have positive experience after performance appraisal that is both appreciation and recommendation for good performance or Guidance and support for weak performance.
CHAPTER FIVE

5. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarizes and discusses the findings of the research. It draws conclusions relevant to the study and makes recommendations on the same. The descriptive survey design is applied to get the desired information from the schools. The study involved 379 teachers, 18 principals and vice principals. Stratified random sampling was employed to select sample schools from all secondary schools of Bole sub-city administration. Furthermore, using random sampling method 194 (51%) respondents were selected from 379 sample population. In addition all principals and vice principals were included in the study. Besides, Questionnaire both closed and open ended were designed for the teachers. In addition checklists and interview schedules for the principals and vice principals have been used as the main tools for data collection. In the descriptive analysis mainly, cross tabulation, frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation were implemented by employing SPSS computer software in the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the collected data.

5.2 Summary of Major Findings

The basic questions were raised in relation to the Performance appraisal purpose, criteria procedures and problems. To be more specific, the research questions were:

1. How do teachers perceive the purposes of performance appraisal conducted in their school?
2. What are the perceptions of teachers towards the procedures implemented in the process of performance appraisal in their schools?
3. How do teachers’ perceive the criteria set for performance appraisal of the schools?
4. What major problems are realized by teachers in the process of performance appraisal practice of their schools?
5. Who is responsible to carryout teachers’ performance appraisal in secondary schools of Bole sub –city?
5.2.1 Demographic Characteristics

The study revealed that majority teacher respondents were male (88.3%) and females were only (11.7%). Regarding principals and vice principals, males (94.4%) have popular number than females (5.6%). It was therefore concluded that, majority of staff members were male. In respect to teachers’ age, it was discovered that more than half (52.7%) of them were between twenty five and thirty. While for principals’, majority (61.1%) of them were above 41 years age. Regarding the number of years they had spent in the profession, above half (54.3%) of the teachers’ has served from 6-10 years. In the case of principals and vice principals, more than three quarter (88.8%) of them were in the profession for 16 years and above years. Pertaining to teachers’ qualification, majority (84%) of the teachers have bachelor degree and only the remaining (14%) of them secured master’s degree. Likewise, large majority principals (77.6%) and vice principals were masters’ degree holders and the remaining one third (22.4%) of them possess bachelors’ degree.

5.2.2 Performance Appraisal Practices and its Associated Challenges

From the analysis and interpretation of the empirical findings of this study, the teachers’ perception on the current performance appraisal practice in the secondary schools of Bole sub-city is stated as follows.

The study showed that teachers largely acknowledged the purpose of performance appraisal as a tool designed to promote teaching and learning process, to facilitate further education for teachers, to decide on teachers’ promotion to higher position and to enhance student achievement. However, some teachers viewed the current teacher appraisal intent as ineffective in motivating teacher towards their job. Even most teachers considered the purpose of performance appraisal as an instrument of punishing them.

The study found that the schools have appraisal criteria in place, and this was largely acknowledged by teachers and also principals. It was also approved by the researcher through check lists. However, the finding revealed to a large extent is that performance criteria have not been developed in consultation with teachers and appraisers. The study further showed that there were no sufficient prior orientations on the nature of the criteria and how performance appraisal process was implemented. According to the research, a majority of respondents perceive the role of appraisal criteria as valuable in enhancing teachers’ motivation towards work. The finding
confirmed that the performance criteria between private schools and between private and public schools were quite different.

The study found out that the appraisal process takes place by prior information to teachers about when it is conducted, post appraisal feedback was given, the appraisal process was carried out at least twice a year in regular bases, in most cases constructive feedback were given to teachers. Evidences showed that teachers were provided feedback and encouraged to participate in the post appraisal discussions. In another way, great number of the respondents indicated that the appraisal process has been used to victimize workers. According to the finding, principals and department heads frequently evaluated teachers’ performance appraisal always by observation and portfolio.

The key challenges identified by the study were personal biases of evaluators; in addition, rating appraisal higher / lower than actual performance and avoiding extreme rating by placing all teachers at the middle were also significantly recognized performance appraisal challenges. It is evident in the study that defensive culture and resistance of teachers, knowledge, skill and technical problems of principals were also the major problems to transform performance appraisal results into practice.

Concerning the appraisers of teachers’ performance; department heads and vice principals are the main appraisers. Principals and students also have major participation in the appraisal process. Representatives of parents also participate in evaluating teachers in some schools especially in public schools.

Regarding the measures taken after performance appraisal it is identified that most teachers got appreciation and recommendation for further promotion when they perform well and got guidance from evaluators as well as resource to improve performance when they perform weak. In the Contrary some teachers revealed that they face warning for poor performance.

5.3 Conclusions
Based on the study findings and on the basis of the research questions for the study conclusions were drawn.

The majority of teachers and principals were male than females. In respect to age of teachers, the large majority were between twenty five and thirty and the great majority of principals and vice principals were above 41 years. Regarding the number of years they had spent in the
profession, above half of the teachers’ has served from 6-10 years. In the case of principals and vice principals, more than three quarter of them were in the profession for 16 and more years. Pertaining qualification of teachers great majority of them have bachelor degree and where as principals and vice principals except a few of them which have bachelor degree, the great majority of them secured master’s degree.

The finding confirmed that teachers’ perceived purpose, standard, process of performance appraisal enhanced teachers’ performance. Teachers’ performance appraisal also developed teaching learning process, student academic achievement and teachers’ promotion for higher position.

All schools have performance appraisal system and standards but the standards weren’t similar in content with in public and private and also between private schools. The purpose and standard of performance appraisal were not developed in collaboration with stakeholders and not sufficiently clarified to the teachers and principals prior to implementation.

Teachers viewed the current appraisal system somehow as poorly administered, but undertaken regularly and carried by technically incompetent appraisers. Carrying out appraisal process at least twice a year was considered to be normal activity of the schools.

The majority of the principals more often appraise teachers using class room observation and portfolio. This shows that most of the schools rarely engaged in teachers’ appraisal using peer evaluation, self-evaluation and other methods.

According to respondent teachers; the major challenges experienced during performance appraisal were personal biases of evaluators, teachers‘ negative perception towards appraisal, technical problems of principals, committing appraisal higher/ lower rating than actual performance and avoiding extreme rating by placing all teachers at the middle.

Since one of the objectives of performance appraisals was to motivate employee for their best achievement, majority teachers were motivated or rewarded by appraisal so as to work hard to improve quality of education. This shows that schools device mechanisms to reward teachers accordingly, through salary increment, bonus or other mechanisms based on performance appraisal.

In the schools, pre-appraisal orientation was undertaken though it is not enough. In this regard, the current teachers’ performance appraisal is carried out by providing teachers with the necessary information about the methods and procedures of the system.
Therefore, it is better to conclude that the existence of pre appraisal orientation in the schools make most teachers aware of what is expected from them and also able to recognize its value.

Teachers perceived the system of performance appraisal that led to feedback and discussion after evaluation promisingly. In addition, teachers’ perception on the measures taken following performance appraisal was encouraging.

### 5.4 Recommendations

In light of the previous summary and conclusion, recommendations might be drawn from the research which can be used by various stakeholders.

According to the finding, the schools mainly use observation and portfolio as a method of performance appraisal. However, the schools appraisal, to be more accurate and useful may incorporate all methods of performance evaluation. Likewise, secondary schools of the sub-city could plan and use both summative and formative appraisal schemes so that the appraisal will influence teachers’ effectiveness and ultimately improve students’ achievement.

Some teachers have not recognized well the appraisal standards and process due to lack of participation and orientation. The importance of teachers’ participation in designing appraisal standards, process and identifying tasks and competency most likely support the idea of positive perception and attitude towards appraisal. Thus, the secondary schools’ principals, sub-city and bureau of educational offices should widen teachers’ participation in planning, designing and orienting performance appraisal standards and procedures.

The challenges that are prevalent in the schools were of two types in their kind i.e. attitudinal and technical. These incorporate teachers’ negative perception and resistance towards performance appraisal and appraisers’ bias and also teachers’ perception on students as evaluators which tends to perceive students as not mature enough to evaluate their teachers. School heads should ensure that the appraisal process is fair and transparent to avoid any forms of bias. School leaders may also choose appraisal process that make their subjects free and feel a sense of belonging to the appraiser rather than making them hate the system. Students shall be oriented about how to be more objective.

According to the finding, there was no evaluation standard similarity between public and private and among private schools. On the other way, all teachers of the secondary level are expected to have similar professional competency consequently they should be also measured in
the same professional appraisal scheme and promoted to the career ladder. Therefore, School leaders and education office of the sub-city may produce similar performance appraisal standards.

Moreover, the researcher suggests that other studies can be conducted to investigate the source of problems and come up with solutions both from the teachers and principals’ side to provide applicable solutions to the problems.
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Questionnaire for Teachers

Dear Respondent, the primary objective of this study is to examine teachers’ perception on the practice and its associated challenges of performance appraisal (Evaluation) of secondary schools in Bole sub-city. Research findings derived from this study will assist Teachers, Principals and supervisors in the performance appraisal processes.

1. Please remember that there are no rights or wrong answers; simply answer the questions based on your current knowledge and/or experience.
2. Please complete the questionnaire without discussing it with other members of your school.
3. All information will be treated as strictly confidential.
4. Please your answers should focus on the current practices of your school.

Your assistance in completing the survey questionnaire will allow the researcher to gather necessary data and arrive at right conclusion.

Thank you for your Time and effort

The Name of your School _________________________________

SECTION A: Demographic Data

1. Gender
   - Male------ □ Female ------------ □

2. Age group
   - 21-25 ------ □ 26-30 ------ □
   - 31-35 ------ □ 36-40 ------ □
   - 41 and Above -------

3. What is your education level?
   - First degree---------------- □ Certificate------------------- □
   - Second degree---------- □ Diploma--------------------- □
   - PhD--------------------- □
4. Years of teaching service

- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21-25
- Above 26

Section B. Performance appraisal (PA) practice

Direction 1.

Read each of the following items carefully and put the sign “x” for the alternative you think is true for you.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

- Strongly agree (SA) ___ (5)
- Agree (A) _______ (4)
- Undecided (U) ________ (3)
- Disagree (DA) _______ (2)
- Strongly disagree (SD) ______ (1)
# Items related to performance appraisal Practices

## I. What do you think is the Purposes of Teachers Performance appraisal in your school?

Please rate the items below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items related to purpose of performance appraisal</th>
<th>Rating Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To identify strength and weakness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To improve teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To improve communication and relationship with principals and colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To increase satisfaction in the teaching job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To identify training needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To penalize teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To enhance students academic achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>To promote teaching learning process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>To reward teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## II. What do you think about Teachers Performance appraisal Criteria of your school?

Please rate the items below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items Performance Appraisal Criteria</th>
<th>Rating Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Criteria are relevant to improve teachers' performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Criteria are appropriate to raise professional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Criteria can help to enhance teachers’ motivation to work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Criteria are suitable to improve poor performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Criteria measure what intended to measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The criteria are adequate to measure good performance from poor performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The criteria measure good teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. What do you think about the procedures implemented in performance appraisal process of your school?
Please rate the items below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items Related to Performance Appraisal Procedures</th>
<th>Rating Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orientation is given prior to the appraisal for the appraise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teachers evaluation process takes place in regular basis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Post appraisal discussion takes place between appraiser and appraise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is practice of feedback to the appraise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teachers’ performance appraisal process reflect teachers’ actual performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teachers performance appraisal feedback provides constructive idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teachers’ performance appraisal process is west of time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The appraisal process is used as a tool for victimizing some workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Appraisers measure teachers each other rather than with the standard /criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Appraisers avoid extreme rating (high or low), by rating all the teachers at the middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Appraisers evaluate based on past records only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. What major problems are encountered in the performance appraisal process of your school?
Please rate the items below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items related to problems of Performance Appraisal</th>
<th>Rating Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personal bias of evaluators are problem of performance appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Appraisers lack of the necessary knowledge, skill and experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Students aren't mature enough to rate their teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of transparency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poor administration of the overall Appraisal process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>the inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lack of favorable perception of teachers about teachers’ performance appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shortage of time to appraise teachers performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What other main challenges/problems you observed in teachers performance appraisal processes of your school? Please specify_____________________________________________
V. Which of the following methods are used while evaluating teachers in your school? (Tick as many as applicable)

1. Student evaluation  
2. Colleague evaluation  
3. Self evaluation  
4. Department head evaluation  
5. Vice principals evaluation  
6. Principal evaluation  
7. Parent Evaluation  

8. If any other please specify. ___________________________________________________

VI. What measures are taken following performance appraisal? (choose as many as applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciates me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warn me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide and advice me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend me for further training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides me necessary resource for improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If others please specify__________________________________________________________
Check list for the secondary documents

The research title: Teachers’ perception on the practice of performance appraisal of secondary and preparatory schools in Bole sub-city.

1. The school performance standard, Available _____Not Available_______

2. Documents on standard development procedure

3. Communication documents on performance standard

4. Discussion documents between appraiser and appraisee Prior performance evaluation

5. Feedback documents on performance appraiser

6. Samples of teachers performance evaluation
The research title: Teachers’ perception on the practice and its associated challenges perception on the practice of performance appraisal of secondary schools in Bole sub-city.

1. How do teachers perceive the purposes of performance appraisal conducted in their school?
2. What are the perceptions of teachers towards the procedures implemented in the process of performance appraisal in their schools?
3. How do teachers’ perceive the criteria set for performance appraisal of the schools?
4. What major challenges are perceive by teachers in the process of performance appraisal practice of their schools?
5. Who is responsible to carry out teachers’ performance appraisal in secondary schools of Bole sub–city?