

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE  
APPRAISAL SYSTEM IN GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF LIDETA  
SUB-CITY IN ADDIS ABABA

BY  
YIGZAW TAREKEGN REDA

June, 2017 G.C  
ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE  
APPRAISAL SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION IN GOVERNMENT SECONDARY  
SCHOOLS OF LIDETA SUB-CITY IN ADDIS ABABA

BY:

YIGZAW TAREKEGN REDA

A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Educational Planning and Management  
College of Addis Ababa University in partial fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Degree of Master of Arts in School Leadership

June, 2017 G.C.

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Yigzaw Tarekegn Reda, entitled: An Assessment of the implementation of Teachers' performance Appraisal system in government secondary schools of Lideta Sub – city in Addis Ababa city government and submitted in partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in School Leadership compiles with the regulations of the university and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

_____	_____	_____
External Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Internal Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Advisor	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____

Chairman, Department Graduate Committee Signature date

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Many individuals and institutions had their own contribution for the completion of this thesis work. First and for most I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Dr. Amanuel Worku for his insight full and constructive comments: Unreserved guidance and encouragement through my research work. In deep without his professional support this study would have not seen realized. His comments were indispensable asset to me.

I also my special thanks to Dejazmach/Balcha Abanefso Secondary and Preparatory school staff members for supportive during the study.

My heartfelt thanks also go to respondents of sample secondary schools of Lideta sub – city for their cooperation to fill the questionnaire and to be interviewed during data collection.

My deepest thanks also go to my wife w/ro Yalganesh Kassa for her provision of special support and sustained encouragement during the study.

## Table of Contents

List of Contents	Pages
Acknowledgements.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Tables .....	v
Abbreviations and Acronyms .....	vi
Abstract .....	vii
<b>CHAPTER ONE</b> .....	1
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statements of the Problem .....	5
1.2.2. Basic Research Questions.....	6
1.3. Objectives of the Study .....	6
1.3.1. General Objectives of the Study.....	6
1.3.2. Specific Objectives of the study .....	7
1.4. Significance of the Study .....	7
1.5. Delimitations of the Study .....	7
1.6. Limitations of the study .....	8
1.7. Operational Definition of Key Terms .....	8
1.8. Organization of the study.....	
<b>CHAPTER TWO</b> .....	10
<b>REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</b> .....	10
2.1. An Overview of Performance Appraisal.....	10
2.1.1. Meaning of Performance Appraisal.....	11
2.1.2. Historical Development of Performance Appraisal .....	11
2.1.3. Purposes of Performance Appraisal .....	
2.1.4. Principles and Methods of Performance Appraisal .....	14
2.2. Criteria and Standards .....	16
2.3. Approaches to Performance Appraisal.....	18
2.3.1. Formative Appraisal.....	18
2.3.2. Summative Appraisal.....	19

2.4. Process of Performance Appraisal system .....	19
2.4.1. Data Gathering Tools for Performance Appraisal .....	19
2.4.2. Monitoring.....	20
2.4.3. Communication .....	22
2.4.4. Training .....	22
2.4.5. Appraisers.....	24
2.4.6. Feedback Mechanisms.....	25
2.4.7. Rating the Performance .....	27
2.4.8. Post-Appraisal Meeting .....	30
2.5. Characteristics of Effective Appraisal System.....	32
2.6. Problems, Errors and Bias of Performance Appraisal System.....	35
2.6.2. Errors Made in Personnel Appraisal .....	37
2.7. Teachers Performance Appraisal in Ethiopia .....	
<b>CHAPTER THREE</b> .....	41
3. Research Design and Methodology .....	41
3.1. Research Methods .....	41
3.2. Sources of Data .....	41
3.3. Sample Size and Sampling Techniques .....	41
3.4. Data Gathering Instruments .....	43
3.4.1. Questionnaires .....	43
3.4.2. Interview.....	43
3.4.3. Document Analysis.....	43
3.5. Procedures of Data Collection .....	44
3.6. Method of Data Analysis and interpretation .....	44
3.7. Validity and Reliability Checks .....	44
<b>CHAPTER FOUR</b> .....	47
4. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretations of Data.....	47
4.1. Characteristics of Participants.....	47
4.2. Data Pertaining to the Major Variables of the Study.....	49
4.2.1. Purpose of Teachers' Performance Appraisal.....	49

4.2.2. Development of Teachers' Performance Appraisal Criteria Techniques Used and Feed-Back Procedures.....	53
4.2.3. Who better appraise teachers' performance and Competency of Appraisers? .....	59
4.2.4. The Process of Teachers' Performance Appraisal System .....	66
4.2.5. Problems Related Teachers Performances Appraisal System Implementation .....	69
<b>CHAPTER FIVE</b> .....	<b>75</b>
5. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations .....	75
5.1. Summary .....	75
5.1.1. Characteristics of Participants .....	76
5.1.2. Summary of Major Finding .....	76
5.1.2.1. The purpose of Teachers' Performance Appraisal .....	76
5.1.2.2. Development of Teachers' Performance Appraisal Criteria, Techniques Used and Feed-Back Procedures. ....	77
5.1.2.3. Competency of Appraisers .....	77
5.1.2.4. The Process of Teachers' Performance Appraisal System Implementation .....	77
5.1.2.5. Problems Related Teachers Performance Appraisal System .....	78
5.2. Conclusion .....	78
5.3. Recommendations .....	79
References .....	
APPENDIX A.....	85
APPENDIX B.....	

List of Tables

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table I. Summary of total population, sample size and sampling Techniques	44
Table II. Reliability test results with cronbach's alpha .....	48
Table 1: distribution of participants by sex and age .....	49
Table 2: Distribution of participants by years of service, Academic Qualification and weekly teaching Load .....	50
Table 3: The purpose of TPA system Implementation .....	52
Table 4: The participants Involved in the Development of TPA Criteria, Techniques used and feedback procedures .....	56
Table 5: The characteristics of TPA Criteria, Techniques used and feedback Procedure .....	59
Table 6: Better Appraisers of Teachers Performance .....	62
Table 7: Participants Opinion on competency of Appraisers.....	64
Table 8: Sources of Evidence on Performance Appraisal of Teachers .....	67
Table 9: Types of Teachers' Performance Appraisal Evaluation.....	69
Table 10: Participants Opinion on Approach of Class Room Observations.....	70
Table 11: Perception of participants on Appraisal Training.....	70
Table 12: Evaluations and Scales of Evaluations on Performance Appraisal of Teachers.....	71
Table 13: Participants Opinion on problems Related to Appraisers .....	73
Table 14: Major problems Related to the Design and Implementation of teachers performance Appraisal system.....	75

## **Abbreviations and Acronyms**

BARS	Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scale
BOS	Behavioral Observation Scale
ETP	Education and Training Policy
FCSC	Federal civil Service Commission-Federal civil Service Commission
F	Frequency
GRS	Graphic Rating Scales
HRM	Human Resource Management
MOE	Ministry of Education
MS	Mean Score
MSS	Mixed Standard Scale
PTSA	Parent Teacher Student Association
PA	Performance Appraisal
RET	Rater Error Training
TPA	Teachers' Performance Appraisal
WM	Weighted Mean

## Abstract

*This study was conducted to assess teachers' performance appraisal system implementation in government secondary schools of Lideta sub- city in Addis Ababa city government. Competence of appraisers, the process and problems of teachers' performance appraisal system implementation were the major focus of the study. To achieve the purpose of the study, a descriptive survey design supported by qualitative study was employed. The study was conducted in three government secondary schools of lideta Sub-city found in Addis Ababa city government. The respondents of the study were 30 appraisers (principals, vice- principals, department heads) and 77 appraisees (teachers). To select these sample respondents, simple random sampling and purposive sampling techniques were employed. Questionnaire, interview and document analysis were instruments employed for data collection. Data were gathered from respondents through close ended questions developed based on a five - point Likert scale and few open ended questions. In addition to this, data were collected through interview of appraisers and appraisees and document analysis. The statistical tools employed in analyzing the data were frequency, percentage, mean score and weighted mean.*

*The study that the purpose of teachers' performance appraisal system in government secondary schools of Lideta sbu – city in Addis Ababa city government was not successfully achieved as intended, because neither appraisers nor appraisees of secondary schools of the sub-city were participatnts in the development of teachers' performance appraisal criteria, techniques used and feedback procedures Moreover,sufficient training on teachers' performance appraisal was not offered and knowledge about the system was in adequate. Both appraisers and appraisees indicated that the criteria of the appraisal system were not effective to achieve its intended goals and objectives.*

*The study showed that a committee comprising the principal, vice- principal department heads and students could be better appraiser of teachers' performance. The study also revealed that class room observation and post appraisal conference had not frequently practiced furthermore, continuous assessment of performance of teachers and timely feedback had not conducted successfully. In addition to these the major problems that encountered the effective implantation of teachers' performance of Appraisal were lack of the required knowledge and commitment of appraisers, in appropriate criteria of the appraisal system, lack of motivation for best workers, lack of revising both appraisers and appraisees through trainings and lack of developing appraisal criteria based on teachers' ladder. In general, it was concluded that the implementation of teachers' performance appraisal system in government secondary schools of Lideta sub – city in Addis Ababa city government was perceived as ineffective in attaining its intended objectives and integrating with teachers' professional development as that improving the quality of teaching – learning process rather for administrative purposes. Finally, it was recommended that both appraisers and appraisees should not only be implementers but also formulated of appraisal criteria, and the appraisal plan should be revised. Sub – city and bureau levels of different training motivation to best workers could be given, most data gathering evidences for teachers' performance and committee of concerned bodies of appraisers could be established for effective implementation of the system.*

# CHAPTER ONE

## 1. Introduction

The chapter provides insight into the background, statement of the problem, basic research questions, objective of the study, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study operational definition of key terms and organization of the study.

### 1.1. Background of the Study

Performance appraisal is an almost universal feature of organizational life. Most organizations operate systems for monitoring and developing staff performance, but few develop these systems to their maximum potential. Typically, designing and prioritizing basic performance aims resolve around providing a basis for reward decisions, enhancing motivation and improving performance, identifying potential and generally improving communications and problem solving. However, the needs of those involved the organization; the appraiser and the person appraised do not always coincide, and indeed may conflict. Understanding these differing perspectives is essential to establishing on effective appraisal system one which sets realistic and achievable goals that offers something of value to all parties (Fletcher, 2008).

The achievement of goals requires resources, above all human resources; those are the most critical elements. Because, it is people who plan, organize, implement the plan, coordinate and control all other resources to achieve the stated goals. The success of an organization depends on an availability of competent and committed manpower at every level of the organization. Thus, to get the desired benefit from people, an organization should properly evaluate its employee's contribution (Chandan, 2003).

Basically, organizations are intended primarily in how employees carry out their assigned tasks and work. Organizations use performance appraisal as a tool for this purpose: to assist in delegating the carrying out of work and to control the conduct of the work so that the planned results are obtained. Similarly, the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers. Because teachers are so fundamentally important to school improvement and student success, improving the evaluation of teacher performance is particularly relevant as a means to recognize excellence in teaching and to advance teacher effectiveness. A meaningful evaluation

focuses on instructional quality and professional standards, and through this focus and timely feedback, enables teachers and leaders to recognize, appreciate, value, and develop excellent teaching (Saiyadain, 1999).

According to Khan (2008), teacher's performance evaluation is an objective way to evaluate employee work-related behavior. Performance appraisal is widely used for determining wages and salaries, promotion, training and development, providing performance feedback, and identifying employee strengths and weaknesses. The two types of uses for performance appraisal information; these are developmental uses, and administrative uses. Developmental uses include, providing performance feedback, identifying individual strengths/ weaknesses, recognizing individual performance, assisting in goal identification, evaluating goal achievement, identifying individual training needs, determining organizational training needs, reinforcing authority structure, allowing employees to discuss concerns, improving communication, and providing a forum for leaders to help.

Furthermore administrative uses include, documenting personnel decisions, determining promotion candidates, determining transfers and assignments, identifying poor performance, deciding retention or termination, deciding on layoffs, validating selection criteria, meeting legal requirements, evaluating training programs progress, personnel planning, and making reward/ compensation decisions. Many researchers have emphasized that performance appraisal results must be linked with other HRM activities and strategic decision making, which would ultimately help the organizations to develop and grow (Khan, 2008).

According to William (2012) the primary purposes of a quality teacher evaluation system are to determine levels of competence, enhance teacher efficiency, effectiveness and good performance; improve accountability levels within schools; provide a basis for decisions on mechanisms to recognize good performance, ensure that teachers perform their duties with integrity, and maintain a positive, vigilant attitude towards all learning activities; provide a basis for paying salary progression, rewards and other incentives; contribute to the successful achievement of the goals and objectives defined in the school divisions educational plan; and improve the quality of instruction by ensuring accountability for classroom performance and teacher effectiveness.

Performance appraisal can be regarded as an administrative tool for planning and controlling the assignment of work and how well or poorly it is completed. One of the most efficient ways for managers to develop subordinates is to keep them clearly informed of their responsibilities and of how well they are performing in those areas. Employees whose performances are deficient in one way or another can be given training or coaching to meet the stated standards set by the organizational superior or agreed upon through management by objective goal setting. At the same time, the manager can work closely with subordinates to discuss work assignments and to plan their completion so that to create a trustful interpersonal climate in which self-development is stimulated and interpersonal communication is reasonably open and authentic (Thomas, 1982).

According to Olson (1981), a true appraisal includes performances review and development, in which boss and subordinate look at how things are going and plan future work based on their joint view. From this idea it is clear that the objectives of performance review development are indentifying the key requirement of the job and develop a mutual understanding of responsibilities and goals at three levels: the employee being evaluated, the appraiser, and the appraiser's superior. Basically, evaluate an employee's performance as objectively as possible, against specified job goals and providing a flow of information about the performance and developmental needs of employees, to enhance future personnel decisions about job assignments, promotions, transfers, and terminations to achieve greater use of employee skills and capabilities, directly or indirectly influencing productivity.

In planning and reviewing, managers must define job responsibilities and specific goals relating to those responsibilities, gather periodic information on performance to ward set goals, assess that performance, communicate the assessment to employees, and lastly decide on a course of action to develop and expand employee productiveness. The aim of teacher evaluation policy is that integrating professional development, teacher evaluation and student learning. This means teacher evaluation provides information about the quality of instruction; it provides data regarding teachers' professional growth needs and increasingly, the teacher evaluation process provides feedback on extent to which teachers are successful in fostering valued student outcomes. Since decisions as to continued, it is important that this process should be conducted in a consistent, fair and equitable manner (Fletcher, 2008).

In addition to this managing performance in the work place involves letting employees know what is expected of them, how they are doing, and how they can do an even better job. Only then can employees contribute their best, use their abilities to the fullest, and feel connected to their organization. The items on an appraisal form can usually be divided into traits, tasks, goals and job behaviors. The trait approach has been around for a long time. The form lists personal qualities for managers to rate, such as initiative, effort, dependability, leadership, analytical ability, judgment, creativity, attitude, maturity, critical thinking, enthusiasm, versatility, self-control, thoroughness, accuracy and sincerity (Olson, 1981).

The task approach usually presents a list of typical functions such as planning, organizing, producing, knowing the job, delegating, handling people, meeting deadlines, following through, and so on. An increasingly popular method is based on goal (the result desired in a job). A goal form contains a section for setting goals and for reviewing progress. Job behavior criteria can take two forms: open ended, essay type descriptions and predetermined job behaviors. An appraisal form should be matched against simplicity, relevancy, descriptiveness, adaptability and objectivity. Means and ends, methods and goals, should be designed and discussed at the beginning of the evaluation period (Saiyadain, 1999).

There are two approaches to performance appraisal namely, formal and informal. There is no specific time when informal evaluation has begun. Informal appraisal has no records for its origin, but it takes place in a day-to-day observation of the employees. On the other hand formal appraisal is based on a scheduled event, which takes place at a prescribed interval (Adams, 2004).

According to Gupta (1981 cited in Kibrie, 2005) formal performance appraisal system was started in the American military establishment during the time of World War I and then spread to other organizations. Gradually, the traditional performance appraisal is shifting from trait based to result based. The evaluation of employees' performance serves as a basis for judging the contributions and weaknesses of employees so that continuous efforts can be made to build a stronger and more effective work force.

In Ethiopian School the performance appraising of teachers was first introduced in 1937 E.C. the system was known as "inspection" created by a British education and two Ethiopians to assist

him. The department of inspection was dissolved and in place of it sections for supervision under departments of elementary and secondary education were established. The major purpose of supervision of that time was the improvement of the teaching – learning process (Melaku, 1992).

According to Birhanu (2006) result – oriented performance appraisal was introduced in Ethiopia since 2002, in line with national civil service reform program. Because, of different weakness and reasons without showing a significance change it was not continued.

Therefore, this study was intended to investigate the major problems that affect teachers' performance appraisal system implementation in government secondary schools in Addis Ababa city Administration: the case of Lideta Sub- city and how appraisers and appraisees in these secondary schools perceived the problems.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

Performance appraisal is a process of evaluating a staff members' quality in terms of the requirements of the job to know how well a member performs the assisted organizational activities. The essential feature of a systematic appraisal is the accurate measurement of performance (Melaku, 2010).

A systematic of TPA, carefully designed and systematically operated, is believed to have a potential value to enhance professional development of teachers and improve students' learning (Melaku, 1992).

Performance appraisal can be subjected to various errors that may emanate from the appraisers lack the required knowledge and skill and commitment to appraisal both appraisers and appraisees, and/or from the design and operation of the process. According the local studies, teachers' performance appraisal is not in a position to achieve the intended objectives of the teaching and ensure related and school related problems (Girma, 2011).

The finding of (Yilma, 2007), that teachers and appraisers did not have favorable. Attitude towards teacher's performance appraisal criteria and appraisers are not competent enough to appraise and the formation evaluation was not based on improving teachers' future performance. Similarly, one of the serious problems in secondary schools of Lideta Sub city in Addis Ababa was the improper appraising of teachers. There were conflict between teachers and appraisers at

the end of every semester or every year between teachers and appraisers concerning performance appraising.

Since the researcher has a good work experience on the study issues and he had observed that in secondary schools of Lideta sub – city in Addis Ababa: concerning the implementation of performance appraisal, teachers were often raising complaints and conflicts against their appraisers.

Therefore, this study assessed teachers’ performance appraisal system implementation in government secondary schools of Lideta Sub-city in Addis Ababa.

To this end the following basic questions were addressed by the study.

### **1.2.1. Basic Research Questions**

- a. To what extent are the major purposes of teachers ‘performance appraisal system in government secondary schools of Lideta sub- city effective interms of level of competency, enhance teachers efficiency, improve accountability level, timely feedback?
- b. To what extent do appraisers and appraisees participate in desing and implements the appraisal criteria, techniques used and feedback procedure?
- c. Who are involved in appraising teachers’ performance appraisal?
- d. To what extent is the process of teachers’ performance appraisal system effective interims of skill, competency, and transparency?
- e. What are the major problems in practicing TPA system in the study area?

### **1.3. Objectives of the Study**

The study had the following general and specific objectives.

#### **1.3.1. General Objective of the Study**

The main objective of the study was to assess the implementation teachers’ performance appraisal system in government secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa City government.

### **1.3.2. Specific Objectives of the study**

The specific objectives of the study were to:

- Identify the implementation of teachers' performance appraisal system in governmental secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa.
- Asses the development of teachers' performance appraisal system.
- Clarify the appropriateness of appraisers in appraising teachers' performance appraisal in the studied area.
- Examine the process of teacher's performance appraisal system in the study area.
- Identify the major problems related to teachers' performance appraisal system in the sample area secondary schools.

### **1.4. Significance of the Study**

This study that was aimed at assessing the implementation of teachers' performance appraisal system. The researcher believed that the findings would have significance for the following reasons.

- Addis Ababa city administration education bureau, Lideta Sub –City education office and secondary schools to improve the process and implementation of TPA system.
- Contribute to strength the relationship between appraisers and appraises and may create conducive work environment.
- Provide information about the current level of teachers' performance appraisal, this research findings and the recommendation of the researcher to those may concern bodies by using panel discussions.
- Identify the strong and weak sides of performance appraisal system
- Serve as sources of information to planers of teachers' performance appraisal system.

### **1.5. Delimitations of the Study**

The system of teachers' performance appraisal was operating at all level of government schools all over Addis Ababa City government. However, for the sake of making the research manageable, the study was delaminated to three secondary schools found in Lideta sub- city the

practice in the year 2007 E.C – 2008 E.C to assess the purpose, development, appropriateness, the process and the major problems of TPA system implementation in particular in the selected sub-city of Addis Ababa secondary schools. But, this was due to the fact that the student researcher is currently working as a school vice-principal, had faced a serious time shortage and budget.

## **1.6. Limitations of the study**

One of the limitations of the study was time factor. In addition to this, some respondents did not provide response to a few open- end questions and few of them responded carelessly. Similarly, some respondents showed reluctance to give adequate time for interview and one school leader limited not give adequate documents for document analysis. Moreover 100% return of the distributed questionnaires had not been achieved. As the result, all these might have their Owon effect on the findings of the study.

## **1.7. Operational Definition of Key Terms**

The following key terms were used in the context of the study.

**Appraisee:** Secondary school teachers whose performance being appraised.

**Appraiser:** refers to those management bodies (principals, vice-principles, department heads) who were involved in teacher's performance evaluation process.

**Performance:** is a progressive achievement of tangible, specific, measurable and personally meaningful goals (Daily. R.C.1988).

**Secondary School:** is a school level which comprises grade level either from grade 9 to 10 or grade 9 to 12. This study used both grade 9 to 10 and grade 9 to 12.

**Sub-City:** is an administrative structure which is divided into many woredas and directly accountable to Addis Ababa City government education bureau.

**Performance Appraisal:** is the appraisal process that is used to appraise the result achieved the performance process.

## **1.8. Organization of the Study**

This study is organized into five chapters. The first chapter deals with the problem and its setting. The second chapter provides review of related literature chapter three contains research design and methodology. The fourth chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data. Finally, the fifth chapter, presents about summary, conclusion and recommendations.

## CHAPTER TWO

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter deals with review of related literature on different aspects of performance appraisal in general and that of teachers' performance appraisal in particular. It includes meaning of Performance Appraisal, historical development of performance appraisal, Purposes of performance appraisal, principles and methods of performance appraisal, design and development of performance appraisal, approaches to performance appraisal, process of performance appraisal system, characteristics of effective appraisal system, Problems of performance appraisal system, and teachers' performance appraisal system in Ethiopia.

#### 2.1. An Overview of Performance Appraisal

Teacher evaluation has been considered as a key element in reforms worldwide in order to improve the quality of education. However, the ways in which it has been implemented in different countries vary in terms of its main purposes, processes and effects.

Teacher evaluation matters because teaching matters. In fact, “the core of education *is* teaching and learning, and the teaching-learning connection works best when we have effective teachers working with every student every day.” Evaluation systems must be of high quality if we are to discern whether our teachers are of high quality. The quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers. The role of a teacher requires a performance evaluation system that acknowledges the complexities of the job. Teachers have a challenging task in meeting the educational needs of an educationally diverse student population, and good evaluation is necessary to provide the teachers with the support, recognition, and guidance they need to sustain and improve their efforts. Because teachers are so fundamentally important to school improvement and student success, improving the evaluation of teacher performance is particularly relevant as a means to recognize excellence in teaching and to advance teacher effectiveness (Fletcher, 2008).

A meaningful evaluation focuses on instructional quality and professional standards, and through this focus and timely feedback, enables teachers and leaders to recognize, appreciate, value, and develop excellent teaching. The usage of the terminology is consistent with the

professional literature, but that “effective” is not intended to connote a particular technical definition. The benefits of a teacher evaluation system are numerous and well documented. The process of teacher evaluation can be valuable in several ways, including: assessing the effectiveness of classroom teachers; identifying areas in need of improvement; making professional development more individualized; and improving instruction school wide (Saiyadain, 1999).

### **2.1.1. Meaning of Performance Appraisal**

Appraisal can be defined as an assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of a planned, ongoing, or completed intervention. The aim is to determine the relevance of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability so as to incorporate lessons learned into the decision making process. Nonetheless, placing teacher evaluation at the core of school reforms has also generated a large consensus among the teaching profession that meaningful teacher evaluation is indispensable. This is an important achievement in itself and a significant step towards successful implementation. In moving forward and addressing the weaker points that have been revealed, it is important not to lose sight of the positive features and strengths of the model or slip backwards, losing the ground that has been gained. In considering modifications, notice must also be taken of the integrated system of performance evaluation for public administration (Matthews, 2009).

Therefore, the above meaning of performance appraisal describes for employees in general and that of teachers in particular indicate that performance appraisal is an essential managerial function in public administrations that enables to achieve its goals and objective if properly implemented. Furthermore, it helps to know how well employees are performing and influence their future efforts activities, results and task directions.

### **2.1.2. Historical Development of Performance Appraisal**

Performance appraisal is one of the most important theories of human resources management and is one of the subjects which have been studied and investigated in the psychology of work extremely. Systems of performance evaluation were studied in a spinning factory in Scotland for the first time more than two hundred years ago. Systems of performance evaluation are one of the most vital subjects of human resources in 21 century.

Today Performance appraisal has been transformed to a strategic approach for integrating of human resources activities and business policies. Due to the point that organizations try to evaluate employees and growth and improvement of their capabilities, increasing of performance and distribution of reward, Performance appraisal is observed as a subject that covers various activities (Fletcher, 2008).

Both two parts of theory and practice are focused on the subject of evaluation and psychology of developmental performance evaluation in a close route. In general, developmental performance evaluation as each attempts those results in enrichment of viewpoints, experiences and skills in order to improve employees' efficiency. Performance appraisal is an action for testing, measuring, valuating and justifying about the performance during a certain period of time. It is synonymous with improvement of individuals' effectiveness and process of the organization's business from organizational viewpoint (Watz & Levy, 2004).

Performance appraisal was once considered as a process involving a line manager completing an annual report on subordinate's performance. But as time passes it has become an integral part of performance management system and performance appraisal is today considered as the key element of performance management .The history of performance appraisal has its root in the early 20th century pioneered by Taylor's Time and Motion studies, which became a formal management procedure from the time of the Second World War. Performance appraisal is the process through which an organization gets information on how well an employee is doing his or her job. Performance should be compared to a set of standards and then communicated with the employees. Performance appraisal is also known as, employee rating, employee evaluation, performance review, performance evaluation, and results appraisal (Mathis and Jackson, 2005).

According to Khan (2008), it is an objective way to evaluate employee work-related behavior. Performance appraisal is widely used for determining wages and salaries, promotion, training and development, providing performance feedback, and identifying employee strengths and weaknesses. The two types of uses for performance appraisal information; these are developmental uses, and administrative uses. Developmental uses include, providing performance feedback, identifying individual strengths or weaknesses, recognizing individual performance, assisting in goal identification, evaluating goal achievement, identifying individual training needs, determining organizational training needs, reinforcing authority structure,

allowing employees to discuss concerns, improving communication and providing a forum for leaders to help. Administrative uses include, documenting personnel decisions, determining promotion candidates, determining transfers and assignments, identifying poor performance, deciding retention or termination, deciding on layoffs, validating selection criteria, meeting legal requirements, evaluating training programs progress, personnel planning, and making reward/compensation decisions . Many researchers have emphasized that performance appraisal results must be linked with other HRM activities and strategic decision making, which would ultimately help the organizations to develop and grow.

### **2.1.3. Purposes of Performance Appraisal**

The purposes of performance evaluation are to determine competence, assess strengths, provide support and mentoring, assure continued growth through differential experiences, and monitor the organization's employment decisions. The purpose of the employee evaluation is to assist the employee with personal development while maintaining the objectives of the organization. The organizational objectives should be based on standards and known desirable characteristics expressed by the organization. The purpose of the Performance Appraisal System is to promote continuous school improvement. The performance appraisal system has multiple dimensions. The first spans the length of a person's career and is designed to provide growth and development and support increased performance. The results/outcome side is a systems approach to provide organizational growth. These outcomes are influenced by the employee interacting with the special conditions within a job that exists at a specific work site, which may be impacted by the individual developmental continuum of the employee (Cullingford, 1995).

It is appropriate that teacher evaluation serves a double purpose: improvement and accountability. Evaluation for professional development seeks to improve the teacher's own practice by identifying strengths and weaknesses for further professional development. It involves helping teachers learn about, reflect on, and improve their practice. The evaluation framework also permits to place the examination of teachers' practices in the school context so professional development opportunities are aligned with the school development plan.

Characterizing teacher effectiveness is important because of the direct impact teachers have on student performance. In fact, teacher effectiveness is the most significant school- related variable

impacting student learning outcomes. The primary purposes of a quality teacher evaluation system are to determine levels of competence, enhance teacher efficiency, effectiveness and good performance; improve accountability levels within schools; provide a basis for decisions on mechanisms to recognize good performance, ensure that teachers perform their duties with integrity, and maintain a positive, vigilant attitude towards all learning activities; provide a basis for paying salary progression, rewards and other incentives; contribute to the successful achievement of the goals and objectives defined in the school division's educational plan; and improve the quality of instruction by ensuring accountability for classroom performance and teacher effectiveness (William, 2012).

There are many benefits of productive performance evaluations according to Sachs (1992) such as employees learn of their strengths and weaknesses, new goals and objectives are agreed upon, employees can be active participants in the evaluation process, training needs are identified, employees feel that they are taken seriously as individuals and that the supervisor is concerned about their needs and goals.

#### **2.1.4. Principles and Methods of Performance Appraisal**

The implementation of the teacher performance appraisal is guided by the principles: ensure fairness by taking into account relevant contextual factors that impact on teacher performance; minimize subjectivity through transparent and open discussion throughout the appraisal process; use the Teacher Performance Appraisal instrument professionally, uniformly and consistently. Moreover, provides feedback on the appraisal process by focusing on Performance and not personality, availability of evidence and not assumptions, objectivity and not subjectivity and the specific and concrete and not the general and the abstract.

According to William (2012) the following principles are essential in the implementation of teacher performance appraisal.

According to the first principle, teacher evaluations must be based on professional standards that are sophisticated enough to match our knowledge of teaching quality as it is manifested across the whole continuum of teacher development. The standards of teaching practice selected as appropriate at each level of teacher development should guide evaluations but should take into account the requirements for successful teaching in the unique context in which it occurs.

The teacher not only understands the content to be learned and understands it deeply, but comprehends which aspects of the content are crucial for future understanding of the subject and which are more peripheral and are less likely to impede future learning if not fully grasped. The teacher also understands when present preconceptions, misconceptions or difficulties are likely to inhibit student learning. The teacher also has invented or borrowed or can spontaneously create powerful representations of the ideas to be learned in the form of examples, analogues, metaphors or demonstrations. Mere understanding of the content is only half the challenge. Teachers must translate that content into language and ideas accessible to their students.

In a similar way the second principle indicates, teacher evaluations should include performance assessments to guide a path of professional learning throughout the career. When teachers engage in self-assessment, reflection on practice, and professional conversation, they become more thoughtful and analytic about their work, and are in a position to improve their teaching. Evaluators can contribute to teachers' professional learning through the use of in-depth reflective questions. By shifting the focus of evaluation from inspection" to collaborative reflection educators can ensure the maximum benefit from the evaluation activities.

As the third principle, the design of a new evaluation system should include a study of existing successful innovative practices that are being used in the state and country and should encourage schools and districts to explore innovations. Teachers must have a significant role in the design of a new framework and in promoting it among teachers in the state.

The fourth principle indicates, schools and districts should focus on building teacher accountability that looks at student outcomes among teams of teachers as well as that of individual teachers. Those outcomes must include agreed-upon indicators, and not only standardized test scores, that are recognized as evidence of student mastery of the state standards for the grade and content area.

According to the fifth principle, evaluations should be frequent and conducted by expert evaluators, including teachers who have demonstrated expertise in working with their peers. Evaluators at each juncture should be trained in the recognition and development of teaching quality, understand how to teach in the content area of the evaluated teacher, and know the specific evaluation tools and procedures they are expected to use. Evaluations should be

accompanied by useful feedback, connected to professional development opportunities, and reviewed in evaluation teams to ensure fairness, consistency and reliability.

Teachers have significant roles in selecting, designing, and implementing a professional development plan that meets the needs of all teachers, and that, given the constraints that limit administrators' participation in a robust, ongoing evaluation process, peers and leaders should use professional standards and performance outcomes to evaluate teachers.

As it can be seen in principle six, the evaluations that lead to teacher tenure must include more extensive evidence of quality teaching. This evidence should be collected and reviewed by both the teacher and trained evaluators and should include documentation that shows that the teacher's practice exhibits the standards that exemplify good practice. The process should be an ongoing part of a serious teaching induction process that helps novices grow in their profession, with the help of mentors and coaches, guided by clear standards of practice.

Moreover, the seventh principle indicates that Evaluations should be accompanied by useful feedback, connected to professional development opportunities, and reviewed in evaluation teams to ensure fairness, consistency and reliability.

In sum up, principles and methods are the basic guides in the implementation of teachers' performance appraisal. These principles should be professional, uniform and consistent instruments.

## **2.2. Criteria and Standards**

Performance Criteria are those factors, characteristics or standards that will be used to describe and assess effective performance. They may be general, such as key performance areas, or they may be very detailed and specific such as measurable targets. Performance Standards are agreed criteria to describe how well work must be done. They clarify the key performance areas of a job by describing what "working well" means. The criteria used in the appraisal system should emerge from the job itself.

Even if these requirements are met, subjectivity on the part of the evaluator cannot be totally eliminated. To minimize the opportunities for poor judgments in appraisals, it is essential to focus on behavior which relates to performance standards (Khan, 2008)

Measures of performance are classified as objective or subjective. Objective measures of performance focus on output or results, such as number of units delivered, number of people served, etc. However, these measures may be deceptive; numerical results may be influenced by various factors beyond the control of the worker. For example, the number of people receiving aid in a particular area may be determined by the size of the area, so an evaluation based on numbers alone will not accurately reflect a worker's performance.

Objective measures can also utilize personnel data such as absenteeism, tardiness, turnover, grievance rates and accident frequency. This information is important to have, but it is rarely available in a usable form; if personnel data are to be used fairly and accurately, it is necessary to compile the statistics carefully. Subjective measures of performance require the use of personal judgment on the part of the evaluator. The performance appraisal is made by comparing one person to another (effort applied on the job, cooperation with co-workers, planning of work, etc.) or by using a rating scale (e.g. 1=unacceptable to 5=outstanding). Obviously the effectiveness of subjective measures depends heavily on the evaluator. It requires fair-mindedness, an ability to dispassionately weigh personality and performance factors, and a thorough familiarity with the individuals under appraisal (Eisner, 1999).

As Santiago (2009) a fair and reliable teacher evaluation system needs to evaluate teachers using well-established criteria for good teaching. The parameters defined by the Ministry of education for both the scientific-pedagogical and functional evaluations are a good basis to establish criteria for teacher evaluation. For developmental evaluation, the Ministry could also define items and well-articulated criteria to be used across all schools. Schools should retain the autonomy to further refine such items and criteria and weight of each component so their particular context and objectives are contemplated. This would bring a better balance between the ownership of the process by schools and the need to ensure the comparability of standards across schools, while recognizing the still incipient expertise of schools in developing instruments and criteria for teacher evaluation.

The uniform performance standards for teachers are used to collect and present data to document performance that is based on well-defined job expectations. They provide a balance between structure and flexibility and define common purposes and expectations, thereby guiding effective instructional practice. The performance standards also provide flexibility, encouraging

creativity and individual teacher initiative. The goal is to support the continuous growth and development of each teacher by monitoring, analyzing, and applying pertinent data compiled within a system of meaningful feedback. Clearly defined professional responsibilities constitute the foundation of the teacher performance standards. A fair and comprehensive evaluation system provides sufficient detail and accuracy so that both teachers and evaluators reasonably understand the job expectations (Greer, 2001).

Performance ratings are not made at the performance indicator level, but at the performance standard level. Additionally, it is important to document a teacher's performance on each standard with evidence generated from multiple performance indicators (Desseler, 2011).

In sum, performance to be effective, they should have the characteristics of validity, reliability, acceptability, and specificity. For effective implementation of appraisal criteria, teachers and school leaders should participate in the development of the criteria.

## **2.3. Approaches to Performance Appraisal**

### **2.3.1. Formative Appraisal**

Formative evaluation is an evaluation intended to improve performance, most often conducted during the implementation phase of projects or programs and designed to provide feedback to the person being appraised for the purpose of self improvement. Formative evaluation is ongoing, coaching and counseling which is done to improve teacher's performance.

Formative appraisals are basically permitted to monitor how well the organizational goals and objectives are being met .Its main purpose is to catch deficiencies so that the proper learning interventions can take place that allow the learners to master the required skill and knowledge. Formative appraisals can help both the appraiser and appraisee to revise the performance standards which were predetermined by both parties. It also helps to rearrange employees' placement and it can protect the organization from unnecessary wastages of resources money by taking corrective action on the shortcomings or performance defaults (Santiago, 2009).

### **2.3.2. Summative Appraisal**

**Summative evaluation:** A study conducted at the end of an intervention (or a phase of that intervention) to determine the extent to which anticipated outcomes were produced. Summative evaluation is intended to provide information about the worth of the program.

Related term: impact evaluation. Assessment of performance quality occurs only at the summative evaluation stage, which comes at the end of the evaluation cycle. The ratings for each performance standard are based on multiple sources of information and are completed only after pertinent data from all sources are reviewed. The integration of data provides the evidence used to determine the performance ratings for the summative evaluations for all teachers. There are two major considerations in assessing job performance during summative evaluation: the actual teacher performance standards, and how well they are performed. The performance standards and performance indicators provide a description of well-defined teacher expectations (Arreola, 1995).

From the above discussion, it is possible to say that formative evaluations are basically permitted to monitor how well the instructional goals and objectives are being implemented. Its main purpose is to catch deficiencies so that the proper learning interventions can take place that allow the learners to master the require, knowledge and skills. However, summative evaluation is a method of judging the worth of a program at the end of the program activities; its focus is on the outcome. It should be taken for granted that the ultimate success of any approach to teachers ,, performance appraisal system heavily depends on whether or not it is perceived by teachers and appraisers as potentially valuable.

## **2.4. Process of Performance Appraisal system**

### **2.4.1. Data Gathering Tools for Performance Appraisal**

Teacher evaluation system should be based on three core instruments: classroom observation, self-evaluation and the documentation of practices in a simplified portfolio. Teacher evaluation, both developmental and for career progression, should be firmly rooted in classroom observation, since this is where the key dimensions of teaching take place.

According to Crowell (2003), it could be useful to develop a simplified, but well structured, portfolio to complement the teacher's self-assessment. Teacher portfolios can contain different elements including: lesson plans and teaching materials, samples of student work and commentaries on student assessment examples, teacher's self-reported questionnaires and reflection sheets. The portfolio should also allow teachers to mention specific ways in which they consider that their professional practices are promoting student learning and provide evidence to demonstrate student progress in their classrooms. It should be noted that portfolios are not only a tool for evaluation per se, but also play a role in supporting a reflective approach to teaching practice that is a hallmark of effective teachers. Self-appraisal is one of the main sources of collecting source of information. It is an evaluation of one's own teaching performance. It involves a reflection on one's work, outcome and development needs. This method can encourage input from teachers in the appraisal process to share the responsibility.

The other ways of collecting of information is a portfolio. Portfolios may include scholarly writings, action research, logs of professional development activities, structured reflection on practice and teaching artifacts (such as assignments, worksheets, students' work and project directions). The portfolio will demonstrate a teacher's accomplishments over time and across a variety of experiences.

Moreover, other sources of data are formal or informal interviews and discussions, daily observation, stakeholder survey, e.g. Student surveys, parent surveys and teacher surveys, record of non-teaching duties students' academic achievements and progress record of students' award and punishment and record of extra-curricular activities.

Therefore, from the above concepts it is possible to say that in the process of evaluating the performance of teacher's multisource of data are very for effective evidence of the system, but lesson observation of the process of teaching and learning in class room is very essential in understanding a teacher's effectiveness and it should be arrange several times over the year.

#### **2.4.2. Monitoring**

Monitoring is a continuous function that uses the systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and

progress in the use of allocated funds. Monitoring gives information on where a policy, program, or project is at any given time (and over time) relative to respective targets and outcomes. It is descriptive in intent. Results-based monitoring is a continuous process of collecting and analyzing information to compare how well a project, program, or policy is being implemented against expected results. (Matthews, 2009).

Building and sustaining results-based Monitoring and Evaluation systems is admittedly not an easy task. It requires continuous commitment, champions, time, effort, and resources. There may be many organizational and technical challenges to overcome in building these systems. Political challenges are usually the most difficult. And it may take several attempts before the system can be tailored to suit a given governmental or organizational policy, program, or project (Dailey, 1988).

Monitoring can be described as a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Monitoring progress towards intended results serves a dual purpose. It informs management of program implementation at work plan level. It also informs reporting on progress achieved towards the attainment of intended results to concerned stakeholders including the internal management of the organization. Monitoring is part of program management and should therefore not be considered as an additional task serving only reporting purposes. It allows keeping track of progress, to ensure that the implementation is on the right track and to take corrective measure when required. Transparent and results-oriented manner in order to inform decision-making and to improve future policy and program design (Grote, 2002).

The function of monitoring is to compare the planned with the actual situation and make necessary changes when needed. Results-based monitoring is relevant both at the activity/project level and at higher levels. Hence, the responsible officer of a major programmer needs to routinely review if the results achieved at the activity/project level contribute in effect to the achievement of the higher-level results and thereafter to the outcomes thus ensuring the coherence of the results chain (Duke, 1995).

Thus, it can be concluded that monitoring should be a continuous and systematic collection of data that bring a progress of teachers' capacity and achievement of objectives towards the intended result.

### **2.4.3. Communication**

Performance information can make a dramatic contribution to improve government performance if it is effectively communicated to stakeholders, including citizens. It is emphasized that it is important for both the appraiser and the appraisee to prepare for the discussion on the agreement on objectives and on feedback so that both parties can gain maximum benefit. Thus, preparation is the first step in the performance appraisal process.

Stronge (2010) discusses the essential components for a quality teacher evaluation system which he terms the three "C"s - Communication, Commitment and Collaboration. In order to create the synergy that can elevate evaluation to a meaningful dialogue about quality instruction for students.

In sum, from the above concept it can be said that effective communication between appraisers and appraisees is very essential to improve performance of the institution.

### **2.4.4. Training**

The success of the teacher evaluation system will greatly depend on the in-depth training of the evaluators. Experience from other countries suggests that evaluators should have a range of characteristics and competencies, including: background in teaching; knowledge of educational evaluation theories and methodologies; knowledge of concepts of teaching quality; familiarity with systems and procedures of educational and school quality assurance; understanding of instrument development; awareness of the psychological aspects of evaluation; expertise in rating an assessment; and mastering of evaluation-related communication and feedback skills. Evaluators for career progression should be highly qualified in all these areas (Mealiea, 1996).

It is also vitally important that teachers as evaluatees are given support to understand the evaluation procedures and to benefit from evaluation results. Training modules should be offered for teachers so they know what is expected from them to be recognized as good teachers, and to be prepared to make the best use of the feedback received. The aim would be that as

standard professional behavior, teachers would regularly engage in reflective practice, study their own methods of instruction and assessment, and share their experience with their peers in schools. The training should ensure that all teachers have a thorough understanding of the purposes, principles, processes and procedures of the teachers' performance appraisal and issues relating to how the teachers' performance appraisal will be implemented in the school are addressed (Rudner 1992).

According to Reinke (2003) continuous training is needed in areas such as goal-setting and monitoring performance on a frequent basis, and personal and interactional skills. An organization could provide training as this on a regular basis in such a manner that it becomes an accepted part of the supervisor's position and thus becomes a part of the organization's culture. There needs to be an increased focus on the interpersonal issues surrounding appraisal. The reason is that especially interpersonal issues such as trust are important in the performance appraisal process and should thus be a part of the training program.

Kondrasuk (2002) concluded that RET is nonsensical if one is interested in improving rating accuracy. Instead they recommend a combination of observation and decision-making training because this might lead to even more improvement in rating accuracy than would either alone. But even if training improves via several factors, performance appraisal effectiveness is not likely that training raters could compensate for the lack of opportunity to observe. Good observational skills or a better understanding of common rater errors, coupled with inadequate exposure to the rate will not lead to reliable ratings.

In summary, it is a necessary condition that raters are sufficiently trained so that they: (1) understand the appraisal process; (2) are able to use the appraisal instrument as intended which includes interpreting standards and use of scales; and (3) are able to give effective feedback including goal-setting. Acceptance will only be gathered if rates and raters perceive these conditions to be fulfilled. Furthermore, these skills need to be updated or refreshed on a continuing basis. But also rates should receive a certain form of appraisal training to introduce them to the appraisal system. To attain their acceptance and support of the appraisal system also employees must understand the appraisal system as a whole as well as the behavioural aspects and standards that are used to evaluate their performance.

Therefore, as already discussed above, effective training on the appraisal system can combat the appraisal errors and reduce their occurrence. Training improves the ability of raters to communicate appraisal information in a constructive manner with rates.

#### **2.4.5. Appraisers**

The teacher evaluation model is comprehensive, includes most domains of teacher performance, a wide range of sources of data, provides for more than one evaluator and has a peer-review element.

As explained in Isoré (2009), gathering multiple sources of evidence about teacher practice meets the need for accuracy and fairness of the evaluation process, taking into account the complexity of what a good teacher should know and be able to do. Also, the participation of multiple evaluators is often seen as a key to successful practices; at least more than one person should be involved in judging teacher quality and performance.

McGreal (2000) explained that the 360-degree evaluation systems, which incorporate the participation of many kinds of evaluators, support the idea that a teacher's competence may be seen from several different perspectives and that it should be exemplary (or at least adequate) from all those different angles. The case for involving more than one evaluator strengthens with high stakes evaluation, that is to say evaluation for career progression rather than for developmental feedback.

One of the approaches commonly employed to evaluate teaching is by considering students' judgments of the effectiveness of certain teacher characteristics. This is because students have been directly involved in the instructional process and can provide appropriate comments for instructional improvement. The emphasis in most rating forms is, however, more on evaluating what the instructor does instead of what the students have learned as a result of the teaching. The effectiveness of the teacher characteristics is considered as indicator of the quality teaching, although several studies reveal that students anyway rate the educational experiences based on their perceptions of how much they learned in a course (Harris, 1988).

In sum, the appraisal scheme should allow variety of appraisers of teachers that help offset bias and favoritism that may be realized when teachers are appraised only by a single appraiser.

## **2.4.6. Feedback Mechanisms**

Feedback is the transmission of findings generated through the evaluation process to parties for whom it is relevant and useful so as to facilitate learning. This may involve the collection and dissemination of findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons from experience.

To feedback to the employee generally aims at improving performance effectiveness through stimulating behavioural change. This is the manner in which employees receive feedback on their job performance a major factor in determining the success of the performance appraisal system. Hearing information about the self discrepant from ones self-image is often difficult and painful. Thus, because feedback may strike at the core of a person's personal belief system, it is crucial to set conditions of feedback so that the rate is able to tolerate, hear, and own discrepant information (Khan, 2008).

Only if conditions facilitate the acceptance of feedback information then the likelihood of change increases. The feedback event should be a confidential interaction between a qualified and credible feedback giver and rate to avoid denial, venting of emotions, and behavioural and mental disengagement. In such an atmosphere discrepancies in evaluations can be discussed and the session can be used as a catalyst to reduce the discrepancies (Harris, 1988).

Because employees and their supervisors often find appraisal both painful and demotivating, the practice of informal, regular communication between supervisor and employee are far more desirable and effective than formal performance appraisal process. It is also important to integrate the process of feedback into the daily interactions of supervisors and subordinates in a way that more frequent but less formal meetings. So called achievement updates on a weekly basis then touch upon good and bad issues, while so called achievement assessments take place are more formal and aim at getting a more clear depiction of issues troubling both sides (Kondrasuk 2002). Roberts (2003) instead concluded that effective feedback is timely, specific, and behavioral in nature and presented by a credible source. Basically, when performance feedback is precise and timely it may result in behavior change, even though job behaviors are generally difficult to modify. And if during the interview is adequate time for a full discussion of the issues and counseling it will enhance perceived system fairness, system satisfaction, acceptance and supervisory support. Furthermore performance feedback alone generates

improvements to rates' organizational commitment, and particularly to work satisfaction. But performance feedback combined with goal-setting contributes the most strongly to rates work satisfaction; possibly since goal-setting fosters feelings of participation in work related issues and meaningfulness at work.

It is also found that the process of goal-setting gives the appraisee a broader picture of the work unit and the organization's objectives. An evaluative interview for providing feedback which focuses on problem-solving and goal-setting and which has high employee involvement. Done this way it is more likely to be satisfying to employees than retrospective, subjective interviews. Beside this focus on the future, two more things need to be taken into account. It is very risky to give too complex feedback. The more complex the feedback, the more likely recipients will distort it by focusing on results that match their self-perceptions and ignore contradictory ones. Second, to be maximally effective, there must be an ongoing formal and informal performance feedback (Wise, 1998).

In summary, it can be concluded that giving feedback in an appropriate manner is a key factor in determining the employee's willingness to adapt behavior. First, it is important that the feedback is given in a confidential atmosphere and that the appraiser is perceived as being in state to give useful feedback. Second, the feedback should be precise and detailed and if possible contain examples of the behavior at hand. Third, feedback giving should leave room for discussion of important aspects, thus involving the rate in giving opportunity to state his opinion and referring to his problems. Fourth, goal-setting should be part of the feedback. Goals should be clear, as well as the way how to achieve these goals, relevant, specific and moderately difficult. Furthermore, both parties should accept the goals. Fifth, it might be useful to give beside the annual performance review regular informal performance feedback. If all these conditions are met, the acceptance of the feedback will be enhanced and behaviour change will be more likely.

Therefore, from the above discussions performance appraisal system implementation to be more effective, feedback should be given timely, detailed and precisely and should be presented by a credible source.

### **2.4.7. Rating the Performance**

A rating scale is a standard scale for rating teachers' performance in relation to specific categories of performance. For an evaluation system to be meaningful, it must provide its users with relevant and timely feedback. To facilitate this, evaluators should conduct both interim and summative evaluations of teachers. While the site administrator has the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the evaluation system is executed faithfully and effectively in the school, other administrators, such as assistant principals, may be designated by the evaluator to supervise, monitor, and assist with the multiple data source collection which will be used for these evaluations. To provide feedback that promotes professional growth, the teacher's overall performance is rated. The rating provides both new and experienced teachers with clear direction about their performance level as a first step in identifying opportunities for further development (Kondrasuk 2002).

According to Latham and Wexley (1977) there are mainly three different rating approaches existing: (1) examine cost-related variables, (2) judgments on traits or attitudes and (3) observe and record behaviour. The cost-related approach means that profits, product quantity or quality or return on investment is taken as criteria to appraise an individual.

This approach as a generally inadequate measure of individual job performance for several reasons: First, it gives no information to the employee why he is effective or ineffective. Thus, there is also no clue how to improve performance. He emphasized that a system must be designed in such a manner that it provides guidance for employees relative to how increased performance is to be achieved. Second, these measures are also contaminated by other factors over which the individual has little or no control. The second approach also does not indicate what exactly the individual has to do differently to improve performance. The interpretation of the feedback is left to the employee. The behavior approach is a more direct measure of what the employee does or has to change to become more effective. Furthermore, it is less influenced by factors not under control of the employee (Harris, 1988).

Berry (2003) distinguishes between objective and subjective measures of performance. Objective data can be obtained through production measures and personnel-related measures. Additional to the disadvantages identified, He adds that these measures can be deficient in assessing

performance on certain jobs. Personnel data for example can include information on various work behaviours such as unruliness, theft or simply attendance. But most of these measures are deficient because they do not address job- specific performance. Subjective measures are based on human judgment. Even though most commonly used, these ratings are far from being perfect measures of performance and they should not be substituted for objective measures when these are available.

A third way to distinguish rating approaches is by the sources appraising performance. Generally, the rating task requires someone with special knowledge and ability, and someone who can observe the performance of the employee. There are four different single appraisal sources possible: First, the most common source of performance feedback is the immediate supervisor of the employee because the supervisor is expected to have the basic knowledge and ability to conduct performance appraisal on the subordinates (Berry 2003).

In particular, employees' self-ratings tend to be more positive than the ratings they receive from others. The fourth possible feedback source is subordinates and is thus only suitable for employees who actually have subordinates. Even though this system has the potential to improve managerial skills it is not without problems. For example, managers might be concerned that some subordinates will rate them negatively because the manager has disciplined the employee in the past. Also, subordinates are likely to fear reprisals if they give negative ratings. The presented single sources can be combined to multi-source or 360-degree performance appraisal systems. Therefore, it can be concluded that the behavior approach is most suited for appraising performance. But when available, objective data should be included to give a more complete picture of the employees' performance. Second, performance can be appraised by a supervisor, co-workers, the employee self or subordinates. But to guarantee the acceptance of users, before implementing it must be determined which approach is preferred in the organization at hand. If only some sources are combined, there is a multi- source performance appraisal system at hand. If there is a complete combination of upward, downward, lateral and self-appraisal then this system is called 360-degree performance appraisal (Berry 2003).

Rating techniques can also be distinguished on basis of several factors. The most common way for a rater to express a judgment of a rate's job performance is with a graphic rating scale. Such

scales provide a continuum from high to low performance levels concerning an overall performance or specific performance dimensions (Grote, 2002).

Anchors which can be verbal or numerical are placed at the mid- and/or endpoints on the scale. The rater then has to indicate with either on-point or between point responses how the individual has performed. GRS has three advantages: First, this procedure is simple, easily constructed and implemented what makes it a cost-effective method for evaluating employees. Second, the results from that method are standardized what allows comparisons to be made between ratees. Third, because of the ease of use GRS are appealing to evaluators.

The behaviorally anchored rating scale (BARS) was developed to make the rating task easier what in turn is expected to result in more accurate ratings. BARS use behavioural statements or concrete examples to illustrate multiple levels of performance for each element of performance. The rater then acts as an observer who indicates which behavioural description most closely resembles the ratee's work behavior instead of requiring the rater to act as a judge who decides whether the ratee's performance on each element is excellent, average or below average (Kondrasuk 2002).

It is summarized the potential advantages: First, raters get a clearer idea of what constitutes good job performance. Thus, the ambiguity concerning expectations is reduced. Second, BARS result in more accurate measurements because of a better understanding of the requirements for good job performance the behavioural observation scale (BOS) is a procedure that was also based on BARS rationale for reducing subjectivity and error in performance appraisal. This technique asks raters to report the frequency of certain behaviour. BOS results in several advantages: BOS produces higher levels of employee satisfaction with appraisal process. Second, because it pinpoints the precise course of action needed to improve performance, BOS seems superior in fostering behaviour change. BOS appears more likely to minimize barriers in the communication process between superiors and subordinates because it pinpoints for both the specific organizational expectations and performance requirements. This way, role ambiguity and role conflicts are likely to be reduced.

Furthermore, BOS decreases raters' fear of possible confrontations with their subordinates because this technique directs the discussion toward the frequency of specific behaviours,

rather than toward the raters' evaluation of those behaviours. From the viewpoint of the ratee the feedback is seen as more factual, objective and unbiased (Latham and Wexley, 1977).

In the mixed standard scale (MSS) three performance standards are developed per behaviour dimension. These standards reflect average performance, superior and inferior performance. The standards for all behavioural dimensions are then randomly sequenced to form a MSS. Rater can indicate whether the focal ratee is better, equal or worse than standard. This technique aims at ensuring that the rater does not simply use an overall impression of the ratee and produce a rating that contains error, such as leniency and halo. But unfortunately the weaknesses of MSS are too obvious: It leaves the rater not only without any clear sense of how good a rating has been given, but also with very little information that the rater can use for feedback to the ratee. MSS are difficult to score and only slightly easier to develop than behavioural scales. This comes back in the fact that raters prefer BARS over MSS (Berry, 2003).

In summary, research indicates that there is no clear picture of which type of scale is the best. Because different scale formats elicit judgment processes, the acceptability and effectiveness of various formats varies across individuals.

It is possible to conclude that rating the performance of teachers based on a number of job related characteristics such quantity of the work, quality of the work, cost effectiveness and timely working can be rated as low, satisfactory, high and very high. A rater biases are likely to occur or reflected in a subjective measures of performance but objective data minimize the biases so rating the performance of teachers requires an appraiser with special knowledge and skills.

#### **2.4.8. Post-Appraisal Meeting**

It is collaborative conference between appraisers and teachers. In many organizations appraisal is one way and secret. A two ways and open appraisal require that an interview takes place between manager and subordinates good post appraisal interview between the manager and the subordinate can permit and enhance problem-solving capacity and there by develop positive relationship between the subordinate and the appraiser. To improve performance, employees need information (feedback) about their performance along with guidance in reaching the next level of results. In this regard most theories of work motivation point out that, before employees

can improve their performance, they must know how well they are currently doing (Cullingford, 1995).

An appraisal interview is a common way for a manager as they discuss the specific points in the evaluation. The discussion between the employee (subordinate) and the superior must focus on performance short coming of the subordinates and give suggestion for improvement. The success of the interview depends, however on the climate in which it is conducted. When the subordinate senses the immediate manager's support and approval, then the appraisal interview can be high and constructive. But when the climate is one of the mistrust and skepticism, the subordinate is likely to be defensive. Once appraisal has been conducted it is important to communicate them so that employees have clear understanding of how they stand in the eyes of their immediate superiors and the organization.

The appraisal feedback interview can clear up misunderstandings on both an opportunity and a danger; because the immediate manager communicates both praise and constructive criticisms. A major concern for the managers is how to emphasize the positive aspect of the employee's performance while still discussing ways to make needed improvement (Mathis and Jackson (1997).

If the manager or appraiser lack interview skill and handled it poorly, the subordinate may feel resentment, and conflict may result which could be reflected in future work. As discussed earlier, training the rater is the best solution to develop interview skill (French, 1990:411). To this end, Pratt and Bennett (1990) described three main approaches to feedback discussion.

In a tell and sell feedback interview the supervisor tells the employees how good or bad the employee's performance has been and then attempts to persuade the employee to accept this judgment. The employee has no input in the evaluation because it is very directive and one sided. The Tell and sell' interview can lead to defensiveness, resentment, and frustration on the part of the subordinate. The employee may not accept the results of the interview and may not be committed to achieving the goals that are set. This may lead to poor performance in the future.

According to tell and listen, in this approach the supervisor tells the employee what has been right and wrong with the employee's past performance but then gives the subordinates a chance

to react. As stated by (ibid) such approach attempts to overcome employee reactions by counseling on how to perform better.

Moreover, in problem solving feedback discussion approach, the subordinate has much more control on the problem solving interview. Employees evaluate their own performance and set their own goals for future performance. Supervisor is primarily a helper and colleague rather than a judge and offers observations and advice in non –critical manner. During problem solving interview “An active and open dialogue ensues, in which goals of improvement are established mutually by both the appraiser and the appraisee”.

Byers and Rue (1987) stated that, many of the variables that have been identified and associated with positive outcomes from performance appraisal interviews, are behaviors and skills that can be taught to manager or superior responsible for conducting he interviews. So all the organizations including schools should give due emphasize to manager or principals development training program. Many immediate managers are hesitant to initiate performance counseling sessions because the subordinates may raise uneasy questions for which they may not have answers or they may question their judgments and decisions which may lead to argument, debate, and misunderstanding. To avoid such problems the raters should get adequate training to develop interview and counseling skill.

Therefore, post appraisal conference, if carried out properly provides a considerable contribution for effective implementation of the appraisal scheme. A well conducted active and open dialogue between the appraiser and appraisees facilitates the process of the system and establishes mutual understanding in every activity.

## **2.5. Characteristics of Effective Appraisal System**

Meaningful teacher evaluation and the resulting feedback, reflection and professional development will only happen if teachers are motivated to make it work. Hence, it is essential to find ways for teachers to identify with the goals and values of teacher evaluation arrangements and practices. This includes providing support to teachers to help them understand what evaluation involves, how it can strengthen their role as professionals and how it can help them to improve student performance. Also, by having the opportunity locally to develop instruments and

procedures for teacher evaluation, based on central guidance, teachers have the scope to develop a clear, fair and rigorous approach in every school (Eisner 1999).

Performance appraisals need to be effective; otherwise they are a waste of time and money. What makes them effective is their potential to improve employee performance. But performance appraisal will only lead to behavioral change if its users accept the system. The characteristics of performance appraisal which have proven to partly determine the effectiveness by affecting acceptance are introduced and discussed. First, it is started with more general aspects like rating approaches and rating techniques. Second, the impact of tying performance to pay will be presented. Next, the accuracy of ratings and the existence of errors and bias in ratings will be discussed. The fourth part deals with the way performance feedback is given (Dickinson, 1993).

According to Wise (1998:305) a quite young variant of performance appraisal is 360-degree performance appraisal. The typical 360-degree process, supervisor(s), subordinates, peers and (less frequently) internal or external customers provide feedback on performance for each target ratee, using some type of standardized instrument. The ratee is then expected to use the data, along with a self-rating, to make appropriate changes to improve performance. The purpose of 360-degree performance appraisal is generally the same as for normal performance appraisal, but it is assumed that the new process offers some advantages.

In terms of methodology, 360-degree appraisal might improve the subjective measurement of performance by supplementing supervisory ratings with those of multiple raters. The use of multiple rates can reduce bias and errors in performance appraisal because multiple raters can bring non-redundant information to the judgments task. But in believing in the error-reducing capacity of 360-degree appraisal one automatically assumes that all rater groups define each performance dimension similarly and raters calibrate rating scale points.

Well-constructed scales can exhibit construct validity across different rater groups. He also analyzed if different groups of raters are able to share a common conceptualization of performance dimensions underlying the items. Unfortunately, not all optimistic expectations concerning 360-degree appraisal have become reality (Wise, 1998).

It is hypothesized which reasons could be responsible for the differences in performance evaluation. First, it might be possible that different rater groups may have different conceptualizations of what constitutes effective performance in a particular job. Second, raters differ in their opportunity to observe any given individuals' work behavior and raters are exposed to only moderately overlapping sets of rate behavior. Third, motivational and informational differences between rating sources, such as self-raters need for self-enhancement and differences in social comparison information available to self-raters and their supervisors, might exist. Fourth, well-established attribution tendencies, such as the self-serving attribution bias and the actor-observer effect might be at hand. Fifth, it is possible that differences in observed ratings from different sources may be substantive differences between the rater groups (Reinke, 2003).

According to Wise (1998) effectiveness of appraisal depends on an integrated development and accountability approach. Feedback from participants indicate that the desirability of a retention of the balance between development and accountability in appraisal.

According to Clarity micro-process, the latter statement suggests that clarity in guidelines and criteria for all performance management micro-processes is crucial if staff is to understand how to implement policy effectively.

Quality Time is another micro-process making and taking enough time to carry out appraisal is considered as crucial to effectiveness. There is an implication from all of the findings that management must be given time and support to implement appraisal. Several schools gained consent to open one hour later, two times a term, to allow for appraisal interactions to occur. Other schools used specified teacher only days for appraisal.

As developing educative interactions, respectful, trust-based and open relationships are at the core of appraisal effectiveness, good interpersonal interactions generally are often noted as important but elaboration beyond such broad statements is rare in the general appraisal literature.

Moreover, effectiveness the dearth of literature on how to help appraisers develop the sort of educative, problem-resolving, interactions in appraisal is indicative of the extent to which this is overlooked and perhaps even avoided because it is in the too hard basket. It's still an uncomfortable thing to do, especially with an average teacher or one who is out of their depth.

It's an extra burden on an already over-abused group. Helping appraisers to develop educative relationships should be an essential feature of all appraisal training.

Training a school management must rethink the approach to training for appraisal so that it goes beyond the quick-fix, one day or even shorter. It is recommended that the training includes coverage of all elements of appraisal such as values, purposes, objective setting, observation skills, data-gathering skills, interviewing and report writing. The training should also focus on helping appraisers to develop an educative process. This account reveals that substantially more than short-term training is required to help appraisers to develop educative process interactions with appraisees.

Creating Respect, Openness and Trust the final feature of effective appraisal overlaps with earlier mentioned features. The link between appraisal effectiveness and on-going educative relationships cannot be ignored. It is revealed that respect, openness and trust need to be established through honest interactions in all situations - not just that of appraisal, but in every interaction at every level of the school.

## **2.6. Problems, Errors and Bias of Performance Appraisal System**

The accuracy of ratings is determined by the reliability and validity of the measurement at hand. Reliability refers to the relative absence of random measurement error in a measurement instrument or precision of a measurement instrument rating accuracy is an important, albeit insufficient condition for feedback to positively affect future performance. Unfortunately, there are several different error phenomena which all poses a threat to the accuracy of ratings. In general, these errors can be differentiated as being related to (1) inadequate observations, (2) faulty standards or expectations about performance, and (3) difficulties in using a rating scale. Even though one can conclude that lack of error implies a certain level of accuracy, there are additional factors as opportunity to observe and delays between observing and giving feedback which have the potential to enhance or deflate the accuracy of ratings (Berry, 2003).

Smith (2001) describes bias as an over- or under identification of evaluations relative to performance for some groups because of identification that the rater may have toward his or her own or toward a reference group. He argues that these systematic distortions result from limitations in cognitive processing, from individual motivation, or from a combination from

both. Two other types of bias are the correspondence and the encoding bias. The correspondence bias refers to the tendency of perceivers to ignore compelling situational explanations when determining the cause of a person's behavior and instead wrongly assumes that the behavior is a direct manifestation of a person's underlying dispositional state. A rater compares perceived rate features with schemas or prototypes. When the rate features resemble a conceptual category the rate is assigned to this category. At this point the risk of encoding bias exist because accessible but arbitrary constructs can bias encoding because rate behavior often has ambiguous meaning that makes it open to varied interpretations and extraneous, contextual influences .

Furthermore, it became obvious that subordinates who helped managers to feel proud of being a good manager, or helped them to make them feel fulfilled, received better performance ratings. Hence, such favoritism undermines employees' perceptions of procedural fairness and therefore acceptance. Related to this subject, ingratiation and other impression management techniques also contaminate performance appraisal, but also has negative effects on the morale of the staff (Cook, 1995).

In summary, it can be concluded that even though bias and errors never can be totally deleted there is a chance to minimize them. To do so these conditions must be met: (1) make sure that raters have sufficient opportunity to observe their rates; (2) give raters techniques at hand how to minimize the cognitive demands in evaluating behavior and the risk of decay; (3) train raters sufficiently in understanding and using the appraisal standards; and (4) design the performance appraisal form and scales in such a way that they are comfortable and easy to use for raters. Concerning the acceptance of a performance appraisal system it is furthermore necessary that appraisers perceive the rating as relatively unbiased, while appraisers must feel able to implement the system as intended.

The reasons behind the limited impact of evaluation on instructional improvement are interrelated with Poor evaluation instruments, little school district guidance on the substance of the teacher evaluations, lack of time for evaluators to conduct the evaluations, lack of skill and content knowledge among the evaluators, lack of will among evaluators to conduct thorough and accurate evaluations, absence of high-quality feedback to teachers through the evaluation process and thus few consequences, positive or negative, attached to the evaluations.

Unfortunately, even though a teacher's effectiveness is recognized as the most important factor in improving student achievement, schools rarely measure, document, or use effectiveness ratings to inform decision-making. The result is that it is difficult to distinguish between poor, average, good, and excellent teachers. Sometimes termed the "Widget Effect," schools tend to assume that teachers' effectiveness in the classroom is the same from teacher to teacher and, thus, treat them as interchangeable parts. A results-based management system is essential for a government to achieve strategic goals and to know when the goals are achieved both in quantity and quality.

Furthermore, the process of tracking and measuring performance provides information that can be used to take corrective action and to learn what methods are worth replicating. In the process of implementing performance management systems, governments have found key practices that have improved performance but have also encountered many challenges and obstacles. Four typical obstacles are: (1) uneven integration with other management systems; (2) technical difficulties in measuring outcomes; (3) the burden of extra work to maintain current systems while adding additional and parallel processes; and, most of all, (4) resistance to change and negative mentality among those who must implement the system. Typically, positive factors that help to overcome these obstacles include: (1) the expressed desire for more efficient and effective government performance; (2) sustained leadership; (3) stakeholder ownership; (4) focused planning; (5) capacity building; and (6) the recognition of intermediate, and perhaps smaller, successes (Isore, 2008).

### **2.6.1. Errors Made in Personnel Appraisal**

In using either objective or subjective measures of performance, errors often result from some bias on the part of the appraiser. These common errors should be recognized and avoided (William, 2001)

In the common "Halo" Effect this error is perhaps the most pervasive bias in performance appraisal. It occurs when the appraiser assigns ratings or makes judgments which are influenced by his or her impression of one of the worker's qualities or performance in a single job dimension. The general impression (or "halo") then carries over to ratings given on other aspects of the job. The appraiser fails to distinguish among levels of performance on each different

aspect. Halo errors can be minimized by clearly defining the various aspects of a job and by evaluating all workers on one aspect before evaluating them on a second, then a third, and so forth. Furthermore, training appraisers to recognize the tendency to make halo errors helps them to avoid it.

Similarly the common error Leniency and Harshness, many managers might be classified as either too easy or too harsh in their ratings. The easy rater gives subordinates ratings that are higher than the average performance level of subordinates. On the other hand, the harsh rater gives ratings that are lower than the average performance level of subordinates on the rated dimensions.

The following suggestions are offered to minimize leniency/harshness errors: force the appraiser to rate subordinates so that a given percentage falls into categories such as high, average and low (although this technique alone may produce warped evaluations), reduce the ambiguity of the rating scale by clearly defining the dimensions of the ranking system in terms that are as descriptive and meaningful as possible; and set clear standards for each job function for the appraiser to use as a “yardstick”.

Moreover, Central tendency error is the unwillingness on the part of the appraiser to assign extreme ratings-either high or low. The appraiser tends to stay around the midpoint in evaluating the performance of subordinates. Although this tendency is the opposite of the leniency/harshness syndrome, it can be minimized by using the same countermeasures.

Recent performance of a worker can significantly influence the appraisal. If recent performance takes precedent in the mind of the evaluator over performance during the entire appraisal period, it may bias his/her judgment. For this reason, appraisers need to guard against good, average or poor recent performance influencing the appraisal disproportionately. Collecting and evaluating demonstrated behaviors over the entire course of the appraisal period may minimize the regency error.

## **2.7. Teachers Performance Appraisal in Ethiopia**

In Ethiopia, teachers’ performance appraisal started in 1930s and its main purpose was to control and inspect the instructional process. Later on, it continued to operate by changing its name to

supervision and function by large remained unchanged (Berhan, 1999). In 1955 E.C the inspection department was replaced supervision department with the purpose of curriculum and teaching–learning improvement (MoE, 1979 EC).

In 1973E.C due to the ideological change introduced in the county, and experience gained from socialist countries department of supervision again replaced by inspection. The prime objectives of the inspection were to assure whether policies, guidelines, plans and programs were properly implemented according to the socialist ideology. Therefore, appraising the performance of teachers has been left to educational administrators at the school level.

MOE under the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia developed Education and Training Policy (ETP) in1994. The Education and Training Policy envisages bringing up citizens endowed with human outlook, countywide responsibility and democratic values having developed the necessary productive, creative, and appreciative capacity in order to participate fruitfully in development and development and the utilization of resources and the environment at large (MoE, 1994). This is realized through quality of education. To guarantee quality of education one of the majors taken was to improve the performance of teachers through the performance appraisal system.

According to Federal Civil Service Commission (FCSC) (1996 E.C:18-19). Result oriented performance plan is a work program derived from national vision, mission and strategic in context of specific organization: involving key, major, minor and additional tasks to be performed by team or individually in a year or lesser time (usually half a year), The process of replacing the traditional performance appraisal by the modern approach termed as result oriented management is underway. Such an intention as to FCSC (1997E.C:30) will be realized provided that the following three preconditions are fulfilled: These are establishing management –by – objective system; performance oriented human resource management and output oriented budgeting.

FCSC(1997E.C:31-32) and FCSC( 1995E.C:4-5) present the objectives of the result oriented performance plan as ensuring that managers and employees are fully performing to their level best as expected of them in terms of quantity , time and cost, identifying strengths and weakness at organizational, department, group and individual level with intention of improvement in the

forth coming performance period, identifying the need assessment for development and training both for managers and employees, providing performance based payment or incentives for the managers and employees and making decisions on management and employees matters that is based on tangible documents and concrete facts. Result – oriented performance appraisal of teachers was prepared and become operational in 1995 E.C. in line with the national civil service program new idea concerning weaknesses of result-oriented plan performance appraisal FCSC (1996 E.C.22) and FCSC (1999) present that is more subjective. It focus more of team work, too much paper work, extra burden and consumes more resource, supervisors and employees may not be able to prepare specific, measureable, relevant and time based objectives, even employees didn't have enough awareness about the program. Because of the above weaknesses and other similar reasons result-oriented performance appraisal system was not continued in Addis Ababa city government in line with the civil service reform program.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **3. Research Design and Methodology**

#### **3.1. Research Method**

Since this study was aimed at examining and describing the implementation of teachers' performance appraisal system in government secondary schools of Addis Ababa City Administrations the case of Lideta sub-city, a descriptive research design employed to address all issues of the study. The selection of the research method was based on the nature of the problem or issues being addressed, the investigator's personal experience, the population for the study and the availability of time and financial resources for the research work. Mixed approach help in triangulating information across quantitative and qualitative methods by collecting both types of data at the same time and then integrating the information in the interpretation of the overall results. Basically, it is through such methods of research design that can be collected in depth and comprehensive information regarding the current status of phenomena and can better validate the result of study than single approach (Creswell, 2003).

#### **3.2. Sources of Data**

Both primary and secondary data sources were employed in the study. The primary data were gathered from principals, vice principals, department heads and teachers Secondary data were gathered from documents performance appraisal criteria, policy documents, evaluation of teachers, city administration and sub-city education offices statistics, annual abstracts and other related materials to consolidate the data in the study. This was due to the fact that the student researcher is currently working as a school vice- principal, had faced a series time shortage didn't covered more other sources.

#### **3.3. Sample Size and Sampling Techniques**

The target population composed of both male and female teaching staffs and school leaders involved in teachers' performance appraisal in the government secondary schools. According to annual report of Lideta sub-city education office(2016), there were 3 government secondary schools in the sub-city and all the government secondary schools were included in the study. As

stated in the annual report, with in these government secondary schools 12 principals and vice-principals and 261 teachers are currently found.

Taking in to consideration those who had served in the schools for a period of not less than three years. Out of the total population (N =273), the target population, 112 (41.02%) sample population size was selected as participants of the study. The participants were 32 appraisers (12 principals and vice-principals, 20 department head) and 80 teachers.

The researcher used simple random sampling and purposive sampling techniques to select the respondents of the study. In order to select principals and vice-principals, purposive sampling techniques was employed, because they were small in number and rich in information on the issue under the study. A simple random sampling technique, that give an equal chance of being selected, were employed to select department heads and teachers from the sample schools based on ratio proportion of teachers in the school. On the other hand, to select sample participants for interview from the total population, a purposive sampling technique was employed.

**Table I. Summary of total Population and Sample size**

No	School	Principals & Vice-Principals			Dep. Heads			Teachers		
		TP	SP	%	TP	SP	%	TP	SP	%
1.	Dej. Balcha Abanefos Secondary & Preparatory	4	4	100%	11	7	63.63%	143	50	34.96%
2.	Africa Hibret Secondary School	4	4	100%	11	6	54.54%	45	16	35.55%
3.	Lideta Hidase Secondary School	4	4	100%	11	7	63.63%	40	14	35%
		12	12		33	20		228	80	

### **3.4. Data Gathering Instruments**

The data gathering instruments were questionnaire, unstructured interview and document analysis.

#### **3.4.1. Questionnaire**

A self developed, containing both closed and open ended separate questionnaires were prepared for both sample groups appraisees and appraisers. Questionnaire is advantageous in descriptive survey research, because it is restricted to a finite set of responses that are easy and quick to answer. In addition to this, they have response categories that they are easy to code and they permit the inclusion of more variable in a research study. Thus, the investigator preferred to use this instrument.

The respondents indicated the extent of their performance or importance by choosing one of the five options, degree of agreement or disagreement, through a five point Likert scale but some questionnaire were with three options provided that the questions were close-ended one.

#### **3.4.2. Interview**

Interview has an advantage that enables the interviewer to establish rapport with the respondents, allows the interviewer to listen and observe, permit more complex questions to be asked than through other types of data collection tools. Unstructured interviews were conducted with purposefully selected three appraisers (a principal vice- principal & dep.head) and three appraisees. (Teachers) These interviews were conducted in Amharic to avoid communication barriers and the information obtained was cross-checked with those obtained via other data gathering tools.

#### **3.4.3. Document Analysis**

All available documents performance appraisal criteria guidelines, policies, annual school plan, instructional and supervision program, recorded appraisal results, class room observation forms and other documents that have direct relationship with teachers' performance appraisal were collected and used. This tool was used to enrich the data obtained through questionnaires and interviews.

### **3.5. Procedures of Data Collection**

Having read adequate available related literatures on teachers' performance appraisal system implementation the researcher formulated basic questions and objectives that were addressed by the study in which the design of the questionnaire, interviews and document check lists were based on them. Questionnaires, interviews and document check list questions were prepared in English. To employ those data gathering tools, the procedures were followed in a sequential way or in phases by giving priority to the questionnaire and the conducting interviews and lastly document analysis.

### **3.6. Method of Data Analysis**

As data were collected through questionnaire, interviews and documents analysis both quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis were employed. The data gathered through questionnaire was structured, organized and tallied to make easy for analysis. The data obtained through close ended questions were organized and presented in tables where as the data collected through interview, document analysis and open-ended questions were analyzed in narration under each category in the tables that were relevant to the issue. The collected data were categorized in to two groups, that is, data that were collected from appraisers (principles, vice-principals and department heads) as one category and the second category were appraises (teachers) so that compression were made on the findings. From the descriptive statistics frequency, percentage, mean score and weighted mean were used. Finally based on the data analysis and interpretation, summary were made and conclusion and recommendations were forwarded.

### **3.7. Validity and Reliability Checks**

To ensure the validity and reliability of the questionnaire were given to practitioners and educated friends in similar fields of education to assess, review and make adjustments concerning how well the items, on the questionnaire, represents the intended content areas clarity of language and grammatical order so that amendment was made if necessary. Then, the questionnaire was submitted to the thesis advisor for further examination and available adjustments. Support letter was asked, to conduct the research, from Addis Ababa University department of educational planning and management and Lideta sub-city education office.

Before the main study, pilot test was carried out in Yekatit 23 secondary school found in Addis Ketema sub- city to check the validity and reliability of the tools. This helped to check whether or not the items in the questionnaire enable the researcher relevant and sufficient information.

During data collection from sample secondary schools, orientation was given to respondents to make clear the contents of the questionnaire and objectives of the study. Finally, the questionnaire was distributed to the respondents. After distributing the questionnaire, time for interview and document analysis were arranged and conducted with the concerned sample respondents. The interview was conducted in Amharic to avoid communication barriers. At the end the questionnaire was collected in the sample way as the distribution. As a result 32 respondents, (80%) appraisers out of tem and 24(80%) appraises out of 30 appraisees were selected using simple random sampling techniques to respond the questioner and interview. Based on the result of pilot of test two items were cancelled and five items were modified.

According to Kothari (2004) validity refers to the degree to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. Reliability has to do with the consistency or repeatability of a measure or an instrument and high reliability is obtained when the measure or instrument gives the same results it the research is repeated on the same sample (Maree, 2007). To ensure validity of instruments, the instruments were developed under close guidance of the advisor and, also a pilot study was carried at on 32 participants out of these 22 were appraisers (principals and department hoods) and 10 were, also appraisees (teachers) those were not included in the sample schools to pre – test the instrument. The pilot test were well informed about the objectives and how to fill, assess and give feedback on the significance of the constants, item length simple city of items, and details of the questionnaire. Based on the result of pilot test two items were cancelled and five items were modified. Similarly, recognizing of the order questions of some items had been done before the major instruments of the study were administered to reduce errors. The questionnaires had given through revisions exhaustively to strengthen its validity. Generally, the test has shown that the designed questioners is inductive and acceptable to measure the major problems of teachers' performance appraisal operating in government secondary schools of Lideta sub –city in Addis Ababa. The pilot test was providing an advance opportunity for the researcher to check the questioners and to minimize errors due to improper design of instruments, such as problem of wording or sequence (Adams et al, 2007).

**Table II. Reliability test results with Cronbach's Alpha**

<b>No</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>No of items</b>	<b>Cronbach alpha</b>
1.	The purpose of TPA systems implementation	16	0.987
2.	The development of TPA criteria techniques used and feedback procedures	18	0.736
3.	Competency of appraisers	28	0.969
4.	The process of teachers performance appraisers system	13	0.891
5.	Major problems of TPA system implementation	17	0.969
	Average reliability result		0.9104

The result of the pilot testing was statistically computed by the SPSS 20.0 program. The Cronbach's Alpha model was used for analyzing the data. Based on the pilot test, the reliability coefficient of the instrument was found to be 0.910 (91.0%) and, hence, was taken to be highly reliable. That is, the instrument was found to be reliable as statistical literature recommended a test result of 0.65 (65%) reliability and above as reliable (George & Mallery, 2003). The above table indicates high reliability, which means the instrument gives the same result if the research is repeated on the same sample.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### 4. Presentation, Analysis and Interpretations of Data

This chapter consists of two major parts. The first part presents the characteristics of the participants emphasizing on their personal and professional characteristics where as the second part deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data on an assessment of teachers' performance appraisal system implementation in government secondary schools of Addis Ababa city government. In the case of Lideta sub-city.

#### 4.1. Characteristics of Participants

The data for this study were collected from appraisees (teachers) in one group and appraisers (principals, vice-principals and department heads) on the other group. A total of 112 questionnaires were distributed to the study sample schools, of which 32 questionnaires were distributed to appraisers and 80 questionnaires to appraisees of the total distributed questionnaire, 77 (96.25%) from appraisees and 30 (93.75%) from appraisers were appropriately filled and returned.

**Table 1: Distribution of Participants by School department**

Item		Participants			
		Appraisers (N = 30)		Appraisees (N = 77)	
		F	%	F	%
A. Sex	Male	24	80	65	84.42
	Female	6	20	12	15.58
	Total	30	100	77	100
B. Age	20 – 25	-	-	-	-
	26 – 30	10	33.33	30	38.96
	31 – 35	12	40	25	32.47
	36 – 40	3	10	10	12.99
	41 – 45	3	10	4	5.19
	46 – 50	-	-	5	6.49
	≥ 51	2	6.67	3	3.89

As it can be seen from table1 above, appraisers and appraisees who accounted for 24 (80%) and 65 (84.42%) respectively, were male participants. Female participants were 6(20%) for

appraisers and 12 (15.58%) for appraisees. This showed that female representation in both groups in government secondary schools under the study was found to be very low. This low representation of females in both groups might be because of their low participation in education in the past.

Concerning age, 12 (40%) of appraisers participants and 30 (38.96) of appraisees participants were in the age of 31 – 35 and 26 – 30 years respectively. Were as 6-67% of appraisers and 3.89% of appraisees were fall in the age category of above 50 years. Generally, it was observed that majority of teachers in the sample schools of Addis Ababa in Lideta sub-city were at the age of 31-35 and 26-30years of appraisers and appraisees respectively.

**Table 2: Distribution of participants by years of service, Academic qualification and weekly teaching load**

Items		Participants			
		Appraisers (N = 30)		Appraisees (N=77)	
		F	%	F	%
A. year of service	≤ 5	2	6.66	9	11.69
	6 – 10	15	50	30	38.96
	11 – 15	5	16.67	18	23.37
	16 – 20	3	10	9	11.69
	21 – 25	3	10	6	7.79
	26 – 30	-	-	2	2.6
	≥ 31	2	6.66	3	3.89
B. Academic qualification	BA/BSC/Bed	25	83.33	67	87.01
	/MA/MSc/MEd	5	16.67	10	12.99
C. Weekly Teaching load *	≤ 10	5	27.78%	9	11.69
	11 – 15	13	72.22%	42	54.54
	16 – 20	-	-	16	20.78
	21 – 25	-	-	-	-
	≥30	-	-	-	-

\*Does not include principals and vice-principals.

As indicated in table 2 items 4, 15 (50%) of appraisers have service within the range of 11-15 years where as 30(38.96%) of appraisees were 6 – 10 years. However 2 (6.66%) appraisers have served 31 years and above and 2(2.6%) appraisees had work experience of 26-30 years.

Hence, this implies that majority of the appraisers in the study areas of secondary school of Addis Ababa city administration in Lideta sub city have good experience to lead school activities. Regarding participants' academic qualification 25(83.33%) of appraisers and 67

(87.01%) of appraisees were first degree (BA, BSC or BEd) holders. However 5(16.67%) of appraisers and 10 (12.99%) of appraisees were masters' degree holders.

Thus, almost the expected qualification in the sample secondary schools of Addis Ababa city administration in Lideta sub-city with regard to principals and teachers was fulfilled. Table 2 item C also reveals that 13 (43.33%) of appraisers and 42(54.54%) of appraisees have a weekly teaching load of 11-15 periods. On the other hand 5(16.67%) appraisers and 9 (11.69%) appraisees have ten and less periods per week. Thus all department heads were not overloaded. They have sufficient time to evaluate their teachers effectively.

## **4.2. Data Pertaining to the Major Variables of the Study**

This is the main section of the chapter where the data obtained from participants are presented, analyzed and interpreted. This section was divided into five sub-sections which are the purposes, development, and competency of appraisers, process and problems of teachers' performance appraisal system implementation in government secondary schools of Addis Ababa city government in the case of Lideta Sub-city.

### **4.2.1. The Purpose of Teachers' Performance Appraisal**

Both appraisers and appraisees were asked their opinion on the purposes of TPA in their respective schools. For this sub section fifteen close-ended and two open-ended questions were asked. For the close ended questions participants responded to each item using a five point Likert scale which ranging from "strongly agree to "strongly disagree" and their values run through five to one respectively.

**Table 3. The Purpose of TPA System Implementation**

No	Item	Respondents Appraisers (N=30) Appraisees (N=77)	Frequency, Percentage and Mean											
			SA		A		UD		D		SD		MS	WM
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1.	To identify teachers professional needs	Appraisers	10	33.33	13	43.33	2	6.67	3	10	2	6.67	3.87	3.75
		Appraisees	24	31.17	26	33.76	10	13.98	9	11.69	8	10.39	3.63	
2	To decide on teachers salary increment	Appraisers	9	30	10	33.33	3	10.0	5	16.67	3	10	3.56	3.57
		Appraisees	18	23.37	20	25.97	4	5.19	18	23.37	1	1.3	3.59	
3	To decide on teachers promotion or demotion	Appraisers	6	20	11	36.67	5	16.67	6	20	2	6.67	3.43	3.61
		Appraisees	24	31.17	30	38.96	10	12.98	10	12.98	3	3.89	3.8	
4	To decide on teachers' transfer	Appraisers	3	10	2	6.67	4	13.33	10	33.33	11	36.66	2.2	2.32
		Appraisees	8	10.39	10	12.98	7	9.09	29	37.66	23	29.87	2.44	
5	To reward competent teachers	Appraisers	9	30	11	36.66	4	13.33	4	13.33	2	6.66	3.7	3.36
		Appraisees	18	23.38	23	29.87	12	15.58	12	15.58	12	15.58	3.03	
6	To motivate teachers on their job	Appraisers	8	26.67	14	46.67	5	16.66	2	6.66	1	3.33	3.86	3.54
		Appraisees	16	20.78	21	27.27	14	18.18	16	20.77	10	12.98	3.22	
7	To promote teachers knowledge and skill	Appraisers	3	10	4	13.33	3	10	12	40	8	26.67	2.4	2.2
		Appraisees	6	7.79	7	9.09	1	1.3	30	38.96	33	42.85	2.0	
8	To measure job performance of teachers	Appraisers	3	10	3	10	-	-	14	46.66	10	33.33	2.16	2.12
		Appraisees	4	5.19	8	10.38	6	7.79	31	40.25	28	36.36	2.08	
9	To improve the quality of teaching-learning process	Appraisers	3	10	2	6.67	2	6.67	14	46.67	9	30	2.2	2.13
		Appraisees	6	7.79	5	6.49	2	2.6	38	49.35	26	33.76	2.05	
10	To measure teachers' professional competence	Appraisers	8	26.67	12	40	4	13.33	5	16.66	1	3.33	3.7	3.56
		Appraisees	20	25.97	28	36.36	7	9.09	9	11.68	13	16.88	3.42	
11	To provide feed-back for teachers	Appraisers	4	13.33	6	20	2	6.67	14	46.62	4	13.33	2.73	2.56
		Appraisees	8	10.39	10	12.98	4	5.19	38	49.35	17	22.07	2.40	
12	To strengthen the relationship between teachers and students	Appraisers	1	3.33	3	10	3	10	17	56.66	6	20	2.2	2.19
		Appraisees	6	7.79	4	5.19	13	16.88	32	41.55	22	28.57	2.19	
13	To strengthen the relationship between teachers and appraisers	Appraisers	3	10	4	13.33	3	10	15	50	5	16.66	2.5	2.22
		Appraisees	3	3.89	6	7.79	1	1.3	41	53.24	26	33.76	1.94	
14	To strengthen the relationship between teachers and parents	Appraisers	4	13.33	6	20	2	6.67	14	46.67	4	13.33	2.73	2.47
		Appraisees	7	9.09	6	7.79	7	9.09	34	44.15	23	29.87	2.22	
15	To achieve school goals and objectives	Appraisers	2	6.66	8	26.66	2	6.66	12	40	6	20	2.6	2.44
		Appraisees	7	9.09	9	11.68	7	9.09	30	38.96	24	31.16	2.28	

As can be seen in table 3, item 1, 5(16.67%) appraisers and 17 (22.06%) appraisees reported that TPA system was not able to identify teachers' professional training needs. On the other hand, 23(76.66%) appraisers and 50(64.93%) appraisees responded that the system was effective to identify teachers' professional training need to achieve its intended purpose with mean value of 3.74 which was above average. In this regard, the designed purpose of the system was helpful to identify teachers' professional training need in government secondary school of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa city government.

Moreover, as indicated in item-2 of table 3, 8 (26.67%) appraisers and 19 (31.13%) appraisees conformed that TPA system was not used to decide on teachers' salary increment to achieve its intended purposes. However, 19 (63.33%) appraisers and 38 (62.28%) appraisees reported that the system was helpful to decide on teachers' salary increment. The mean score of appraisers and appraisees were above average and the weighted mean was also above average, i.e. 3.57. Hence, both appraisers and appraisees perceived that the system was not that much effective in deciding on teachers salary increment.

Table 3, item3 depicts that 8(26.67%) appraisers and 13 (16.87%) appraisees responded that TPA purpose was not used to decide on teachers promotion. On the other hand, 17 (56.67%) appraisers and 54 (70.13%) appraisees responded that the system was practiced to decide on teachers' promotion. As indicated in table 3 item4, 21(69.99%) appraisers and 52(67.53%) appraisees reported that the purpose of appraising performance of teachers was not used to decide on teachers' transfer with weighted mean value of 2.32. Only 5 (16.67%) appraisees and 18 (23.37%) appraisees responded that the system could used to decide on transfer of teachers. Generally majority of the appraisers and appraisees perceived that the system was ineffective in deciding on teachers' transfer.

As can be seen in table 3 item 5 and 6, concerning the purpose of appraising teachers' performance to reward competent teachers and to motivate teachers on their job, participants rated both items and the weighted mean values are 3.36 and 3.54 respectively. As indicated in table 3 item7, both appraisers and appraisees, 20 (66.67%) and 63 (81.81%) respectively reported that the system did not promote teachers' knowledge and skill and the mean scores are 2.4 and 2.0 for appraisers and appraisees respectively. The weighted mean was below average.

Similarly in the same table of item-8, 24 (79.99%) appraisers and 59 (76.61%) appraisees indicated that the system did not appropriately measure job performance of teachers. Moreover, the mean score of participants for the item was found to be 2.16 and 2.08 for appraisers and appraised respectively. These were far below average. Similarly the weighted mean for the two groups was also far below average that is 2.12. In this case, it could be perceptible that there has been a mismatch between the designed purpose of TPA system and the manner in which the system would have been implemented in secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa.

As presented in table-3item9, 23 (76.67%) appraisers and 64 (83.11%) appraisees responded that the current TPA system did not support to improve the quality of teaching –learning process. The mean scores of appraisers and appraisees were 2.2 and 2.05, respectively which is far below average. The weighted mean of both grouped was 2.13. In this regard, the system was not effective in supporting the teaching-learning process which should be the back bone of performance appraisal of teachers. On the other hand 20 (66.67%) appraisers and 48 (62.33%) appraisees responded that the system was not that much helpful to measure professional competence of teachers with mean scores 3.7 and 3.42 for appraisers and appraisees respectively. And the weighted mean of both groups was found to be 3.56. Thus; the system was effective to measure professional competency of teachers. In a similar way 18 (60%) appraisers and 55 (71.42%) appraisees reported that the system was not effective in providing feed-back for teachers. The mean scores of appraisers and appraisees were 2.73 and 2.40 respectively and the weighted mean of both groups was 2.56. The result of this item supported by Grote (2002:262) that performance appraisal is used to provide feed-back to individual on how well he or she did during the previous days and use that information to improve his or her performance in the future.

On the contrary, in the above table 3, participants rated for items 12,13 and 14 which were about the relationship between teachers and students, teachers and appraisers and teachers and parents responded with weighted mean of 2.19, 2.22 and 2.47, respectively which were far below average. Since teachers, students and parents are the three main responsible bodies to achieve the quality of teaching learning process. So, the relation among them was not strengthened in secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa. Generally as indicated in item 15 of table3, 18 (60%) appraisers and 54(70.12%) appraisees responded that goals and objectives of the

system were not achieved as intended and planned. The mean scores of the two groups were found to be 2.6 and 2.28 for appraisers and appraisees respectively and the weighted mean was 2.44 which was below average. According to the data obtained from open end questions the system did not give more focus to the teaching and learning process and it had not integrated with teachers' professional development and it was simply a paper work.

#### **4.2.2. Development of Teachers' Performance Appraisal Criteria Techniques Used and Feed-Back Procedures**

In this sub-section the perception of appraisers and appraisees, in government secondary schools of Lideta sub city in Addis Ababa on the development and implementation of criteria, techniques used and feed-back procedures of TPA and their effectiveness to achieve the intended objective of the system was considered in the study based on the responses collected through questionnaire, interview and document analysis from both appraisers and appraisees and analysis was done as follows.

**Table 4: The Participants Involved in the Developments of Teachers' Performance Appraisal Criteria.**

S no	Item	Respondents Appraisers (N=30) Appraisees (N=77)	Frequency, Percentage and Mean										MS	WM
			UH		H		M		L		UL			
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	Teachers	Appraisers	2	6.67	3	10	5	16.67	12	40	8	26.67	2.3	2.22
		Appraisees	4	5.19	6	7.79	11	14.28	32	41.56	24	31.16	2.4	
2	Department heads	Appraisers	1	3.33	3	10	4	13.33	21	70	1	3.33	2.4	2.27
		Appraisees	4	5.71	2	2.86	5	7.14	48	68.57	11	15.71	2.14	
3	Vice-principals	Appraisers	2	6.67	3	10	3	10	16	53.33	6	20.00	2.3	2.32
		Appraisees	6	7.79	10	12.98	9	11.69	32	41.56	20	25.97	2.35	
4	Principals	Appraisers	3	10	4	13.33	4	13.33	14	46.67	5	16.67	2.53	2.48
		Appraisees	7	9.09	10	12.98	4	6.06	44	57.14	12	18.18	2.43	
5	Sub-city education office experts and supervisors	Appraisers	6	20	12	40	2	6.67	9	30	1	3.33	3.63	3.56
		Appraisees	20	25.97	27	35.06	6	7.79	19	24.67	5	6.49	3.49	
6	Education bureau experts or supervisors	Appraisers	10	33.33	10	33.33	2	6.67	7	23.33	1	3.33	3.7	3.94
		Appraisees	36	46.75	30	38.96	3	3.89	5	6.49	3	3.89	4.18	
7	Experts of ministry of education	Appraisers	13	43.33	7	23.33	6	20	3	10	1	3.33	3.93	3.93
		Appraisees	32	41.55	28	36.36	3	3.89	9	11.68	5	6.49	3.93	
8	Not sure	Appraisers	11	36.67	8	26.67	5	16.67	2	6.67	4	13.33	3.67	3.95
		Appraisees	41	53.24	25	32.46	3	3.89	4	5.19	4	5.19	4.23	

As indicated in table 4, item 1, both appraisers and appraisees, 20 (66.67%) and 56 (72.72%) respectively, responded that teachers' did not participate in the development of criteria, for teachers' performance appraisal in secondary school of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa. The mean scores of appraisers and appraisees were 2.3 and 2.14 respectively and the weighted mean was 2.2 all the mean scores were far below average. So without participation of teachers in the development of the criteria of the system it would be difficult for its implementation.

Similarly, in the same table of item 2, 22 (73.33%) appraisers and 59(84.28%) appraisees reported that department heads also did not involved in the setting of teachers' performance appraisal criteria. The mean score of appraisees was 2.4 and for that of appraisers was 2.14 and the weighted mean was 2.27. As can be observed from table 4 items 3 and 4, 22 (73.33) appraisers and 52 (67.53%) appraisees for vice-principals and 19(63.34%) appraisers and 56 (75.32%) appraisees for principals responded that they (principals and vice principals) did not involved in the development of teachers' performance criteria. The weighted means for items 3 and 4 were 2.32 and 2.48, respectively which were below average. Items 5 of the above table shows that 18(60%) appraiser and 47 (61.03%) appraisees reported that; sub-city education office experts and supervisors were involved in the TPA criteria development. Similarly in the same table items 6 and 7 indicates that 20 (66.66%) of appraisers and 66 (85.71%) appraisees for education bureau experts or supervisors and 20 (66.66%) appraisers and 60 (77.91%) appraisees reported the criteria used for appraising performance of teachers were developed by education bureau experts or supervisors and by the experts of ministry of education. The weighted means for items 6 and 7 were 3.94 and 3.93 respectively which were far above average. However, 19 (63.34%) appraisers and 66 (85.7%) appraisees were not sure who were participated in the development of TPA criteria. Generally, majority of the participants perceived that in developing teachers' performance appraisal criteria there is no participation of appraisers and appraisees.

Regarding the establishment of teachers' performance criteria, Hawthorne (1981) believes that performance data can be set when individual teachers and the administration of the school have equal opportunity to participate in selecting performance criteria. Similarly Gorton (1983) suggests that teachers should be given responsibility of investigating research findings out of which they can develop performance criteria which finally should be revised by central office personnel. Therefore, the overall effectiveness of the appraisal criteria could not be ensured

when appraisees are not adequately participated in the process of developing the appraisal criteria.

The interview made with both appraisers and appraisees revealed that appraisal criteria were developed experts of by sub-city education bureau experts and experts of ministry of education with no involvement of appraisers and appraisees on the real situation.

Besides this discussions on the criteria were not conducted before its implementation. According to the response of interviewees, the appraisal plan was not inclusive all activities of teachers that is there were some important activities left without measuring and some criteria have subjectivity behaviors.

**Table 5: the characteristics of teachers' performance appraisal criteria.**

S no	Items	Participants Appraiser (N= 30) Appraisees (N=72)	Frequency, percentage and mean											
			SA		A		UD		D		SD		MS	WM
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	Related with educational objectives	Appraisers	6	20	15	50	2	6.67	5	16.67	2	6.67	3.6	3.19
		Appraisees	13	16.88	23	29.87	4	5.19	29	37.66	8	10.38	2.79	
2	Relevant with teachers professional development	Appraisers	5	16.67	6	20	3	10	9	30	7	23.33	2.76	2.62
		Appraisees	8	11.26	9	12.67	8	11.26	31	43.66	15	21.12	2.49	
3	All my duties are measured in the evaluation criteria techniques and feedback	Appraisers	3	10	10	33.33	2	6.67	10	33.33	3	10	2.8	2.99
		Appraisees	15	19.48	24	31.16	6	7.79	25	32.46	7	9.09	3.19	
4	Objectively measure teachers performance	Appraisers	10	33.33	9	30	3	10	5	16.67	3	10	3.6	3.31
		Appraisees	13	16.88	24	31.16	6	7.79	20	25.97	14	18.18	3.02	
5	Complete to measure overall performance of teachers.	Appraisers	3	10	7	23.33	2	6.67	13	43.33	5	16.67	2.67	2.68
		Appraisees	8	10.38	17	22.07	9	11.68	30	38.96	13	16.88	2.7	
6	Effective in creating conducive environment between teachers and appraisers.	Appraisers	2	6.67	6	20	2	6.67	14	46.66	6	20	2.46	2.62
		Appraisees	10	12.98	20	25.97	5	6.49	28	36.36	14	18.18	2.79	
		Appraisees	9	11.68	17	22.07	9	11.68	30	38.96	12	15.58	2.75	
7	Well defined and clearly stated in unambiguous words	Appraisers	4	13.33	7	23.33	2	6.67	12	40	5	16.67	2.76	2.75
		Appraisers	8	10.38	19	24.67	8	10.38	30	38.96	12	15.58	2.75	
8	Based on career ladder of teacher	Appraisers	1	3.33	2	6.67	1	3.33	19	63.33	7	23.33	2.03	2.03
		Appraisers	3	3.89	5	6.49	6	7.79	41	53.24	22	28.57	2.03	

The above table 5 describes the reactions of appraisers and appraisees to the characteristics of criteria, of teachers' performance appraisal in government secondary schools of Lidet sub-city in Addis Ababa. As it is indicated in item 1 of table 5, 21(70%) of appraisers and 36(46.75%) of appraisees indicated that the stated criteria were related with educational objectives. The weighted mean was 3.19., this implies that the majority of participant confirmed the stated criteria were related with educational objectives. On the other hand, 16(53.33%) appraisers and 46(64.28%) appraisees were either disagreed or strongly disagrees to relatedness of appraisal criteria with teachers' professional development, the mean scores were 2.76 and 2.49 for appraisers and appraisees respectively. So, appraisal criteria were not successfully helpful to develop teachers their profession. Item 3 of table 5, reveals that 13(43.33) appraisers and 39(50.64%) appraisees were either agreed or strongly agreed that appraisal criteria were clear and valid measures of job related activities with the mean scores of 2.8 and 3.19 for the appraisers and appraisees respectively. Furthermore 19(63.33%) appraisers and 34(48.04%) appraisees indicated that appraisal criteria objectively measure teachers' performance. The item was rated with mean scores of 3.6 and 3.02 for appraisers and appraisees respectively (item 4 of tables 5).

Thus, it implies that almost half of the participants perceived that the criteria used were objective and valid to measure teachers' performance and had job relatedness in government secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa.

Item 5 on table 5, depicts that 18(60%) appraisers and 43(55.84%) appraisees reported that the designed appraisal criteria were not complete to measure overall performance of teachers. The mean scores of appraisers (2.67) and appraisees (2.70) were below average and the weighted mean was 2.68. Hence, the appraisal criteria in the system were not fully successful in measuring overall performance of teachers.

Furthermore table 5, item 6 indicates that 2.0(66.66%) appraisers with mean score of 2.46 reported that appraisal criteria were not effective in creating conducive environment between appraisers and appraisees in the study area.

As can noted from table 5 item 7, 17(56.67%) and 42(54.54%) appraisers and appraisees respectively responded that appraisal criteria used were not well defined and stated in ambiguous words. The weighted mean for item 7 was 2.75 which were far below average. In this case the

attainment of the expected appraisal purpose would become ineffective due to the problem of ambiguity of words in the system.

As indicated in table 5 item 8, 26(86.66%) appraisers and 63(81.81%) appraisees responded that the appraisal criteria were not developed based on career ladder of teachers. The weighted mean scores was 2.03 for appraisers and appraisees. Therefore, this shows that the appraisal criteria have no relation with the career ladder of teachers.

#### **4.2.3. Who better appraise teachers' performance and Competency of Appraisers?**

Some organizations use direct supervisors to evaluate their employees and other organizations also use a committee of difference responsible bodies and still other use direct manger to appraise their subordinates' performance. In this subsection different questions on the competency of appraisers were raised and the responses obtained from appraisers and appraisees was analyzed as follows.

**Table 6: Better Appraisers of Teachers' Performance**

S No	Item	Respondents Appraisers (N=30) Appraisees (N=77)	Frequency, percentage and mean											
			SA		A		UD		D		SD		MS	WM
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Principals	Appraisers	12	40	13	43.33	2	6.66	2	6.66	1	3.33	4.1	3.83
		Appraisees	19	24.67	38	49.35	5	6.49	8	10.39	7	9.09	3.57	
2	Vice principals	Appraisers	12	40	12	40	2	6.66	2	6.66	2	6.66	4	3.96
		Appraisees	26	33.76	34	44.15	7	9.09	5	6.49	5	6.49	3.92	
3	Department heads	Appraisers	14	46.66	10	33.33	1	3.33	3	10	2	6.66	4.03	3.84
		Appraisees	20	25.97	36	46.75	4	5.19	9	11.68	8	10.39	3.66	
4	Students	Appraisers	5	16.67	9	30	4	13.33	6	20	6	20	3.16	3.19
		Appraisees	16	20.78	20	25.97	17	22.07	14	18.18	10	12.98	3.23	
5	A team of principals, vice principals and department heads	Appraisers	14	46.67	12	40	1	3.33	2	6.66	1	3.33	4.2	3.95
		Appraisees	27	35.06	25	32.47	8	10.39	10	12.98	7	9.09	3.71	
6	A team of principals, vice principals and department heads and students	Appraisers	13	43.33	12	40	1	3.33	2	6.67	2	6.67	4.06	3.95
		Appraisees	30	38.96	27	35.06	5	6.49	8	10.39	7	9.09	3.84	
7.	A team of principals, vice principals, department heads, students and parents	Appraisers	8	26.67	13	43.33	4	13.33	2	6.67	3	10	3.7	3.52
		Appraisees	19	24.67	24	31.17	10	12.98	12	15.58	12	15.58	3.34	

**Key: Team A:** Principal Vice-principals and department heads Team

B: principal vice-principals, department heads and student

Committees C: principal, vice-principal, department heads, students and parents.

Table 6 item 1, reveals that 25 (83.33%) appraisers and 57 (74.02%) appraises preferred that principals were better appraisers for teacher performance. Similarly, on the same table item 2 indicates that 24(80%) appraisers and 60(77.91%) appraises preferred that teacher performance should be appraised by vice-principals. While item 3 reveals that 24(80%) appraisers and 56(72.72%) appraisees responded that department head, were better appraisers of teachers' performance.

However, only 14(46.66%) appraisers and 36(46.75%) appraises had preferred students as appraisers for teachers performance. As can be observed from table 6 item 5 majority of participants 26(86.67%) appraisers and 52(67.53%) appraises, preferred that a team consisting of principals, vice-principals and department heads could be better appraisers of teachers performance. Still 25(83.33%) appraisers and 57(74.02%) appraises preferred that the team consists of principal. Vice-principals, department heads and students would be better appraisers of performance of teachers. Finally, 21(70%) appraisers and 43(55.84%) appraisees responded that a committee formed from principal, vice-principal, department heads, students and parents would be better appraisers of teachers' performance. As can be noted from the above table 6, all the mean scores for each item were above average.

The data obtained from interview and open ended questions supported the above idea. According to appraisees interview there were poor skilled of appraisers. On the other hand even though some appraisers were competent enough they were not interested and committed to appraise teachers' performance.

**Table 7 Respondents Opinion on Competency of Appraisers.**

S no	Item	Respondents Appraisers (N=30) Appraisees (N =77)	Frequency, percentage and mean										MS	WM
			SA		A		UD		D		SD			
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	Have adequate competence to appraise teachers performance	Appraisers	6	20	10	33.33	3	10	6	20	5	16.7	3.2	3.11
		Appraisees	10	12.99	29	37.66	3	3.89	24	31	11	14.28	3.03	
2	Have good experience to appraise teachers' performance	Appraisers	7	23.33	10	33.333	-	-	10	33.33	3	10	3.26	3.04
		Appraisees	4	5.19	25	32.46	8	10.39	26	33.76	14	18.18	2.83	
3	Have good relationship with teachers	Appraisers	8	26.67	9	30	2	6.67	7	23.33	4	13.33	3.35	3.05
		Appraisees	8	10.39	22	28.57	5	6.49	28	36.36	14	18.18	2.76	
4	Are individuals to be trusted	Appraisers	6	20	11	36.67	2	6.67	6	20	5	16.67	3.23	3.03
		Appraisees	11	14.78	19	24.67	6	7.79	28	36.36	13	16.88	2.83	
5	Asses performance objectively and without bias.	Appraisers	7	23.33	13	43.33	1	3.33	5	16.66	4	13.33	3.46	2.98
		Appraisees	5	6.49	18	23.37	9	11.68	25	32.46	20	25.97	2.5	
6.	Motivate teachers to ask questions about performance appraisal.	Appraisers	4	13.33	9	30	3	10	9	30	5	16.66	2.9	2.78
		Appraisees	6	7.79	20	25.98	7	9.09	30	38.97	14	18.18	2.66	
7	Are good in recording ongoing performance of teachers.	Appraisers	5	16.67	12	40	4	13.33	7	23.33	2	6.67	3.36	2.89
		Appraisees	7	9.09	10	12.98	8	10.38	28	36.36	24	31.16	2.42	
8	Are committed to implement the system	Appraisers	4	13.33	13	43.33	3	10	7	23.33	3	10	3.26	3.05
		Appraisees	7	9.09	21	27.27	8	10.38	27	35.06	14	18.18	2.84	
9	Clearly specify the criteria and techniques used	Appraisers	6	20	12	40	2	6.67	8	26.66	2	6.67	3.4	3.05
		Appraisees	8	10.39	17	22.07	11	14.28	26	33.76	15	19.48	2.7	
10	Openly communicate with the teachers and provide detailed information.	Appraisers	6	20	12	40	2	6.67	7	23.33	3	10	3.36	3.04
		Appraisees	9	11.68	16	20.77	10	12.98	28	36.36	14	18.18	2.71	
11	Have adequate time to appraise.	Appraisers	2	6.60	5	16.66	4	13.33	12	40	7	23.33	2.43	2.51
		Appraisees	6	7.79	13	16.88	8	10.38	36	46.15	14	18.18	2.58	
12	Are faire and ethical in scoring teachers performance appraisal.	Appraisers	6	20	13	43.33	3	10	5	16.66	3	10	3.46	3.12
		Appraisees	8	10.39	19	24.67	9	11.68	31	40.25	10	12.98	2.79	
13	Give regularly and timely performance feed-back.	Appraisers	3	10	8	26.67	3	10	9	30	7	23.33	2.7	2.60
		Appraisees	6	7.79	11	14.28	10	12.98	39	50.64	11	14.28	2.50	
14	Give the highest evaluation scores for the best workers.	Appraisers	5	16.67	13	43.33	2	6.67	7	23.33	3	10	3.38	2.96
		Appraisees	3	3.89	18	23.37	6	7.79	42	54.54	8	10.38	2.55	

As could be seen from items on table 7, 16(53.3%) appraisers and 39(50.65%) appraisees responded that appraisers in the study area had adequate competence to appraise performance of teachers. The mean scores were 3.2 and 3.03 for appraisers and appraisees respectively. Hence this implies that appraisers were competent enough to appraise teacher's performance.

In table 7 item 2, 17 (56.66%) appraisers indicated that appraisers had good experience to appraise teachers' performance whereas 40(51.94%) appraisees reported that appraisers had not good experience to appraise performance of teachers. Similarly in table 7, item3, 17(56.67%) appraisers responded that appraisers of teachers had good relationship with appraisees. On the contrary, 42(54.54%) appraisees responded that there were no good relationship between appraisers and appraisees. Here, the weighted mean was 3.05. Hence, this implies that there were no good relationship between appraisers and appraisees.

As indicated in item 4 of table 7, 17(56.67%) appraisers either agreed or strongly agreed that appraisers were individuals who could be trusted. whereas 41(53.24%) appraisees either disagreed or strongly disagreed that teachers' appraisers were individuals who could not be trusted. The mean score of appraisers was 3.23 and that of appraisees was 2.83.

Item 5 of table 7, depicts 20 (66.66%) appraisers responded that appraisers assessed performance of teachers objectively and without bias. However 45(58.43%) of appraisees reported that appraisers did not assess teachers' performance objectively and there were biases. The mean score of appraisers was 3.46, which was above average and that of appraisees was 2.5 which was far below average.

As it indicated in item 6 of table7, 14(46.66%) and 44(57.15%) appraisers and appraisees respectively reported that appraisers did not motivate teachers to ask questions about their performance appraisal. The weighted mean was 2.78 which is far below average. In table 7 item 7, 17(56.66%) appraisers indicated that appraisers were good in recording ongoing performance of teachers. On the other side 52(67.52%) appraisees responded that appraisers were poor in recording ongoing performance of teachers. Here, the weighted mean was far below averages, which were 2.89. Hence appraisers were not good in recording ongoing performance of teachers. Item 8 and 9 table 7, 17 (56.66%) appraisers either agreed or strongly agreed that appraisers were committed to implement the system, whereas 41(53.24%) appraisees either disagree or strongly disagreed that appraisers were committed to implement the system. Similarly, 18(60%) appraisers were agreed or strongly agreed but 41(53.24%) appraisees either disagreed or

strongly disagreed on the idea that appraisers clearly specify the criteria and techniques used. The mean scores were 3.4 and 2.70 for appraisers and appraisees respectively.

As can be seen from table 7, item 10 above, 18(60%) appraiser responded that appraisers openly communicate with teachers and provide sufficiently detailed information but 42(54.54%) appraisees indicated that appraisers did not openly communicate with their teachers and did not provide sufficiently detailed information. The mean score of appraisers was 3.36, above average and that of appraisees was 2.71 (below average).

In table 7, item 11 the majority of the respondents, 19(63.33%) appraisers and 50(64.33%) appraisees, reported that appraisers had no adequate time to appraise performance of teachers. The weighted mean was 2.51 which were far below average.

As indicated in item 12 of table 7, 19(63.33%) appraisers either agreed or strongly agreed on the idea that appraisers were fair and ethical in scoring teachers' performance appraisal. But 41(53.23%) appraisees either disagreed or strongly disagreed that appraisers were fair and ethical in scoring performance appraisal of teachers. The mean score of appraisers was 3.46, above average, and that of appraisees was 2.79, below average. Hence, majority of appraisers had a positive response, but almost half the appraisees had a negative response on the idea.

As can be noted from table 7, item 13, majority of the respondents 16 (53.33%) appraisers with mean score of 2.7 and 50 (67.51%) appraisees with mean score of 2.50, reported that appraisers did not give regular and timely performance feedback to appraisees.

Item 14 of table 7, depicts that 18(60%) appraisers either agreed or strongly agreed on the idea that appraisers were give the highest evaluation scores for the best workers. But 50 (64.4%) appraisees either disagreed or strongly disagreed that appraisers were give the highest evaluation scores for the best workers. The mean score of appraisers was 3.38, above average, and that of appraisees was 2.55, below average.

**Table 8. Sources for evidence on performance appraisal of teacher**

S No	Item	Respondents Appraisers (N=30) Appraisees (N=77)	Frequency, percentage and mean										MS	WM
			SA		A		UD		D		SD			
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	Self-appraisal	Appraisers	7	23.33	9	30	4	13.33	6	20	4	13.33	3.3	3.28
		Appraisees	16	20.77	29	37.66	6	7.79	12	15.58	14	18.18	3.27	
2	Classroom observation	Appraisers	7	23.33	16	53.33	2	6.67	2	6.67	3	10	3.78	3.59
		Appraisees	17	22.08	32	41.55	7	9.09	11	14.28	10	12.98	3.15	
3	Peers	Appraisers	3	10	15	50	4	13.33	6	20	2	6.67	3.36	3.20
		Appraisees	10	12.98	27	35.06	9	11.69	19	24.67	12	15.58	3.05	
4	Students	Appraisers	8	26.66	10	33.33	4	13.33	6	20	2	6.67	3.53	3.38
		Appraisees	17	22.07	25	32.46	7	9.09	15	19.48	13	16.88	3.23	
5	Appraisers daily documentation	Appraisers	7	23.33	10	33.33	3	10	7	23.33	3	10	3.36	3.24
		Appraisees	12	15.58	28	36.36	7	9.09	18	23.37	12	15.58	3.12	
6	Appraisers personal impression	Appraisers	3	10	8	26.66	4	13.33	10	33.33	5	16.66	2.8	2.91
		Appraisees	15	19.48	25	32.46	6	7.79	20	25.97	11	14.28	3.03	

According to table 8, item 1, 16(53.33%) appraisers and 45(58.43%) appraisees responded that self-appraisal was the better source for teachers' performance appraisal. Item 2 of table 8 indicates that 23(76.66%) appraisers and 49(63.33%) appraisees reported that class room observation was the major sources of evidence for performance appraisal of teachers. Similarly, 18(60%) appraisers and 37(48.04%) appraisees either agreed or strongly agreed that peer evaluation was the source of teachers' performance appraisal in the study area. As can be seen from table 8 item 4, 18 (60%) appraisers and 42(54.54%) appraisees reported that students were taken as source of evidence for performance appraisal of teachers. The mean source of appraisers was 3.53 and that of appraisees was 3.23 and the weighted mean was 3.38. Majority of respondents, 17 (56.66%) appraisers and 40(51.94%) appraisees, responded the most sources of evidence for performance appraisal of teachers. However, a number of participants 15(50%) and 31(40.25%) of appraisers and appraisees respectively responded that appraisers personal impression was not the source evidence for teachers performance. The mean scores were 2.8 and 3.03 for appraisers and appraisees respectively. The weighted mean was 2.91. According to Robbins and Decenzo (1988:256) as the number of tools increased the probability of attaining more accurate information increases. Webb and Norton (1999:198) suggested that tools such as observation, self-evaluation, peer evaluation, students and parents evaluation, portfolio and rating scale are the means to collect information on subordinates' ongoing performance.

#### 4.2.4. The Process of Teachers' Performance Appraisal System

Teachers' performance appraisal should be implemented following systematic processes ordered in logical steps. The major purposes of this study, in this sub-section, were to investigate to what extent of success did the process of TPA implemented in secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa. Hence, to elicit the opinion of respondents about the major processes of TPA, different questions were asked. The participants responded to each item using a five point likert scale which range from strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree and the scores run through five to one respectively.

**Table 9: Types of Teachers' Performance Appraisal Evaluation**

S No	Item	Respondents Appraisers (N=30) Appraisees (N=77)	Frequency, percentage and mean										MS	WM
			SA		A		UD		D		SD			
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	Formative evaluation practiced	Appraisers	2	6.67	9	30	3	10	15	50	1	3.33	2.87	2.83
		Appraisees	8	10.38	20	25.97	6	7.79	33	42.85	10	12.98	2.78	
2	Summative evaluation are clearly specified	Appraisers	2	6.67	20	66.67	2	6.67	4	13.33	2	6.67	3.53	3.78
		Appraisees	2	25.97	47	61.03	4	5.19	5	6.49	1	1.29	4.04	

Item 1 of table 9 portrays that 16(53.33%) and 43(55.83%) appraisers and appraisees respectively responded that formative evaluation was not conducted to take corrective actions in Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa. Moreover, the mean scores of appraisers and appraisees were 2.87 and 2.78 respectively, and its weighed mean was also 2.83 which was below average. As it could be observed from table 9 item 2, 22(73.34%) appraisers and 67(87%) appraisees indicated summative evaluation was most practiced. The mean scores of appraisers was 3.53 and that of appraisees was 4.04 and the weighted mean was 3.78 which was above average. Generally majority of the appraisers and appraisees perceived that summative evaluation was widely used in the schools.

The purpose of formative evaluation are to develop communication skill between the subordinate and the superior, to discuss how the subordinates are working and to take remedial action on performance defaults and thereby help the subordinates improve future performance (webb and Norton, 1999: 375).

**Table 10: Participants Opinion on Approach of Class Room Observation**

S No	Item	Respondents			
		Appraisers (N=30)		Appraisees (N=77)	
		F	%	F	%
	Which approach of classroom observation do appraisers often use?				
	a. Announced visits	10	33.33	23	29.88
	b. Unannounced visits	6	20	14	18.18
	c. Both announced and unannounced visits	14	46.67	40	51.94
	<b>Total</b>	30	100	77	100

As can be observed from the above table, 10 (33.33%) appraisers and 23(29.88%) appraisees responded that an announced classroom observation visits were most practiced in secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa. Of the total respondents 6(20%) and 14 (18.18%) appraisers and appraisees respectively reported that class room observation was practiced through unannounced visits.

Furthermore, the above table reveals that 14(46.67%) appraiser and 40 (51.94%) appraisees indicated that classroom observations were often both announced and unannounced approaches. If classroom observations were not carried out as frequently as possible evidence and realistic remedial to the weaknesses of teachers would not be possible to provide. There is a consensus among many educators and researchers that classroom observation should occupy a prominent on the performance of teachers (Montgomery and Hadfield, 1989:100).

**Table 11: Response of Participants on Appraisal Training.**

S No	Items	Respondents			
		Appraisers (N=30)		Appraisees (N=77)	
		F	%	F	%
<b>1</b>	Have you ever participated in any training related to teacher's performance appraisal?				
	a. Yes	10	33.33	20	25.98
	b. Not sure	3	10	5	6.49
	c. No	17	56.67	52	67.53
	Total	30	100	77	100

As shown in table 11 item 1, 10(33.33%) appraisers and 20(25.98%) appraisees reported that they had participated trainings related to performance appraisal of teachers. On the other hand majority of participants 17(56.67%) and 52(67.53%) appraisers and appraisees respectively responded that no training was given based on teachers' performance appraisal. Moreover, as indicated on table 11 item 1, even though write training was provided, 17(56.67%) appraisers and 52(67.53%) appraisees rated that the training was not sufficient to implement performance of teachers properly.

**Table 12: Frequency of Evaluations and Scales of Evaluations.**

No	Items	Respondents			
		Appraisers (N=30)		Appraisees (N=77)	
		F	%	F	%
1	How often evaluation of teachers performance appraisal is conducted?				
	a. Every week	---	---	---	---
	b. Every two weeks	2	6.67	---	---
	c. Every month	5	16.67	10	13.0
	d. Every quarter	7	23.33	17	22.07
	e. Every semester	10	53.33	50	64.93
	Not at all	-		-	
Total	30	100	77	100	
2	How much are you comfortable with the scales used to evaluate performance appraisal of teacher?				
	a. Very high	---	---	---	---
	b. High	3	10	2	2.60
	c. Medium	9	30	11	14.28
	d. Low	10	33.33	48	62.28
	e. Very low	8	26.67	16	20.78
	Total	30		77	100

Items 1 of table 12 shows that 2(6.67%) appraisers responded that often formative evaluation of teachers performance was conducted every two weeks. A considerable number of participants, 5(16.67%) and 10(13%) of appraisers and appraisees respectively reported that the evaluation performance of teachers was conducted every month. Of the total participants 7(23.33%) appraisers and 17 (22.07%) appraisees, ongoing evaluation of teachers was conducted every quarter of the year. Finally 16(53.33%) appraisers and 50(64.93%) appraisees indicated that teachers' performance was conducted every semester.

As can be seen from table 12 item 2, 3(10%) appraisers and 2(2.60%) appraisees responded that they were comfortable with the scales used to evaluate performance of teachers. However, 18(60%) appraisers and 64(83.12%) appraisees were not comfortable with the scales of evaluation. The rest 9 (30%)

appraisers 11(14.28%) appraises indicated that the scales of evaluation were moderately conformability with the appraising scale.

The interview responses confirm that the process of teachers' performance appraisal system implementation in government secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa did not follow the same process. Even with in a school there were differences in practice across appraisers. Moreover, the process of teachers' appraisal was dependent on reports of quantity and was not checked its quality. In the sample schools classroom observation was not focused. The document analysis indicates that most of the time the sample schools, per and post appraisal discussions were not conducted.

#### **4.2.5. Problems Related Teachers Performances Appraisal System Implementation**

Teaching learning process is very sophisticated and difficult to assess teaching performance of teachers using a single criterion. As much as possible different questions related to teacher's performance appraisal were raised to identify the problems that hinder the effectiveness of the system. The two groups of participants responded to each items using five point likert scale which ranged as strongly agree (SA), Agree (A), undecided (UD), disagree (D) and strongly disagree (SD) and the scores run through five to one respectively. Based on the frequency of responses to each of the options percentages and means were computed and analysis was made next.

**Table 13: Problems Related to Appraisers**

S No	Item	Respondents Appraisers (N=30) Appraisees (N=77)	Frequency, Percentage And Mean										MS	WM
			SA		A		UD		D		SD			
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	Are not willing to appraise (perception related problem)	Appraiser	5	16.67	13	43.33	4	13.33	5	16.67	3	10	3.4	3.52
		Appraisees	20	25.97	30	38.96	9	11.69	16	20.78	2	2.6	3.65	
2	Lack of the required knowledge and experience	Appraiser	7	23.33	10	33.33	3	10	8	26.67	2	6.67	3.4	3.45
		Appraisees	15	19.48	31	40.26	14	18.18	12	15.58	5	6.49	3.51	
3	Do not have adequate lack of time	Appraiser	6	20	12	40	4	13.33	6	20	2	6.67	3.47	3.54
		Appraisees	16	20.78	34	44.15	13	16.88	10	12.99	4	5.19	3.62	
4	Do not follow appraisal procedure criteria and the right techniques	Appraiser	6	20	11	36.67	3	10	7	23.33	3	10	3.33	3.41
		Appraisees	13	16.88	36	46.75	8	10.39	16	20.78	4	5.19	3.49	
5	Lack of timely feed-back	Appraiser	10	33.33	13	43.33	2	6.67	5	16.67	-	-	3.93	3.87
		Appraisees	26	33.76	28	36.36	6	7.80	17	22.07	-	-	3.82	
6	Lack of documentation on teachers' performance	Appraiser	8	26.67	13	43.33	2	6.67	5	16.67	2	6.67	3.67	3.66
		Appraisees	23	29.87	30	38.96	6	7.50	10	12.99	8	10.39	3.65	

As one could see from table 13, item 1, 18(60%) appraisers and 50(64.93%) appraisees responded that appraisers in secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa were not willing to appraise performance of teachers. Furthermore, as indicated in table 13 item 2, 17(56.66%) appraisers and 46(59.74%) appraisees reported that appraisers lacked the required knowledge and experience in appraising teachers performance. The majority of participants, 18(60%) appraisers and 50(64.93%) appraisees, indicated there were problems caused by appraisers because they had not adequate time to appraise performance of teachers. The weighted mean value was 3.54 which were above average.

Similarly, as can be seen from table 13, item 4 and 5, 17 (56.66%) and 49(63.63%) appraisers and appraisees reported that the appraisers did not follow appraisal procedures and the weighted mean was 3.41 which was above average of the participants 23(76.66%) and 54 (70.12%) appraisers and appraisees respectively indicated that the most critical problem was lack of timely feedback of appraisers. The mean score for appraisers was 3.93 and 3.82 for appraisees. Furthermore, table 13 item 6, 21(70%) appraisers and 53(68.83%) appraisees responded that lack of documentation on performance of teachers was found to be one of the most serious problems in secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa. The weighted mean was calculated 3.66 (above average). Generally, appraisers conducted with no adequate timely feedback, lack of documentation and lack of time on teachers; performance appraisal.

**Table 14: Major Problems Related to the Design and Implementation of Teachers' Performance Appraisal:**

S No	Item	Respondents		Frequency, Percentage And Mean										
		Appraisers (N=30)	SA		A		UD		D		SD		MS	WM
		Appraisers (N=77)	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
1	In appropriate criteria techniques used and feedback procedures of the appraisal system	Appraisers (N=30)	8	26.67	18	60	1	3.33	2	6.67	1	3.33	4.06	3.92
		Appraisees (N = 77)	19	24.67	36	46.75	12	15.60	6	7.80	4	5.19	3.78	
2	Lack of continuous evaluation through the semester or the year	Appraisers (N=30)	8	26.67	15	50	2	6.67	4	5.19	1	1.30	3.83	3.67
		Appraisees (N = 77)	17	22.08	32	41.55	8	10.39	13	16.88	7	9.09	3.51	
3	Lack of participation of appraisers and appraises in the formulation of appraisal plan	Appraisers (N=30)	9	30	15	50	1	3.33	3	10	2	6.67	3.84	3.65
		Appraisees (N = 77)	18	23.37	30	38.96	9	11.69	10	12.99	10	12.99	3.43	
4	Evaluating teacher than comparisons with other teacher	Appraisers (N=30)	5	16.67	14	46.67	3	10	6	20	2	6.67	3.47	3.39
		Appraisees (N = 77)	14	18.18	30	38.96	10	12.99	12	15.58	11	14.28	3.31	
5	Resistance of teachers to accept their appraisal results	Appraisers (N=30)	6	20	10	33.33	4	13.33	7	23.33	3	10	3.3	3.23
		Appraisees (N = 77)	9	11.19	34	44.15	8	10.39	12	15.58	14	18.18	3.16	
6	Lack of motivation for best performers	Appraisers (N=30)	9	30	8	26.67	6	20	7	23.33	--	--	3.63	3.96
		Appraisees (N = 77)	27	35.05	31	40.26	8	10.39	6	7.80	5	6.49	3.9	
7	Appraising teachers based on students result	Appraisers (N=30)	7	23.33	14	46.67	3	10	4	13.33	2	6.67	3.67	3.61
		Appraisees (N = 77)	15	21.42	31	44.28	9	12.86	8	11.42	7	10	3.56	
8	Absence of appropriate appraisers	Appraisers (N=30)	10	33.33	5	16.67	6	20	8	26.67	1	3.33	3.5	3.68
		Appraisees (N = 77)	26	33.76	31	40.26	9	11.69	6	7.79	5	6.49	3.87	
9	It is too much paper work	Appraisers (N=30)	10	33.33	7	23.33	4	13.33	7	23.33	2	6.67	3.53	3.59
		Appraisees (N = 77)	20	25.97	32	41.56	9	11.69	10	12.99	6	7.79	3.65	

As it could be seen in table 14 item 1, 26(86.67%) appraisers and 55 (71.42%) appraisees responded that the problems that encountered the effectiveness of teachers' performance appraisal system was the inappropriate criteria developed and used. The mean scores were found to be 4.06 and 3.78 for appraisers and appraisees respectively and the weighted mean was 3.92 which is far above average. As the report of 23(76.67%) appraisers and 49(63.63%) appraisees, lack of continuous evaluation throughout the semester or the year was a serious problem in secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa.

Fundamentally, lack of participation of appraisers and appraisees in the formulation of appraisal was a problem that hinder the implementation of the appraisal as indicated by 24(80%) appraisers and 48(62.33%) appraisees. The weighted mean was 3.65. Similarly as can be seen from item 4 and 5 of table 14.19 (63.34%) and 44(57.14%) appraisers and appraisees respectively indicated that problems were caused due to evaluating performance of teachers in comparison with other teachers and 16(53.33%) appraisers and 43(55.84%) appraisees responded that there were resistance of teachers to accept their appraisal result. Concerning communication there must be a transparency between appraisers and appraisees and should have common understanding on the appraisal system.

Item 6 of table 14 reveals that more than half of appraisers and three fourth of appraisees responded that there was a lack of motivation for best workers. However, table 14 items 7 reveals those 21 (70%) appraisers and 46(65.7%) appraisees believed that appraising teachers based on students result was a critical problem that made assessment of students ineffective.

Table 14 item 8, Portrays that 15(50%) appraisers and 57(74.02%) appraisees responded that lack of appropriate appraisers encountered the effectiveness implementation of the appraisal system but 9(30%) and 11(4.29%) appraisers and appraisees respectively denied this idea. The weighted mean of the two groups was found to be 3.68 which were far above average. In table 14, item 9, the majority of both groups of respondents, 17(56.66%) appraisers and 52(67.53%) appraisees, indicated the appraisal system was too much paper work even though it was denied by 9(30%) and 16(20.78%) appraisers and appraisees respectively.

The mean score of appraisers was 3.53 and the weighted mean was 3.59 which was far above average.

Generally speaking, as it can be seen in table 14 the major problems that encounter the effective implementation of teachers' performance appraisal system in government secondary school of Lideta

sub-city in Addis Ababa were lack of motivation, inappropriateness of criteria ,absences of relevant appraiser, lack of continuous evaluations were identified as the most serious problems.

The data collected from open-ended questions and the interview made with both appraisers and appraisees confirms that appraising teachers' performance based on students result forced teachers to add marks for students in order to score high performance appraisal results. Furthermore, some criteria of the appraisal system were full of subjectivity and there were not skilled appraisers who give continuous feedbacks to improve the teaching-learning process.

Moreover, one of the most critical problems was appraising teachers' performance based on their reports. Hence, it is possible to show that no uniformity of appraising teachers' performance and common understanding, acceptance and commitment on the system. The problem was that, the appraisal system was too much paper work.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### 5. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

This chapter presents the summary of the major findings of the study, the conclusions drawn based on the findings and the recommendations that the researcher assumed worth if applied in improving performance appraisal of teachers in government secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa.

#### 5.1. Summary

The main purpose of the study was to assess the implementation of performance appraisal of teachers in government secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa. In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the following basic questions were formulated to guide the study.

- To what extent are the major purposes of teachers' performance appraisal system in government secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in terms of (levels of competency, enhance teachers efficiency, improve accountability, timely feedback) effective?
- To what extent do appraisers and appraisees participate in developing the appraisal criteria, techniques used and feedback procedures?
- Who are involved in appraising teachers' performance?
- To what extent is the process of teachers' performance appraisal system interims of (skill, competency, and transparency) effective?
- What are the major problems in practicing TPA system in the sample schools?

Since the study was aimed at examining the implementation of performance appraisal system in government secondary schools of Lideta sub-city in Addis Ababa, a descriptive survey method was employed to address all issues of the study. The selection of the research method was based on the nature of the problem. In order to ensure sample representative all the 3 government secondary schools of Lideta sub-city were included in the study. For this study there were two groups of participants, there were appraisees (principals, vice principals and department heads) and appraisees (teachers). A simple random sampling and purposive sampling techniques were employed to select participants of the study. Purposive sampling techniques was employed to select principals and vice principals and because they were small in number and rich in information on the issue under study. The rest participants (department head and

teachers) were selected using a simple random sampling technique that gives equal chance of being selected. As a result, 32 appraisers and 80 appraisees (N=112) were included in the study.

Three basic data gathering tools, questionnaire, and interview and document analysis were used. In this study a total of 112 questionnaires were distributed to collect data for the study. Out of the total distributed questionnaire 30 (93.75%) from appraisers and 77 (96.25%) from appraisees were appropriately filled and returned. Finally the collected data were carefully categorized, tallied and presented.

In order to analyze the data collected statistical tools like frequency, percentage, mean and weighted mean were employed.

### **5.1.1. Characteristics of Participants**

Concerning the characteristics of participants, out of the total participants of the study 89 (83.18%) were males and 18(16.82%) were females. Majority of the participants, 33.33% appraisers and 38.96% appraisees were in the age ranging 26-30 years.

Regarding work experience, 50% appraisers and 38.96% appraisees have worked 6 – 10 years. Moreover, 83.33% of appraisers and 87.01% appraisees of appraises were first degree holders in the sample schools. The weekly teaching load of 72.22% of appraisers and 54.54% of appraisees was found to be 11-15 periods per week.

### **5.1.2. Summary of Major Finding**

#### **5.1.2.1. The purpose of Teachers' Performance Appraisal**

Concerning the purposes of performance appraisal of teachers, the study showed that appraising performance of teachers effectively used for identifying teachers' professional training needs with However, the purposes of appraisal system as measurement of job performance of teachers' as a means of improvement of the quality of teaching learning process and to strength the relationship among teachers', appraisers and students were practiced effectively Generally, the goals and objectives of teachers' performance appraisal system was not achieved as claimed by 18(60%) appraisers and 54(70.12%) appraisees.

### **5.1.2.2. Development of Teachers' Performance Appraisal Criteria, Techniques Used and Feed-Back Procedures.**

Concerning the development of teachers' performance appraisal criteria, techniques used and feedback procedures department heads, vice principals and principals did not participated in the development of teachers performance criteria.

As perceived by both group of respondents, indicated that the criteria of appraisal were related with educational objectives. However, that appraisal criteria were not developed on career of teachers' with weighted mean of 2.03.

### **5.1.2.3. Competency of Appraisers**

Regarding the competency of appraisers, a committee comprising the principal, vice principals, department heads and students would be better appraisers.

On the other hand, appraiser's skill to motivate teachers to ask questions about their performance appraisal was not effectively practiced as indicated by 14(46.66%) appraisers and 44(57.15%) appraises with weighted mean 2.78. In addition to this, it was poorly practiced in giving regularly and timely performance feedback for teachers as indicated by 19(63.33%) appraisers and 50(64.33%) appraises.

### **5.1.2.4. The Process of Teachers' Performance Appraisal System Implementation**

Reports of appraisers and appraisees, 23(76.66%) and 49(63.63%) respectively, indicated that class room observation would be the main sources of evidence for performance appraisal of teachers. Similarly, 18(60%) appraisers and 42(54.54%) appraisees responded that students would be source of evidence for performance of teachers. The study showed that summative evaluation was employed for appraising teacher's performance as indicated by the weighted mean value of 3.78.

Majority of participants, 14(46.67%) appraisers 40(51.94%) appraisees indicated that class room observations were conducted through both announced and unannounced visits. Concerning participation in training related to teacher performance appraisal, 17 (56.67%) appraisers and 52(67.53%) appraisees were reported that they did not participated in any training related teachers' performance appraisal.

Moreover, 18(60%) appraisers and 64(83.12%) appraisees were not conformable with the scales of evaluation. Similarly, 16(53.33%) appraisers and 50(64.93%) appraisees responded that evaluation of teachers' performance appraisal would be conducted in every semester.

### **5.1.2.5. Problems Related Teachers Performance Appraisal System**

Regarding to the major problems related to appraisers the majority of participants, 23(76.66%) appraisers and 54(70.12%) appraisees indicated that the most critical problem was appraisers lacked timely feedback for appraises. Similarly appraisers, 21(70%) appraisers and 53(68.83%) appraisees reported that lack of documentation on performance of teachers' was one of the basic problem of appraisers.

Furthermore majority of respondents, 26(86.67%) appraisers and 55(71.42%) appraisees responded the critical problem that encountered the effectiveness of the teachers' performance appraisal system was inappropriate criteria used.

Fundamentally, 24(80%) and 48(62.33%) appraisees indicated that lack of participation of appraisers and appraisees in the formulation of appraisal plan was one of the basic problem of implementation teachers' performance appraisal system.

Moreover, 17(56.67%) appraisers and 58(75.32%) appraisees believed that one of the major problem was lack of motivation for best school teachers.

## **5.2. Conclusion**

Based on the major findings and in light of the title of the study. The following conclusions were drawn.

- The purpose of teachers' performance appraising system was not effective in measuring job performance of teachers; it was also ineffective in improvement of the teaching- learning process. As a result the goals and objectives of teachers performance system was not achieved in the study schools.
- Indeed appraisers (principals, vice principals and department heads) and teachers did not participated in development of teachers performance criteria.
- The study revealed that in the study schools appraisal criteria were not developed on career of teachers. For career - progression evaluation, the ministry should develop a smaller set of criteria common across schools, reflecting the core aspects of teaching profession, it is important to incuse that all actors have a common understanding of expectations for career progression.
- Majority of respondents have answered, for effective evaluation the competency of appraisers could be a committee allow a verity of appraisers comprising the principal, vice- principals, department heads and students. That helps of set bias and favoritism. Evaluation the appraisal scheme should allow variety of appraisers that help offset bias and favoritism.

- The study revealed that lack of motivation for best school teachers and timely feedback, shortage of participation in any training related to teachers' performance appraisal and unproper documentation on performance of teachers were the basic problems for the practical activity of teacher performance appraisal system in Lideta sub – city secondary schools.
- Majority of respondents revealed that in Lideta Sub –city secondary schools formative evaluations were not practiced, teachers performance evaluation was conducted once in a semester.

### **5.3. Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study and the conclusions drawn, the following feasible recommendations were forwarded.

1. As the findings of the investigation revealed that both appraisers and appraisees did not involved in development of the appraisal criteria and techniques used. Basically both appraisers and appraisees should not only implementers but also formulators of appraisal criteria and techniques used of the system. Therefore appraisal criteria and techniques used should be developed through the participation of both appraisers and appraisees. According to Desselet (2011:97) performance to be effective, they should have the characteristics of validity, reliability, acceptability and specificity. For effective implementation of appraisal criteria. Thus teachers and school leaders should participate in the development of teachers performance appraisal criteria in the study area.  
So that teachers could have good feeling in the implementation stage and they may not resist and criticize the criteria and techniques used. In order to make the system uniform all over the country and by identifying direct participation of appraisers and appraisees in developing and revision time, ministry of education should prepare a guide line for an appraisal system taking into consideration best experiences in the country. Therefore, the current performance appraisal system should be revised as much as possible in every 5 years with full participation of appraisers and appraisees.
2. Basically, it is not possible to participate all appraisers and teachers in the development of teachers' performance appraisal criteria. In order to have effective appraisal system, all appraisers and teachers should be given basic trainings as sub-city and school level before the implementation of the system. In addition to this, to develop adequate knowledge and skills of appraisers and appraisees short training should be provided by education bureau and sub -city experts and supervisors.
3. The findings of the study revealed that appraisers were not competent enough and some were not committed to appraise teachers' performance. To solve this problem, school principals should assign

well experienced, knowledgeable, skillful, well committed and positive thinkers as appraisers of the system.

4. The findings revealed that teachers' performance appraisal system was ineffective in its implementation, because it was too much paper work. In order to solve this problem, the main focus of teacher's performance appraisal should have been focus on the teaching-learning process, should have been integrated with professional development of teachers and should be on career ladder of teachers.
5. Regarding types of evaluation activities that should be based on formative evaluation and continuously evaluated and those of evaluated at the end of a semester should be clearly specified. According Santiago (2009: 96) formative evaluation is ongoing, coaching and counseling which is done to improve teacher's performance. The researcher concluded that the research study schools could not protect from unnecessary wastages of resources, in general without using formative evaluation regularly cannot improve the teaching learning process.

In order to achieve the intended objectives of the appraisal system at the end, sufficient classroom observations, better follow-up and immediate feed-back should be carried out effectively by appraisers. The above mentioned activities should be emphasized and the school principals and vice-principals should be accountable bodies in arranging and approving their practicability.

6. During gathering evidences for teachers' performance appraisal, appraisers should use different and basic sources of evidence and appraisers should be good recorders of activities of teachers following appraisal procedures and effective in providing corrective actions if problems were occurred. To reduce errors and uncertainty in appraising teachers Performance, it is better if a committee performed comprising all concerned bodies such as (principals, vice principals, department heads) that directly or indirectly influence performance of teachers. Furthermore, to make a similar performing of the appraisal system indifferent secondary schools, sharing of experience should be exercised. This could be facilitated and arranged by sub-city and Addis Ababa educational bureau experts and supervisors.

## References

- Arreola, R.A (1995). *Developing a Comprehensive Evaluation system*. A Hand book for College and Administrators on Designing and Operating a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System. San Francisco: Anker Press, Bolton Mass.
- Berhanu (2006). Implementation of Result-oriented Teachers' Performance Appraisal, as Perceived by Principals and Teachers. (unpublished master's Thesis). Addis Ababa University.
- Berry,p.(2003) .Working Towards Result: Managing Individual Performance in the Public Service. *Managing the Public Service for Improvement Series: London*
- Bollington, R.et.al; (1990). An Introduction to Teacher Appraisal. London: Cassell Educational Limited.
- Byers and Rue. (1987) .The Continuing Professional Development of Teachers: International and professional contexts, Cardiff, UCW
- Carnegie, M (2000). *Performance management Process*. London: New Delhi Saga publications
- Chandan, J.S.(2003). *Management Concepts and Strategies*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing Company.
- Cook, J. (1995) . *Managing Employee Performance and Reward: Concepts, Practices, Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J.W (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and mixed Approaches*. London: New Delhi Saga publications.
- Culling ford, J.S (1995).Introduction to Educational Administration. Massachusetts; Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Dailey, R.C. (1988). *Understanding People in Organization*. St. Paul: West Publishing Company.
- Desseler. G. (1998). *Organization and Management*. Roslon, Virginia: Reston Publishing
- Dickinson (1993), "*PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT: The new realities*", London Eisner, D. B .(1999).The Best Techniques for managing teachers. Roslon, Virginia: Reston Publishing

- company. FCSC (1995 E.C). Result-oriented Performance Appraisal. Addis Ababa. (Unpublished).
- Duke, D.L. (1995). *Teachers' Evaluation Policy from Accountability to Professional Development*. New York: State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Fletcher, C. (2008). *Appraisal, Feedback and Development*. Roudge publishing, London.
- Girma S. (2011). An assessment of Teachers' Attitude Towards Appraisal System. (unpublished Master's Thesis). Addis Ababa University
- Gorton,R.(1983).*School Administration and Supervision*. Dubuque Iowa. Wm.C.Brow Company  
 Publisher
- Greer,B. (2001), *The performance measurement management, and appraisal sourcebook*, U.S.A.
- Grote, D. (2002). *The Performance Appraisal Question and Answer book: a Survival guide for Managers*. USA
- Harris. L.(1988). *An organizational analysis of multiple perspectives of effective teaching: New Delhi National press publication.*
- Howthorne, R.(1981). *Teacher Evaluation Handbook*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E.Merrill  
 Publishing Co.
- Isore, NS.(2008). *Personnel Management*. New York: Sage Publications, Inc
- Khan(2008) , *Translating Strategy into Action - The Balanced Scorecard*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
- Kondrasuk (2002). Exemplary teachers: Practicing an ethic of care in England, Ireland, and the United States. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education*,

- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. (2<sup>nd</sup> revised Ed.). New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.
- Latham and Wexley (1977). *Human Resource Management*. (5th edition) Irwin/McGraw-Hill, USA.
- Maduabum, M. A. (1989), *Teaching Integrated Science Effectively*. Onitsha: Brano Graphic Manual. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Mathis R.L & Jackson, J.H. (1997). *Human Resource Management*. New York.. West
- McCormick, A., Adams, D. & Gamage, D. (2009). How does school Leaders Role Influence Student Achievement? A Review of Research Findings and Best Practices. Vol. 4 (1).McGreal (2000). Cross cultural competency and multicultural teacher education.
- Mealiea,LW..(1996). Skills for Managerial Success. Chicago: IRWIN.*
- Melaku Y. (2010). *Resource Management in Education*, Addis Ababa University (unpublished module)
- Melaku, Y (1992). *Appraiser-Appraise Peraption of Teachers Performance Appraisal*. Addis Ababa University (unpublished Master"s Thesis).
- Montgomery,D. and Hadfield,N.(1989). *Practical Teacher Appraisal*. London :Kogan Paye
- Olson, R.F (1981), *Performance Resource Management for Effective Schools*. Boston: Pearson
- Pratt and Bennett(1990).*Appraisal Routes to improved performance"*, London, Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Publishing company. Matthews. (2009). *Performance Management- Basic concept*, St. Paul, Minnesota, USA.
- Reinke,R.W(2003).*Human Resource Management*. New York West Publishing company.
- Review of Educational Research. London*
- Robbins, M.and Decenzo,R.(1988). *Essensals of Organizational Behavior*. Boston: prentice Hall
- Robert, J. H. (2003). *Linking teacher evaluation and student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Rudner,m.(1992). *Traits of highly effective teachers: How to hire, coach, and mentor successful teachers*, CA: Corwin Press.
- Sachs, H. (1992). *Qualities of effective teachers. (2nd Ed)*, Alexandria, VA: ASCD
- Saiyadain( 1999). *A Hand book of Practices and Techniques for Managing by objective*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
- Santiago,D.(2009). *Keys for Teacher Evaluation System recommendations for improvement. New Delhi National press publication.*
- Smith(2001). „Performance management model: A systems based approach to public service quality“, *The International journal of Public Sector Management*, Atlanta, GA: Georgia Department of Education
- Stronge, J. (2010). *Research synthesis of Georgia teacher evaluation standards*. Atlanta, GA: Georgia Department of Education.
- Thomas H. (1982). *A Mangers’ Guide to Performance Appraisal*. London. Collier Macmillan Publishers.
- Watz and Levy.,(2004.) *Corporate Performance Management*, Butterworth –Heinmann , USA.
- Webb, L.and Norton,M.(1999).*Human Resource Administration: pesonnel Issues and needs in Education*. Upper sadle River: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- William, R.(2012).*Teacher keys evaluation system hand book*. Georgia, state school super INtedent.
- Wise k.(1998). The role of performance-related pay in renegotiating the effort Bargain. British public service, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*
- Yilma G(2007). **Practice and Problems of Results-oriented Teachers’ Performance Appraisal** (unpublished Master’s Thesis). Addis Ababa University.
- MOE ትምህርት ሚኒስትር (1979 ዓ/ም) ኢንስፎክሽን መግለጫ, መመሪያና ዘገባ:: ኣዲስ ኣበባ (ያልታተመ) ::

## **APPENDIX A**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

**QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE FILLED BY APPRAISERS AND APPRAISEES**

### **Dear Respondents:**

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather data for the thesis entitled “FACTORS THAT AFFECT TEACHERS PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN ADDIS ABABA: THE CASE OF LIDETA SUB-CITY”. It is believed that your honest and genuine responses to each item in this questionnaire will have a high contribution to the success of the study.

### **General Direction**

In responding the following questions, please note that:

- ✓ No need to write your name
- ✓ Provide your responses by putting a tick mark “✓” in the space provided for objective type of questions and write brief answers to open end questions.
- ✓ Be sure that all your responses will be kept confidential and would only be employed for the academic purposes.
- ✓ It is of great help not to leave any question unanswered or uncompleted?

Thank you very much for your cooperation!

### Part One: Personal Information

- 1.1. School Name \_\_\_\_\_
- 1.2. Sex: a) Male  b) Female
- 1.3. Age (in year): a) 20 - 25  b) 26 - 30  c) 31 - 35  d) 36 - 40   
e) 41 - 45  f) 46 - 50  g) 51 and above
- 1.4. Service (in year)
- a) 5 and below  b) 6 - 10  c) 11 - 15  d) 16 - 20  e) 21 - 25   
f) 26 - 30  g) 31 and above
- 1.5. Your current position in the organization is
- a) Principal  b) vice-principal  c) Department head  e) teacher   
f) others (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 1.6. Your Academic qualification is
- a) B.A/B.Sc/B.Ed  b) M.A/M.Sc/M.Ed  c) Others (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 1.7. Field of study (specialization) \_\_\_\_\_
- 1.8. Weekly Teaching Load (for teachers)
- a) 10 and below  b) 11 - 15  c) 16 - 20  d) 21 - 25   
e) 26 and above

### Part - Two: Questions Related to the Purposes of Teachers' Performance Appraisal

Instruction: indicate the level of your agreement on the following five point scale by putting a tick mark “✓” for each of the items which are assumed to be purpose (5) of teachers' performance appraisal. (Strongly agree (5A), agree (A), undecided (UD), disagree (DA), and strongly disagree (SD)).

2.1 Concerning the purpose (5) of teacher's performance appraisal at your school, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

S. No	Items	Scale for Responses				
		SA	A	UD	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	To identify teachers' professional training needs					
2.	To decide on teachers' salary increment					
3.	To decide on teachers' promotion or demotion					
4.	To decide on teachers' transfer					
5.	To reward competent teachers					
6.	To motivate teachers on their job					
7.	To promote teachers knowledge and skill					
8.	To measure job performance of teachers					
9.	To improve the quality of teaching-learning process					
10.	To measures teachers' professional competence					
11.	To provide feedback for teachers					
12.	To strengthen the relationship between teachers and students					
13.	To strengthen the relationship between teachers and appraisers					
14.	To strengthen the relationship between teachers and parents					
15.	To achieve school goals and objectives					

2.2. Please, list if any purpose of teachers' performance appraisal is left out \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2.3. Describe whether teachers' performance appraisal system in your school is successful in attaining its purpose? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Part Three: Questions related to development of teachers’ performance appraisal criteria.**

**Instruction:** Indicate in rating on the five points scale by putting a tick mark “√” for each of the items the degree in which the listed participants involved in the development of criteria techniques used and feedback procedures for performance appraisal of teachers. (Very high (VH), High (H), Medium (M), low (L), very low (VL))

**3.1. Concerning the development of teachers performance appraisal criteria techniques used and feedback procedure to what extent have the following participants involved?**

No	Items	Scale for Responses				
		VH	H	M	L	VL
	<b>The participants involved in the development of teachers performance appraisal criteria techniques used and feedback procedure are:</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
1.	Teachers					
2.	Department heads					
3.	Vice Principals					
4.	Principals					
5.	Sub-city education office experts and supervisors					
6.	Education bureau experts or supervisors					
7.	Experts of ministry of education					
8.	Not sure					

**3.2. In your opinion, how important are the following aspects of criteria techniques used and feedback procedures when implement the appraisal?**

No	Items the stated criteria techniques used and feedback procedures are	Scale for Responses				
		5A	A	UD	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Related with educational objectives					
2.	Relevant with teachers' professional development					
3.	All my duties are measured in the evaluation criteria, techniques and feedback procedure					
4.	Objectively measure teachers performance					
5.	Complete to measure overall performance of teachers					
6.	Effective in creating conducive environment between teachers and appraisers.					
7.	Well defined and clearly stated in unambiguous words					
8.	Based on career ladder of teacher					

3.3. List down if you have any other comment regarding teacher's performance criteria techniques used and feed-back procedures that your school is following? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Part – Four: Questions related to competency of appraisers**

**Instruction:** Indicate your level of agreement on the five points scale by putting a tick mark “✓” for each the item which are on competency of appraisers. (Strongly agree (SA, Agree (A), Undecided (UD), Disagree (DA), and Strongly Disagree (SD)).

**4.1. In your opinion, who should better appraise the performance of teachers?**

No	Items	Scale for Responses				
		SA	A	UD	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Principal					
2.	Vice principal					
3.	Department heads					
4.	Students					
5.	A team of principal, vice-principals and department head					
6.	A team of principal, vice-principals, department head and students					
7.	A team of principal, vice-principals, department heads, students and parents					

**4.2. Regarding the competency of appraisers at your schools, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?**

No	Items	Scales for Responses				
		5A	A	UD	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Have adequate competence appraise teacher performance					
2.	Have good Experience to appraise teachers performance					
3.	Have good relationship with teachers					
4.	Are individuals to be trusted					
5.	Assess performance objectively and without bias					
6.	Motivate teachers to ask questions related with teachers performance appraisal					
7.	Are good in recording ongoing performance of teachers					
8.	Are committed to implement the system					
9.	Clearly specify the criteria, techniques used					
10.	Openly communicate with the teachers and provide detailed information					
11.	Have adequate time to appraise					
12.	Are fair and ethical in scoring teachers performance appraisal					
13.	Give regularly and timely performance feed-back					
14.	Give the highest evaluation score for the best workers.					

**4.3. From the following assumed sources of appraisal, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?**

No	Items	Scale for Responses				
	The most objective source of evidence for teachers' performance appraisal in your school is:	5A	A	UD	D	5D
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Self-appraisal					
2.	Class room observation					
3.	Students					
4.	Appraisers daily documentation					
5.	Appraisers personal impression					

**4.4. Please write if you have any suggestion on the competency of appraisers in your school in evaluating teachers' performance?** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Part Five: Questions related to the process of teachers’ performance appraisal system**

**Instruction:** Indicate your level of on the five points scale by putting a tick mark “✓” for each of the item which are on the process of teachers’ performance appraisal system implementation. (Strongly agree (5A), Agree (A), Undecided (UD), Disagree (DA), and strongly agree (SD))

**5.1. Concerning the type of evaluation, which do you agree or disagree with the following statements?**

No	Items	Scale for Responses				
		5A	A	UD	D	5D
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Formative evaluation conducts to take corrective					
2.	Summative evaluations are clearly specified and taken on line...					

- 5.2. Which approach of class room observation do appraises often use?  
 A. Announced Visits    B. Unannounced Visits    C. Both Announced and Unannounced
- 5.3. Monitoring of teachers’ performance appraisal is taken.  
 A. Weekly    B. Every Two Week    C. Monthly    D. Quarterly
- 5.4. Have you ever participated in any training related to teachers’ performance appraisal?  
 A. Yes    B. Not sure    C. no
- 5.5. How often evaluation of teachers’ performance appraisal is conducted?  
 A. Every Week    B. Every Two Weeks    C. Ever Month    D. Every Quarter  
 E. Every Semester
- 5.6. How much are you comfortable with the scales used to evaluate performance appraisal of teachers in your school?  
 A. Very High    B. High    C. Medium    D. Low    E. Very Low
- 5.7. Do you have any comment on the process of teachers’ performance appraisal system?

---



---

**Part-Six: Questioner Related to Problem of Teachers’ Performance Appraisal System Implementation.**

Instruction; indicate your level of agreement on the following five points scale by putting a tick mark “v” for each of the items which are assumed to be problems of teachers’ performance appraisal system implementation (Strongly agree (5A), agree (A), Undecided (UD), and Strongly disagree (5D)

**a. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?**

No	Items <b>To Appraise Teachers’ Performance Appraisers</b>	Scale for Responses				
		5A	A	UD	D	5D
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	Are not willing to appraise					
2.	Lack of the required knowledge and experience...					
3.	Lack of time					
4.	Do not follow appraisal procedure criteria and the right techniques					
5.	Lack of timely feedback...					
6.	Lack of documentation on teachers’ performance...					

**6.2. Concerning appraisal design and implementation problems that you have in your school, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?**

No	Items <b>The major problems in implementing teachers’ performance appraisal system are related to</b>	Scale for Responses				
		5A	A	UD	D	5D
		5	4	3	2	1
1.	In appropriate criteria techniques used, feedback procedures of the appraisal system					
2.	Lack of continuous evaluation through the semester or the year					
3.	Lack of participation of appraises and appraisers in the formation of appraisal plan					
4.	evaluating teachers in comparisons with other teachers					

5.	resistance of teachers to accept their appraisal results					
6.	lack of motivation for best performers					
7.	appraising teachers based on students result					
8.	absence of appropriate appraisers					
9.	it is too much paper work					

**6.3. What kind of problems have you observed in the implementation performance appraisal system? Can you suggest solutions for the problems you have observed? Do you have any ideas how to improve performance appraisal?**

a. Problems \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

b. Ways of improvement \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

## **Appendix-B**

### **INTERVIEW: QUESTIONS FOR APPRAISERS AND APPRAISEES**

**Instruction: Please answer the following questions or statement as they apply to you in a more individualistic manner.**

1. In your own understanding what are the purpose of TPA?
2. Do you think that TPA is successfully attaining its purpose?
3. To what extent it improve the teaching-learning process?
4. Who involves in the development of TPA criteria, techniques used, feedback procedures?
5. In your own understanding who can better appraise the performance of teachers?
6. Do you think that appraisers have the required knowledge, experience and ethic to appraise their teachers?
7. In your own understanding what are the sources of appraisal?
8. Do appraisers conduct pre-appraisal and post appraisal discussion?
9. Are there class room observation? How many times for semester?
10. Was any training given to teachers and appraisers about performance appraisal?
11. Are you satisfied with the PA system implementation in your school?
12. In your own understanding what are the major problems related with TPA system implementation?
13. What do you suggest to the success of appraisal system in your school?

## Opinion scale Category for

1. Agree  $\geq 3.00$
2. Disagree  $< 3.00$