

**AN ASSESSMENT OF THE SYSTEM OF
APPRAISING PRINCIPALS' PERFORMANCE IN
SELECTED GOVERNMENTAL TVET INSTITUTES
IN SOUTHERN NATIONS, NATIONALITIES AND
PEOPLES REGION**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE
STUDIES OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIRMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ART
IN MANAGEMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION**

BY

LIDETU GIZAW GOBENA



**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES
P.O. BOX 1176
ADDIS ABABA ETHIOPIA**

**JUNE 2008
ADDIS ABABA
ETHIOPIA**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to Associate Professor Girma Zewdie, my thesis advisor, for his unfailing guidance, constructive comments, and useful suggestions from designing the research up to its completion, which otherwise would hardly be realized in its present form.

I am also grateful to my wife Achamyesh Gtachev for her strong aid on writing and editing the study. On top of that, I would like to pass my heartfelt appreciation to my respected brother Girma Gizaw (M.Sc.) for his financial and material support. Moreover, I would like to acknowledge all members of my family for their help to successfully completing this study.

Finally, my warmest gratitude is also extended to graduate School of Addis Ababa University, Bonga TVET institute, SNNPR Educational Bureau of TVET section and all individuals who contributed their share to the thesis.

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
Acknowledgments -----	I
Table of Contents -----	II
List of Tables -----	IV
Acronyms -----	V
Abstract -----	VI
CHAPTER ONE	
THE PROBLEMS AND ITS APPROACH -----	1
1.1. Background of the Study -----	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem -----	4
1.3. Objective of the Study -----	5
1.4. Significance of the Study -----	5
1.5. Delimitation of the Study -----	6
1.6. Limitations of the Study -----	6
1.7. The Research Methodology -----	7
1.7.1. Sources of Data -----	7
1.7.2. Sampling Technique -----	8
1.7.3. Data Gathering Instruments -----	8
1.7.4. Procedure of Data Collection -----	9
1.7.5. Data Processing Tools -----	10
1.8. Operational Definitions of Key Terms -----	10
1.9. Organization of the Study -----	11
CHAPTER TWO	
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE -----	12
2.1. Historical Development of Performance Appraisal -----	12
2.2. The Major Concepts and Definitions of Performance Appraisal -----	13
2.3. Use of Employee Evaluation as Part of Strategic Plan -----	17
2.4. Result-Oriented Performance Appraisal -----	17
2.5. The Purposes of Performance Appraisal -----	18
2.6. Objectives of Performance Appraisal -----	22
2.7. The Benefits of Appraisal -----	23

2.8. The Characteristics of Good Performance Appraisal -----	26
2.9. Criteria for Performance Appraisal -----	28
2.10. Methods of Appraising Performance -----	30
2.11. Policies of Appraisal -----	36
2.12. The Process of Performance Appraisal -----	38
2.13. Problems in Appraising Performance -----	40
2.14. Overcoming the Problems of Performance Appraisal -----	44
CHAPTER THREE	
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA -----	48
3.1. Characteristics of the Respondents -----	48
3.2. Analysis and Interpretation of Data -----	52
CHAPTER FOUR	
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS -----	73
4.1. Summary -----	73
4.2. Conclusions -----	76
4.3. Recommendations -----	78
Bibliography -----	
Appendices -----	

List of Tables

Tables	Page
Table1: Population and Sample Size -----	8
Table 2: Characteristics of Respondents by Sex, Age, Service Year and Educational Qualification -----	49
Table 3: Test on Representativeness of the Respondents -----	51
Table 4: Data Pertaining to the Purposes of Principals' Performance Appraisal (PPA) -----	53
Table 5: The Nature of Appraisal Criteria -----	57
Table 6: Bodies Involved in the Development of Appraisal Criteria -----	59
Table 7: Respondents Attitude towards PPA -----	62
Table 8: Reason for the Negative Attitude to PPA -----	63
Table 9: Respondents Views on the Process of PPA -----	63
Table 10: Problems Observed within PPA -----	65
Table 11: Sources of Problems Linked to PPA -----	67
Table 12: Problems Observed in the Process of PPA -----	69
Table 13: Respondents Recommendation for the Improvement of PPA -----	70

ACRONYMS

- ❖ **BARS** – Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scale
- ❖ **ECBB** – Education and Capacity Building Bureau
- ❖ **HRM** – Human Resource Management
- ❖ **MBO** – Management By Objectives
- ❖ **MOE** – Ministry Of Education
- ❖ **PA** - Performance Appraisal
- ❖ **PPA** – Principals’ Performance Appraisal
- ❖ **REB** – Regional Education Bureau
- ❖ **SNNPR** – Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Region
- ❖ **TVET** – Technical and Vocational Education and Training
- ❖ **TVETI** - Technical and Vocational Education and Training
Institute

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to assess the perception of TVETI principals' and their appraisers in relation to the purpose, criteria, attitude, process, problems and the system of PPA operating in SNNPR and hence, to discover if differences existed between the two study groups. To this end, descriptive survey research method was employed to identify the limitations and come up with recommendations. The study was conducted in five selected governmental TVET institutes found in SNNPR on the basis of stratified and purposive sampling techniques. The subjects of the study were 103 appraisers and 10 appraises drawn from the sample TVET institutes and REB. Information was solicited from the sample respondents through a questionnaire and interview guide, which was pre-tested in two TVETI and modified for distribution. Various statistical tools such as chi-square test, spearman-rank order correlation, weighted mean score; mean and percentage were used for data analysis.

The findings of the study indicated that the appraisers and the appraises perceived the main purposes of the appraisal scheme as being formative and summative respectively; and the appraisal criteria were found to be inadequate and inappropriate to appraise TVETI principals. Moreover, among the designated appraisers, trainees and parents were identified as being incompetent to undertake the task of PPA.

In general, principals' performance appraisal system was perceived to be fruitless in attaining the major purposes that it was intended to serve. Hence, it was recommended that necessary changes should be made by the concerned authorities at all levels of TVET, in order to revitalize the existing practice of principals' performance appraisal. To this effect, PPA criteria should be clearly defined, flexible and job-related. Furthermore, those who have close contact with the training process and who are familiar with the complexity of the job would appraise principals. In addition to this, long and short term training and orientation need to be given for appraisers and appraises so as to acquire adequate skill, knowledge and experience; and to acquaint them with the purposes, criteria, process and procedures of PPA system.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEMS AND ITS APPROACH

1.1. Background of the Study

An organization, whether social service provider or manufacturing enterprise, needs human and non-human resources to achieve the goals for which it is established. Of these resources, the human element is the most valuable and critical for the successful realization of the desired organizational objectives. This is because it is the human resource that supplies the talent, skill and efforts which enable them utilize all other resources effectively and efficiently (Ayalew, 2000:135; Martin & Tricia, 2000:7).

Since people are the most important assets of an organization, the attainment of organizational goals and objectives will not materialize unless organizations have the right sort of people. Emphasizing this point, Schermerhorn (1989:255) writes, "Without proper human resources, even the best designed organization guided by well-made plans cannot achieve its true performance potential." This implies that organizations need to employ a variety of mechanisms to identify those individuals with better potential and performance, and to ensure the attainment of their predetermined goals and objectives.

Human resources are among the fundamental resources available to any organization. Successful managers recognize that human resources deserve attention because they are a significant factor in top management strategic decisions that guide the organization's future operations. Three crucial elements are needed for firms to be effective: mission and strategy, organizational structure, and human resource management. However, people are the basic resources who do the work and create the ideas that allow the organization to survive (Ivancevich & Glueck, 1989:6)

Human resource management (HRM) is a key ingredient affecting organizational competitiveness and its ability to fulfil its mission. The effectiveness of an organization in providing a product or service that fits

customers' needs is critical if it is to survive. That product or service is provided in part (or entirely) by people. Employees are not only among the most important resources a firm has; they also sometimes are among the most problematic (Mathis & Jackson, 1997:4-5).

Hence, performance appraisal serves a variety of functions of which according to Chandan (1999:207), managerial decisions on promotion, transfer, termination, training, improving employee performance are few. Other authorities classify the same purposes of performance appraisal into groups. For example, Mathis and Jackson (1997:344) classify the purpose of performance appraisal in to two broad categories which often are seen as potentially conflicting, i.e., developmental (formative); identifying strengths, identifying areas for growth, development planning, coaching and career planning and administrative (summative); compensation, promotion, dismissal, downsizing and lay offs. Others still classify the purpose of performance appraisal in terms of beneficiaries in to organizational and participants perspectives (Fletcher, 2003:5; Philp, 1992:6).

In line with the educational system, Gold (2000:311) identifies the overall purposes of performance appraisal to be improving teaching-learning and training process. Promoting research, motivating staff, enhancing professional career development, and ensuring that students have been provided quality instruction and recognizing outstanding performers; trainers or principals.

Almost all social organizations use performance appraisal to manage their human resources. TVET institutes are those institutions created for provision and production of qualified man power to a country through and with a variety of people, including principals, trainers, trainees, administrative personnel and the community at large. Among these human elements involved in the execution of educational goals and objectives, principals would be regarded as having most significant role to play in teaching-learning and training process.

This is because of the role and the responsibility of the principal in a TVET institute to manage all these resources. The position of principals in TVET institute is like that of a commander in chief in an army, they are the life blood of the TVET institute in which his/her feelings and thought affect the individuals and all the activities of the school/institute (Healy, 1994:1; Chaube, S. and Chaube, A., 1996:56). It is essential, therefore, that school principals get the best support possible in the process of reviewing their work and planning their future professional development.

Principals have to be continuously motivated and upgraded so as to improve the quality of their service. Principals' performance appraisal has a major role to play in this regard. There should be systematic and careful evaluation of principals' performance in place for developing their professional competence and for the successful achievement of school instruction (Clayton et al, 1993:24).

TVET system, as social organization, is made to exist to meet the economic and social needs of the society they serve. Accordingly, their major function is to provide the trainees with the necessary knowledge, skill, and attitude through the teaching-learning and training process. And the success of the instructional process depends, among other things, very much upon the effective and efficient management of the human and non-human resources of the TVET system. In this respect, principals are regarded by many educationists as having the central and leading role in the successful operation of the training process. To mention some, Fidler and Cooper (1992:48) note that the principal is of critical importance to the school culture. Similarly, Healy (1994:68) says, "Head teachers play a crucial role in creating the factors which affect the organizational health of the school." Hattersley (1992:1) further records ". . . the quality of the head teacher's leadership is the most important single determinant of the success of a school"

Principals to shoulder their responsibilities successfully, they need to be well motivated, and understand what is expected of them. Besides, they

need to be assisted, encouraged, and inspired to bring about desired changes in their performance. For this to be effective, their performance ought to be appraised in view of identifying their strengths and weaknesses, and providing them with the necessary feedback about their level of performance. To this end, an effective system of principals' performance appraisal plays a vital role.

As Montgomery and Hadfield (1989:12) asserted, if properly carried out and adequately prepared for, the appraisal of principals is likely to benefit the appraisers, the appraisees, the trainees, and the institute / school as a whole. However, due to the principals' role multiplicity and the absence of a clear line-management structure, appraising the performance of principals is found to be the most difficult, sensitive, and challenging task (Fidler and Cooper, 1992:134, Hattersley, 1992:1, and Healy, 1994:67).

Until recently, principals were not appraised on a regular basis. Different kinds of appraisal systems were also employed to appraise principals working at different parts of the region. There are some studies that deal with teachers' performance appraisal and there are too few studies that focus on the appraisal of TVET institution principals. As a result, little is known about the nature, role, and quality of the performance appraisal scheme.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The key purpose of this study is to examine the perceptions of TVET institute principals and their appraisers about the existing appraisal system i.e., its purpose, the appraisal criteria employed, and the competence of the persons involved in appraising the principals of TVET institutions. The study also attempts to identify the major problems encountered in the appraisal process and then forward possible solutions by way of recommendations.

This system of principals' performance appraisal according to SNNPR-ECBB (2004:18) has an advantage over the past technique of appraising principals' performance in motivating and development of school/TVET

institute principals. Therefore, it is assumed to contribute more to the effectiveness of teaching-learning and training process in schools/institutes.

Thus, for an institution to employ an appraisal of principals' performance both the manager and the employee must be acquainted with conceptual and technical aspects of the system. In addition to this, sufficient resources, autonomy and policy integrity are important for successful implementation such that it can operate relatively free from imposition of an excessive number of external constraints (Fletcher, 2003:20).

1.3. Objective of the Study

The main objective of this study is to assess how the performances of TVET Principals are appraised and which factors challenge them; and to propose recommendations based on the findings.

Based on the objective, the researcher tries to answer the following basic research questions:

1. What are the main purposes of appraising the performance of TVET institute principals'?
2. Do principals' exactly know the basic criteria of performance appraisal?
3. What are the attitudes of appraisers and appraisees towards principals' performance appraisal?
4. Who is the right appraiser of principals and involved in the process of performance appraisal?
5. What are the major problems encountered in appraising the performance of TVET institute principals and what interventions should be made?

1.4. Significance of the Study

The researcher believes that this study could be significant in the following ways:

- It may help planners, TVET officials and policy makers to be aware of the problems and there by seek solutions based on the findings.
- It clarifies misconceptions to appraisal related issues like its purposes, methods, processes, importance, handling appraisal related problems and the like.
- It could serve as feedback to policy formulators and regional education bureau to revise the current principals' performance appraisal system and take necessary remedial actions.
- It may encourage others to study the problem in wider scope and depth, and could also serve as a document for future use.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

The study does not included trainees and parents for the sake of less participation in the appraisal process of principals' and lack of knowledge and capacity to answer the questionnaire and an interview. On top of that it could have been more comprehensive if it covered all regions and the devlopment of TVET in the country. However, due to constraints of time and other resources, the study is confined to five selected governmental 10+2 and 10+1 TVET institutes of Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples Region (SNNPR). These institutions are:

- Bonga TVET Institute (10+2),
- Butajira TVET Institute (10+2),
- Dilla TVET Institute (10+2),
- Teppi TVET institute (10+1), and
- Wolkite TVET institute (10+1).

1.6. Limitations of the Study

It is obvious that every study is not totally free of any sort of limitation. Considering these the researcher limited by the following factors i.e. shortage of finance and unavailability of information.

Furthermore the REB of TVET section heads, principals, Civil service officers and vocational counsellors were busy in a series of meetings and

other activities that access to them was really a challenge. Despite these constraints the study was managed and completed according to its plan.

1.7. The Research Methodology

The aim of this study is to assess the system of appraising principals' performance in five selected governmental TVET institutes found in SNNPR i.e., Bonga TVET institute, Butajira TVET institute, Dilla TVET institute, Teppi TVET institute and Wolkite TVET institute. It also goes to suggest some possible means that can be used to increase the efficiency and the effectiveness of principals found in those institutes.

To this end, a descriptive survey research methodology was employed with the assumption that could help to explore the existing practice and situation that are encountered by the institutes.

Thus, this approach enables the researcher to examine the perceptions of TVET institute principals and their appraisers about the existing system of appraising the performance of principals.

1.7.1. Sources of Data

To carry out the study relevant information was gathered from bodies that were claimed to have adequate proximity or exposure to the PPA and which are nucleus for the study. These sources (as primary sources of data) included regional TVET officials and supervisors, principals, vice-principals, civil service officers, vocational counsellors, department heads and trainers.

In selecting the research subjects, stratified, availability and purposive sampling techniques were used. Sixteen trainers from Bonga TVET institute, 20 trainers from Butajira, 16 trainers from Dilla, 5 trainers from Teppi and 8 trainers from Wolkite TVETI were selected as representatives to answer the questionnaire. Also 54 department heads, 5 vocational counsellors, 5 civil service officers, 5 vice principals, 5 principals and 3 regional TVET officials were selected as representatives to respond the questionnaires and interview guide. This makes the total sample size 142.

1.7.2. Sampling Technique

The study was containing five groups of respondents. In 2007/08 academic year Bonga TVET institute, Butajira TVET institute, Dilla TVET institute, Wolkite TVET institute and Teppi TVET institute had a total of 162 (139 male and 23 female) trainers of first and second year trainees are found and 40% of population taken as a sample by using stratified sampling technique. The trainers were stratified according to their sex and level of training they give. Out of the total population 65 (55 male and 10 female) trainers were randomly selected to answer the questionnaires.

On top of that 54 (50 male and 4 female) department heads are leading the departments on the above five institutes. All (100%) of them were available selected to respond to the questionnaires.

Since each of the five institutes had one vocational counsellor, one civil service officers, one Vice principal and one principal all of them were available selected for the interview and to answer the questionnaires. Moreover three regional TVET officials (head, vice head and civil service officer) were purposefully appointed for the interview purpose and the overall picture was indicated in Table 1.

Table1: Population and Sample Size.

No	TVET Institute	Appraisers		Appraisees		No of Trainees				No of DEP'T	Remark
		M	F	M	F	10+1		10+2			
						M	F	M	F		
1	Bonga	49	6	2	-	508	267	188	63	16	
2	Butajira	58	6	2	-	334	224	178	77	17	
3	Teppi	17	3	2	-	216	171	67	46	5	
4	Wolkite	27	2	2	-	249	158	-	-	7	
5	Dilla	48	10	2	-	357	150	200	100	16	

1.7.3. Data Gathering Instruments

To obtain adequate information for the study three kinds of data gathering instruments i.e., questionnaires, interview and document analysis were

employed. Questionnaires were used to elicit data from the larger number of respondents (Gay and Airsian, 2005:25). In order to secure pertinent information for the study a questionnaire was developed for principals, vice principals, civil service officers, vocational counsellors, department heads and trainers as the sources of data collection. The questionnaire mainly included closed ended items followed by some open ended items. The questionnaires were developed in English in order to avoid the deviation of terms and words.

The data was also obtained through interview. The interview was also used to collect data from small or limited number of respondents (Aspinwal et al, 1992:175) and the information used to help strengthen some of the data collected through the questionnaire. The interview was conducted with regional TVET officials, principals, vice principals, civil service officers and vocational counsellors to get relevant information in their respective positions. Document analysis was employed to collect the data as complementary instrument.

1.7.4. Procedure of Data Collection

The questionnaire were pilot-tested on arbitrarily selected fifteen trainers and ten department heads in Bonga and Teppi TVETI that would help to confirm the applicability of the instrument and to know the existing state of potential respondents with respect to the problem under the study. Some experts and regional TVET section heads were consulted to obtain the necessary corrections. Then the questionnaires were set in their final form and distributed to sample TVET institutes with the exclusion of pre-tested trainers and department heads.

Feedback from experienced TVET leaders and experts was obtained to revise and improve questions in the interview guide. Some words in the interview questions were modified and simplified to respondents to understand and respond. Then, a copy of interview guides were given to interviewees before the interview had taken place. Finally, face-to-face interview was conducted with the selected respondents.

1.7.5. Data Processing Tools

The data that collected through questionnaire were tailed, tabulated, organized and analyzed by using statistical tools such as chi-square test, spearman rank order correlation, weighted mean score, mean and percentage.

The mean and weighted mean scores were interpreted as strongly disagree (0.5-1.49), disagree (1.5-2.49), undecided (2.5-3.49), agree (3.5-4.49) and strongly agree for 4.5 and above. In all cases, the existing differences were tested for statistical significance at $\alpha = 0.05$ level in order to tolerate errors that come due to chance. Hence, the chi-square test was made to check the representativeness of the samples. Furthermore, spearman rank order correlation test was employed to check ranking difference between the appraisers and appraisees.

The data collected through interview and document analysis was analyzed. Data from interview was recorded by note taking to preserve the information. The analysis was conducted by categorizing the data obtained through interview. The small pieces of data classified in to general ones to connect the related issues and to make sense (Gay and Airasian, 2000:272). To analyze the document, first, identifying the documents, records, policies and guidelines in relation to PPA. The next step was determining materials which might be relevant to the study. There was a need to analyze the materials on their natural situations and it might be possible to make photocopies of them for latter analysis (Gall and Borg, 1996:362). Lastly, the implication of the result was discussed.

1.8. Operational Definition of Key Terms

- **Appraisee-** TVET institute principals and vice principals whose performance is subject to appraisal.
- **Appraisers-** Persons who are involved in appraising the performance of TVETI principals.
- **Performance-** Specific job of principals and vice principals.

- **Performance Appraisal-** The process of evaluating principals' job performance.
- **Principal-** The formerly appointed executive head of a TVET institute.

1.9. Organization of the Study

The study is organized into four major chapters. The first chapter deals with the problem and its approach. The second and the third chapters deal with review of the related literature, and presentation and analysis of data, respectively. The last chapter includes the summary, conclusion, and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The intricacy of human mind is vivid to most people living in various dimensions of life. It is evident in our day to day environment and even in religious practices. Academicians wrote a lot about human mind, but they still call it “the black box”. Likewise religious people affirm the truth as the spiritual book says “who knows the heart of man”. This is the primary reason why performance evaluation becomes a difficult task in an organized setting.

To cope up with such difficult task proper design of the system, adequate knowledge of the raters and exerting the necessary effort are not optional. Thus many studies are made extensively on performance evaluation and presented it in various terms (Ivancevich, 1997:320).

This chapter is committed to treat some important topics which are related to the system of appraising the performance of employees in general and that of TVET principals in particular.

2.1. Historical Development of Performance Appraisal

There seems to be no written evidence to indicate the exact time when performance appraisal of man started. Men have typically assessed the value of other men in a variety of situations and probably continue to do so. Ahuja (1986:221) noted that the evaluation of individual performance is considered as fundamental human act. The rating of man by another man is therefore as old as mankind. “Accordingly, informal appraisal has been going on for as long as people have been working together. But formal appraisal, however, has a shorter history as clearly indicated in (EdSnape et al, 1997:44).

Formal performance appraisal in industry originated in Scotland in the early 1800s with the ‘silent monitor’ used in Robert Owens textile mills. A multi-coloured block of wood was hung over the employees’ machines, with the front colour indicating the superintendent’s assessment of the previous day’s conduct, from white for excellent through yellow for good,

blue for different and black for bad. Given the complexity of some modern systems of performance appraisal, many managers may secretly learn for such a simple and unambiguous system.

Performance evaluation of person-by-person is not only undertaken in industry but also it goes through TVET institutes.

In the Ethiopian education system, the inspection of educational operations was first introduced in 1937 E.C. This task was assigned to three persons, i.e. one British educator as a head, and two Ethiopians as his assistants. The main function of these inspectors were to visit schools in and outside Addis Ababa, and compile educational statistics concerning the classrooms, students, and teachers (MOE, 1979:3).

While inspection was replaced by supervision in 1955 E.C., the emphasis of the department shifted to the improvement of the curriculum and the teaching-learning process (MOE, 1974:5). In 1973 E.C., due to the ideological change and the experience gained from socialist countries, supervision was again substituted by inspection. The prime objective of the inspection was to assure whether the ministry's policies, guidelines, plans, and programs were properly implemented at all levels of the education system; and this was in operation till 1986 E.C (MOE, 1987: 5-6).

2.2. The Major Concepts and Definitions of Performance Appraisal

The meaning and understanding of performance appraisal varies with the purpose it is intended to serve, the knowledge and understanding of individuals. According to Gomez-Mejia et al. (2003:225), performance appraisal is the identification, measurement and management of human performance in a given organization. Armstrong (2001:468) regards performance simply as the record of outcomes achieved on individual basis. On the other hand, for Prasad and Bannerjee (1985:118), performance appraisal is "a systematic evaluation of an employee by some other qualified person who is familiar with the employee's performance."

Torrington, Hall and Taylor (2003:225-26) define performance appraisal as an important and integral part of human resource management in which organizations used to systematically assess employees' work performance inline with their organization mission and objective through appropriate means of measurement that best fit to the purpose of appraisal. This indicates that, the performance appraisal to be part of the management functions which must be carried out in line with organizational goal.

Aforementioned definitions of performance appraisal imply the existence of different methods of measuring employees' performance. Caron (2007:1), explain the existence of various methods of performance appraisal organization use to assess employee's performance that differs from each other by their approach in measuring performance. These different methods of performance appraisal can broadly categorized into the traditional and contemporary methods based on the characteristics they have in common (Getenet and Maru, 2005:128).

The contemporary or modern approach to performance appraisal on the other hand focuses on the result, or on what an employee has achieved based on pre-determined agreed appraisal criteria with in a given period of time (Hanson, 2005:5). Appraisals are, in effect, a form of judging an employee's performance in a given job (Sutherland et al, 2004:11). Appraisal is an essential part of good management, stimulating a two- way flow of useful information between managers and subordinates that continuously clarifies roles and objectives and engenders support in the pursuit of mutually agreed goals (Cowling, 1998:197).

As defined by Graham and Bennett (1990:203), performance appraisal is "the judgment of an employee's performance in his job, based on considerations other than productivity alone." This explanation indicates that the process of performance appraisal involves not only measuring output but also considering the factors that contributed to the performance of the employee.

Agarwal (1993:310) defines performance appraisal as “the process of evaluating employee performance in terms of predetermined criteria . . . “

Similarly, Megginson (1981:310) considers appraisal as “the process an employer uses to determine whether an employee is performing the job as intended.”

Performance appraisal is the formal, systematic assessment of how well employees are performing their jobs in relation to established standards, and the dialogue about that assessment with employees (Towers, 1998:337). It is also defined as any procedure that involves setting work standards, assessing the employee’s actual performance relative to these standards, and providing feedback to the employee with the aim of motivating that person to eliminate performance deficiencies or to continue to perform above par (Dessler, 1982:342).

Performance appraisal is a key tool in making the most of an organization’s human resources (Ed Snape et al., 1997:43). Appraisal is concerned with setting objectives for individuals for an agreed period and monitoring progress towards these objectives on a regular basis in an atmosphere of trust and cooperation between the appraiser and the individual (Thomson, 2000:142).

Various academicians and researchers on human resource management have defined performance appraisal in different ways. Den Hartog et al (2004: 556-569) in their article entitled “Performance Management: A model and Research Agenda” have cited the following definitions of performance appraisal:

- Performance appraisal is the system whereby an organization assigns some ‘score’ to indicate the level of performance of a target person or group (Goal et al, 2003:458).
- Performance appraisal is a system of review and evaluation of an individual’s (or team’s) performance (Mondy et al, 1990:340).
- Fletcher (2003: 437) define performance appraisal more broadly as “activities through which organizations seek to assess employees

and develop their competence, hence performance and distribute reward". Defined as such, performance appraisal is an important part of performance management.

Mathis and Jackson (1997) defined performance appraisal as the process of evaluating how well employees do their jobs compared with a set of standards and communicating that information to those employees. It also has been called employee rating, employee evaluation, performance review, performance evaluation, and results appraisal.

Terry and Franklin (1997:368) further explain that performance appraisal is the periodic evaluation of an employee's job performance measured against the job's stated or presumed requirements. Goal et al (2003:462-463) describes Performance appraisal as the process of measuring quantitatively and qualitatively an employee's past or present performance. It is a mechanism which can be used to encourage, motivate, control, mould, identify training, and development needs to reward or punish employees.

Heigel in Goal et al (2003:463) quoted that:

Performance appraisal is the process of evaluating the performance and qualifications of the employees in terms of the requirements of the job for which he is employed, for purposes of administration including placement, selection for promotion, providing financial rewards and other actions which require differential treatment among the members of a group as distinguished from actions affecting all members equally.

Moreover, Zaudneh (1987:167) conceives performance appraisal as "a systematic, continuous . . . rating and recording of an individual's excellence . . . to his present job and to his potentials for a better future."

From the above definitions performance appraisal is an essential managerial activity which enables organizations utilizes their workforce effectively and efficiently, and it increases employees' efforts towards achieving both personal and organizational goals.

2.3. Use of Employee Evaluation as part of Strategic Plan

Many organizations have strategic plan. Those plans generally begin with the vision of the Organization/institution. Objectives are then set for the entire organization to accomplish the mission and promote the Organization's /institutions vision, while taking into consideration the values of the various segments of the organization (Beamish, 2000). Once the organization's overall goals and objectives are established, the role of each department or organizational subsection in achieving those organizational goals and objectives is evaluated and departmental goals and objectives are set. Departments supervisors and managers are then charged with developing strategies on how to meet those departmental, and, ultimately, organizational objectives. The strategies developed by the supervisors and managers are, in turn, supported by individual goals for employees. Employee evaluations subsequently are designed to support and advance the goals set for the organization as a whole.

The employee evaluation process can be used to ensure that each employee understands his/her individual role in the strategic plan as well as to ensure that each individual's work is moving the organization towards its over all objectives. Comprehensive evaluation systems are help full for companies to ensure that the vision is implemented those out the corporate system. Good evaluation systems empower employees by giving them specific roles in the organization, there by all alleviating feelings of being only numbers to corporate executives. However, the comprehensive evaluation system must allow for some local variations so local managers can respond to and craft strategic responses to local culture and custom (Bolten, 2001:214).

2.4. Result-Oriented Performance Appraisal

The result oriented performance appraisal technique is commonly known, and written in many literatures by the name management by objective (MBO). Fletcher (2003:20-21), described result oriented performance appraisal as less systematic and comprehensive aspect that organized from management by objective to emphasize the difference between these two

concepts. He more indicates the term result oriented performance appraisal to appear under several names including out come-oriented performance appraisal, management by objective based performance appraisal, and even as management by objective.

Goal et al (2003:471) further explained that result oriented performance appraisal technique attempts to evaluate the attainment of target in the context of overall objectives to ascertain the merit of personnel.

2.5. The Purposes of Performance Appraisal

The purpose of any appraisal is extremely linked with the objective that the system intends to attain. Managers are interested in improving the performance of individuals on specific tasks and designated roles within organizations. In relation to this, Rush et al (1988:251) write that managers are concerned with both the individuals' short-term performance and their long-term contribution to the organization. According to Mullins (1996:606), Megginson (1981:311-312) and Saiyadain (1999:207) performance appraisal meant for such purposes as making decision on promotion, transfer, termination, training, improve employee performance, and to provide record on employees' performance for administrative decisions.

Performance appraisal should serve a variety of purposes in the field of Human Resource Management. To mention some, Szilagyi (1983:584), cites the following purposes: identifying training needs; providing information for selection, placement, and termination decisions; and providing information for reward allocation.

As Turner and Philip (1988:59) cited, "the success of an appraisal scheme has to be judged in terms of how far it achieves the purposes for which it was established."

EdSnape et al (1997:44-45) summarizes the main purposes of performance appraisal as follows:

- **Evaluation.** To enable the organization to share out the rewards and promotions fairly.

- **Auditing.** To discover the work potential, present and future, of individuals and departments.
- **Succession planning.** To construct plans for human resource, departmental and corporate planning.
- **Controlling.** To ensure that employees meet organizational standards and objectives.
- **Training.** To discover learning needs.
- **Development.** To develop individuals by advice and information and to shape their behaviour by praise or punishment.
- **Motivation.** To add to employees' job satisfaction by understanding their needs.
- **Validation.** To check the effectiveness of personnel procedures and practices.

According to Megginson (1981:311-312), there are two general purposes of performance appraisal. First, it can be used for making administrative decisions such as selecting employees for transfers, promotions, and demotions; determining employees' training needs; offering merit salary adjustment; etc. Second, it can be used for development purposes in that it provides employees with information about the performance expectations of their employers; feedback concerning subsequent performance; etc.

Stoner and Freeman (1989:349), also enumerate the purposes of systematic performance appraisal as follows:

- To identify those employees who deserve promotion.
- To locate those employees who need additional training,
- To identify those employees who deserve merit raises.

Those who favour formal performance evaluation contend that it serves several purposes, which are essentially extensions of the above major roles (Ivancevich & Glueck, 1989, and Robbins, 1996). The following are some of them:

- **Developmental Purpose.** Performance appraisal can determine which employees need more training and helps evaluate the results of

training programs. It helps the subordinate supervisor counselling relationship, and encourages supervisors to observe subordinate behaviour to help employees. They pinpoint employee skills and competencies that are currently inadequate but for which programs can be developed to remedy. Similarly, the effectiveness of training and development programs can be determined by assessing how those employees who have participated on their performance evaluation will.

- **Reward and compensation purposes.** Performance appraisal helps the organization decide who should receive pay rise and promotions. It can determine who will be laid off. It reinforces the employee's motivation to perform more effectively. Performance appraisal is also provides information that can be used to determine what to pay and what will serve as an equitable monetary package. Decision as to who gets merit pay increases and other rewards are frequently determined by performance evaluations.
- **Motivational purpose.** The presence of an evaluation program has a motivational effect: it encourages initiative, develops a sense of responsibility, and stimulates effort to perform better. What defines performance in the expectancy model of motivation is the individual's performance evaluation. To maximize, motivation, people need to perceive that the effort they exert leads to a favourable performance evaluation and that the favourable evaluation will lead to the rewards they value.
- **Legal compliance.** It serves as a legally defensible reason for making promotion, transfer, reward, and discharge decisions.
- **Personnel and employment planning purposes.** Performance appraisal serves a valuable input to skills inventories and personnel planning. Performance evaluations can be used as criterion against which selection and development programs are validated. Newly hired employees who perform poorly can be identified through performance appraisal.

- **Communication Purposes.** Evaluation is a basis for an ongoing discussion between superior and subordinate about job-related matters. Through interaction, the parties get to know each other better. Evaluations fulfil the purpose of providing feedback to employees on how the organization views their performance.

To Graham and Bennett (1990:203), the principal purposes of appraisal are:

- To help an employer decide what pay raises shall be granted on grounds of merit, and
- To motivate employees to work better in their present job by providing them with information about performance results, recognition of their contributions and the opportunity to discuss their work with their employer.

Martin and Tricia (2000:126) have laid down three main groups of purposes for performance appraisal:

- **Performance review:** - managers discuss with employees progress in their current posts, their strength, and the areas requiring further development, in order to improve current performance.
- **Potential reviews:** - managers discuss with employees the opportunities for progression, and the type of work they will be fitted for in the future and how this can be achieved, by identifying their developmental needs and career aspirations.
- **Reward reviews:** - these are usually separated from the appraisal system but the decision on rewards such as pays, benefits, promotion, and self-fulfilment are feed by the information provided by performance appraisal.

The above discussion clearly indicates that the purpose of performance appraisal is not only focusing on how well or poor the employee is performing, but also on the potential development of employees and the benefits employees are eligible to get.

Apart from the said purposes, performance appraisal is of paramount significances to the organization, the manager the employees as well. Accordingly, Thomson (2000:129-130) presents the following: organizations benefits from performance appraisal by acquiring standard information about its employees, the staff needs, while the employees benefit from performance appraisal in that it is a good opportunity to evaluate performance of one self.

2.6. Objectives of Performance Appraisal

The objective of performance appraisal can be categorized either as evaluative or developmental. The evaluative objectives focus on the historical performance and do auditing function. And the developmental aspect is concerned with improving the performance targets for future action (Towers, 1998:208).

As Saiyadain presented, Monga has put performance appraisal objectives in different way. He stressed on the need to maintain both organizational objectives and mutual objective (Saiyadain, 1995:203).

- A. Individual Objectives:** Contain such area as personal development, satisfaction and involvement of the individual, and the perception of fair and just compensation.
- B. Organizational Objectives:** On the other hand states that the system should generate man power. That is continually improving his or her performance according to the expectations of the organization.
- C. Mutual Organizations:** Is concerned with aligning both the individual and the organizational objectives by ensuring mutual benefits.

Performance appraisal can be carried out with multifarious objectives in mind and these objectives can be classified under the following four heads (Goal et al, 2003:465-466).

I. Work-Related Objectives

1. To provide a control for work;
2. To improve efficiency;

3. To help in assigning work and plan future work assignment; and
4. To carry out job evaluation.

II. Career Development Objectives

1. To identify strong and weak points and encourages finding remedies for weak points through training;
2. To determine career potential;
3. To plan developmental (promotional or lateral) assignments; and
4. To plan career goals.

III. Communication

1. To provide adequate feedback on performance;
2. To clearly establish goals, i.e., what is expected of the staff member in terms of performance and future work assignments;
3. To provide counselling and job satisfaction through open discussion of performance; and
4. To let employees assess where they stand within the organization in terms of their performance.

IV. Administrative Objective

1. To serve as a basis for promotion or demotion;
2. To serve as a basis for allocating incentives;
3. To serve as a basis for determining transfer; and
4. To serve as a basis for termination in case of reduction in staff strength.

When People think about performance appraisal they often refer to a number of more specific positive objectives such as (Fisher, 1995:11):

1. To review past performance;
2. To asses training needs;
3. To help develop individuals;
4. To audit the skills within an organization;
5. To set targets for future performance;
6. To identify potential for promotion.

2.7. The Benefits of Appraisal

Perhaps the most significant benefit of appraisal is that, in the rush and bustle of daily working life, it offers a rare chance for a supervisor and

subordinate to have “time out” for a one-on-one discussion of important work issues that might not otherwise be addressed (Bird, 1998; Analoui, 2002).

Almost universally, where performance appraisal is conducted properly, both supervisor and subordinates have reported the experience as beneficial and positive. Appraisal offers a valuable opportunity to focus on work activities and goals, to identify and correct existing problems, and to encourage better future performance. Thus the performance of the whole organization is enhanced. For many employees, an “official” appraisal interview may be the only time they get to have exclusive, uninterrupted access to their supervisor. Said one employee of a large organization after his first formal performance appraisal, “In twenty years of work that is the first time anyone has ever bothered to sit down and tell me how I am doing.” The value of this intense and purposeful interaction between a supervisor and subordinate should not be underestimated.

There are a number of reasons why appraisal is necessary from the viewpoints of the organization, the manager and the employee (Thomson, 2000:129-130).

1. The organization benefits from:

- Standard information about its employees;
- The facility to develop individuals based on appraisal information;
- Being able to plan its human resource needs more accurately.

2. The manager benefits from:

- Objective guidelines for assessing staff;
- Gaining a better understanding of staff needs;
- Improved relationships with staff.

3. The individual benefits from:

- An opportunity to discuss his or her work objectives;
- The ability to evaluate performance;
- Consideration of future training and development needs;
- Improved relationships with his or her manager.

The benefits of a successful appraisal scheme can be summed up as follows (Fisher, 1995:15-16):

I. For the Organization

1. Improved performance throughout the organization due to:
 - More effective communication of the organization's objectives and value;
 - Increased sense of cohesiveness and loyalty;
 - Improved relationships between managers and staff;
 - Managers who are better equipped to use their leadership skills and to motivate and develop their staff.
1. Improver overview of the tasks performed by each member of staff.
2. Identification of ideas for improvement.
3. Expectations and long-term views can be developed.
4. Training and development needs identified more clearly.
5. A culture of continuous improvement and success can be created and maintained.
6. People with potential can be identified and career development plans formulated to cater for future staff requirements.
7. The message is conveyed that people are valued.

II. For the Appraiser

1. The opportunity to develop an overview of individual jobs and complete departments.
2. Identification of ideas for improvements.
3. Increased job satisfaction.
4. Increased sense of personal value.
5. The opportunity to link team and individual objectives and targets with departmental and organizational objectives.
6. The opportunity to clarify expectations of the contribution the manager expects from teams and individuals.
7. The opportunity to re-prioritise targets.
8. A means of forming a more productive relation ship with staff based on mutual trust and understanding.

III. For the Appraisee.

1. Increased motivation.
2. Increased job satisfaction.
3. Increased sense of personal value.
4. A clear understanding of what is expected and what needs to be done to meet expectations.
5. The opportunity to discuss work problems and how they can be overcome.
6. The opportunity to discuss aspirations and any guidance, support or training needed to fulfil these aspirations.
7. Improved working relationship with the manager.

2.8. The Characteristics of Good Performance Appraisal

An effective performance appraisal has certain identified natures. Mondy and Robert (1990:408-409) discuss some of them as follows:

I. Standardization

Employees have to have adequate knowledge of the standards by which they are going to be appraised. Since the most crucial aspect of performance appraisal is identifying the standard of effective performance. Employees in the same job category under the same supervisor should be appraised using the same evaluation instrument. In addition, the appraisals should cover similar period of time. Feedback section and the appraisal interviews should be regularly scheduled. In short, an important and necessary step in developing a performance appraisal system is the development of standard that indicates successful performance (Donnelly et al, 1992:471).

II. Performance Expectations

As to Mondy and Robert (1990:409), managers must clearly explain performance expectations to their subordinates in advance of the appraisal period. Otherwise it is not reasonable to evaluate employees using yardsticks that they know nothing about.

III. Qualified Appraisers

In order to ensure consistency, appraisers must be well trained. Training appraisers gives them confidence in their ability to make appraisal and handle appraisal interview (Mathis and Jackson, 1997:365). Training should emphasize that performance appraisal is a significant component of every manager's job and training should also stress that a primary task of the supervisor is to ensure that subordinates understood what is expected of them.

IV. Open Communication

A good appraisal system provides extremely preferred feedback on a continuing basis. A worthwhile goal is to avoid surprise during the appraisal interview. Even though the interview presents an excellent opportunity for both parties to exchange ideas, it could not serve as a substitute for day-to-day communication. Most employees have strong need to know how well they are performing.

V. Due Process

In relation with a formal challenge, ensuring due process is crucial. A formal procedure should be developed if one doesn't exist to permit employees to appeal appraisal results that they consider inaccurate or unfair. They must have a procedure for pursuing their grievances and having them addressed objectives.

Nuttall in (Montgomery and Hadfield, 1989:31) summarize the following qualities where good appraisal schemes have been observed:

- A tradition of institutional self evaluation;
- Formative rather than summative;
- Result linked to action;
- Involves those who will be appraised;
- Shared understanding of criteria and process;
- More than one appraiser increases reliability and validity;
- Appraisers need training.

When performance appraisal is used to develop employees as resources, it usually works. When management uses appraisal as a punishment or when

raters fail to understand its limitations, it fails (Mathis and Jackson 1997:364). The authors claim that the key is not which form or which method of performance appraisal is to be used, but whether managers and employees understand its purpose. They also argue that in its simplest form, performance appraisal is a manager's statement: "Here are your strengths and weaknesses, and here is a way to shore up the weak areas." As to them, if done right, it can lead to higher employee motivation and satisfaction. Perfect performance appraisal system may not exist; however, effective performance appraisal system are the once that let employees know where they stand, provide input about their jobs, and establish and clarify goals. Mathis and Jackson (1997:367) put characteristics of effective Performance system here below:

- Consistent with the strategic mission of the organization.
- Useful as a development tool.
- Useful as an administrative tool.
- Legal
- Viewed as generally fair by employees.
- Documentation of employee performance.

The two obvious characteristics of performance appraisal in governmental organizations are secrecy and fairness. Whereas secrecy emanates out of the strict hierarchical structures of the government and its impersonal character, the fairness of the system has been in question for a very long time. Subjectivity attitudes, personal bias and out-dated value system have been pointed out as the main faults of the appraisal system in government (Goel et al, 2003:481).

2.9. Criteria for performance Appraisal

Cascio in his "Managing Human Resources" discusses that there are five key preconditions that any appraisal system has to fulfil. These are relevance, sensitivity, reliability, acceptability and practicality (2003: 336-337). The first three are categorized as legal and scientific requirement, where as the last two as requirements in the context of ongoing operation.

Performance criteria are standards commonly used for testing or measuring performances. Criteria for evaluating job performance can be classified as trait-based, behaviour-based and result-based (Mathis and Jackson, 1997:341).

A trait-based criterion identifies a subjective character trait such as “pleasant personality”, “initiative,” or “creativity”. The assumption in using trait criteria is that they are definable traits or attributes that are necessary for good performance. That is trait criteria describe what the employee is, rather than what the employee does (Webb and Scott, 1999:383).

Behaviour-based criteria focus on specific behaviours that lead to job success. Behavioural criteria are more difficult to develop but have the advantage of clearly specifying the behaviours management want to see (Mathis and Jackson, 1997:341).

The third type is result-based criteria. These criteria look at what the employee has done or accomplished. The rationale for this approach is that teachers and administrators should achieve certain objectives and that their performance can be meaningfully assessed by examining the extent to which those objectives have been accomplished. How the objectives are met is not considered to be as important as the result (Webb and Scott, 1999:383). Here, it is clear that for some jobs where measurement is easy and appropriate, a result-based approach works very well.

As Spector (2000:74) cited, a criterion is a standard against which you can judge the performance of any thing, including a person. Criteria can be classified as either actual or theoretical. The theoretical criterion is the definition of what good performance is rather than how it is measured. In research terminology, the theoretical criterion is a theoretical construct. The actual criterion is the way in which the theoretical criterion is assessed or operational zed.

Moreover, Goal et al, (2003:464) lists the criteria of performance appraisal as follows:

1. The employees should be made aware of the performance in terms of goals, targets, behaviours, etc., expected of them. A personal equation between the evaluator and the evaluatee has to be developed to achieve mutual understanding of the criteria of evaluation.
2. The employees should be encouraged to express themselves freely on the performance reports.
3. The organization should feel that the appraisal system itself is job-related, performance-based, uniform and non-variable, fair, just and equitable; and appraisers are honest, rational and objective in their approach, judgement and behavioural orientations.
4. Supervisors responsible for performance appraisal should be well trained in the art and science of performance appraisal to ensure uniformity, consistency and reliability. The ultimate success for evaluation rests with the evaluator, it does not depend on any system, however, perfect a support it may ensure.
5. Performance appraisal report should be examined meticulously before taking any positive or negative action.
6. To promote intra and inter-departmental consistency and uniformity, line and staff coordination should be ensured.
7. There should be provision for appeals of appraisals to ensure confidence of the employees and their associations/unions.

2.10. Methods of Appraising Performance

In order for performance appraisal to achieve its purposes, a variety of methods have been developed. The choice of a method depends on organizational ethos, its objectives in making the appraisal, its size, product, technology, etc. The most prevalent methods fall under four major groups, namely, category rating methods, comparative methods, narrative methods, and special methods (Bacal, 1999:93-107).

I. Category rating methods

These are the simplest methods for appraising performance which require a manager (supervisor) to make an employee's level of performance on a

specific form. The graphic rating scales, checklist and the forced choice method fall under this classification.

- A. Graphic rating scale.** This is the oldest and most widely used performance evaluation technique also known as linear rating scale or simple rating scale. It measures the degree of characteristics required for adequate performance of the job and consists of a number of characteristics and qualities which are judged on a point scale.
- B. Checklist.** The checklist is a simple rating technique in which the supervisor is given a list of statements or words and asked to check statements representing the characteristics and performance of each employee.
- C. Forced choice.** In its simplest form, the method consists of providing a list of behaviour related statements. The supervisor is asked to indicate one least and one most descriptive statement for a particular subordinate. These statements are usually grouped in clusters of five based on a broad theme covered by these statement. Each statement carries some weight which is not known to the supervisor.

II. Comparative methods

Ranking systems involve comparing people against each other and determining whether an employee is better than, the same as, or worse than his or her colleagues on the basis of some set of criteria. Comparative method includes ranking, paired comparison, and forced distribution.

- A. Ranking.** The ranking method consists of listing all employees from highest to lowest in performance. It is difficult to do if the group of employees being compared numbers over twenty. It is also easier to rank the best and worst employees than it is to evaluate the average once. Simple ranking can be improved by alternative ranking. In this approach, the evaluation pick the top and bottom employees first, then select the next highest and next lowest, and move toward the middle (Ivancevich & Glueck, 1989:353-354).
- B. Paired comparisons.** This method requires the ratter to compare each employee with every other employee working under him or her on the

overall efficiency aspect (Saiyadain, 1999:196-197). The number of comparisons can be calculated using the following formula. $N(N - 1)/2$
Where N=Number of people rated

C. Forced distribution. This method is developed to prevent the ratters from rating too high or too low. Under the forced distribution method, the ratter after assigning the points to the performance of each employee has to distribute his or her ratings in a pattern to conform to normal frequency distribution (Rao & Rao, 2004:228-229).

III. Narrative methods

Written appraisal information is sometimes requires of some managers and human resource specialists. These methods are used when documentation and description of an employee's actions are sought rather than an actual rating. The two most widely used techniques that fall under this classification are the essay and critical incident methods.

- A. **Essay or free from appraisal.** This method requires the ratter to write a short essay describing each employee's performance during the rating period. It emphasizes evaluation of overall performance, based on strengths and weakness of employee performance, rather than specific job dimension. As ratters may be required to enumerate specific examples of employee behaviour, the essay technique minimizes rater bias and halo effect (Rao & Rao, 2004:234-235).
- B. **Critical incidents.** Critical incidents focus the evaluator's attention on those behaviours that are keys in making the difference between executing a job effectively and executing it ineffectively. That is, the appraiser writes down anecdotes describing what the employee did that was especially effective and ineffective. The key her is that only specific behaviours, not vaguely defined personality traits, are cited (Robbins, 1996:653-654).

IV. Special methods

These methods comprise behavioural ratings, behavioural anchored rating scales and management by objective (MBO).

A. Behavioural rating approaches. These approaches attempt to assess an employee's behaviours instead of measuring or quantifying outputs. Behaviour-based performance appraisal formats which concentrate on the rate's behaviours are most appropriate under circumstances where controlling behaviours or processes assumes that the desired output will result. In other words, they are most appropriate when the transformation process is understood or when there is a high degree of linkage between means and ends (Lee, 1985:322-323).

B. Behaviourally anchored rating scales (BARS). BARS combine major elements from the critical incident and graphic rating scale approaches. The appraiser rates employees based on items along a continuum, but the points are examples of actual behaviour on the given job rather than general descriptions or traits (Keeley, 1978:428-429).

C. Management by objectives (MBO). This method of appraisal was introduced and made popular by Peter Drucker in 1961. In this method, subordinate in consultation with the supervisor sets out short term objectives followed by specific actions that he or she has to carry out. The goals are jointly set and are action-oriented. Since they are verifiable, appraisal becomes easy. At the end of specified time period, the activities are jointly reviewed by both the subordinate and the supervisor, and depending on the performance of the subordinate, the goals are modified or redesigned for the next period of time (Saiyadain, 1999:200-201).

MBO is on cure-all, on panacea for all managerial ills. It, too, has dysfunctional consequences (Flippo, 1980:221-222). First, when multiple activities are closely interrelated, one will have to move to establishment of group objectives prior to identifying individual responsibilities.

The methods of performance appraisal are the means by which organizations use in evaluating the performance effectiveness of their

employees. Since performance appraisal is used for various purposes, it requires different methods and approaches. Gupta (1998:520) proposed the following methods of performance appraisal:

- a. **Confidential rapport method**- is rapport prepared by the employee's immediate supervisor about strength and weakness of employees.
- b. **Free form or essay method**- is a method in which an evaluator writes short essay on employee's performance based on overall impression.
- c. **Straight ranking method**- is a method in which the evaluator assigns relative ranks to all employees in the same work until doing the same job.
- d. **Paired comparison method**- in this method a comparison is made between each employee with all others in pair one at a time.
- e. **Forced distribution**- the rate is required to distribute the rating in the form of normal frequency distribution. The purpose is to eliminate the rate's bias of central tendency.
- f. **Graphic rating scale**- is a method that involves a numerical scale indicating different degrees of particular trait.
- g. **Checklist method**- is a method on which the raters check to indicate if the behaviour of an employee is positive or negative to each statement, which describes characteristics and performance of employees.
- h. **Critical incidents methods**- in this method the supervisor keeps a written record of critical (good or bad) events and how different employees behaved during such events.
- i. **Group appraisal method**- in this method a group of events assesses employees.
- j. **Field review method**- a training officer from personnel department interviews a line supervisor to evaluate the respective subordinates by preparing the question in advance.

In addition to the abovementioned methods, Rue and Byars (1990:220) have identified the following three methods:

1. **The Essay Appraisal**- which requires the appraiser to describe an appraisee's performance in written narrative form. As Leap and Crino (1993:356-357) cited, the short-comings of this method are:
 - a) It can be time-consuming,
 - b) Its usefulness depends largely on the writing skills of the appraiser, and
 - c) Its usefulness for rewards and validation of selection devises is severely limited.
2. **The Work-Standard Approach**- which involves setting a standard or expected level of output and then comparing each appraisee's performance to that standard.
3. **Management by Objectives (MBO)** - which consists of the appraiser and appraise jointly agreeing on what the appraisee's work objectives will be and how they will be accomplished. This method, accordingly to Leap and Crino (1993:357), includes the following steps:
 - a) Appraise proposes goal for the next time period.
 - b) Appraise and appraiser discusses, modify, and reach an agreement concerning the specific nature of the goals.
 - c) Periodic formal and informal reviews regarding progress and problems associated with achieving the goals are made.
 - d) The cycle is repeated.

These are the various methods employed in different organizations, including TVET institutes, to appraise the job performance of employees. As indicated earlier, each of these methods has its own strengths and weaknesses. The strength of any performance appraisal is method, as Schermerhorn (1989:432) noted, is measured by reliability and validity.

So far an attempt has been made to treat the various methods of performance appraisal. Other components of appraisal are essential in the process of appraising principals' performance. Among these, the appraisal discussion is considered to be central to the success of the whole process.

There is a consensus among educators that a particular appraisal technique will not necessarily work well for all employees, and consequently the technique or combination of techniques that is best for a given situation should be selected carefully and reviewed periodically to see that it is accomplishing what is expected (Terry and Franklin, 1997:389).

2.11. Policies of Appraisal

Organizations should have stated policy regarding the appraisal to ensure the proper functioning of the system. The policy may state the evaluator, the appraisal period and other related matters depending on its importance to the organization (Ivancevich, 1997:324).

I. Who Should Do the Appraisal?

The policy regarding appraiser choice may vary from company to company. Possible choices are presented as follows (Wayne, Mondy and Noe, 1990:386):

A. Immediate Supervisor:

This is the most common choice for evaluating performance because immediate supervisor is in a good position to observe employees performance from the view point of knowledge and proximity. And further it is crucial to safeguard supervisors' authority from being undermined.

B. Subordinate:

This is usual in academic environment and creates a sense of supervision in the minds of supervisors. If subordinates are in excellent position to observe managers, they will be shouldered with such responsibility.

C. Peers:

Peers appraisal is common for tasks that require considerable interaction. This approach may be regarded but the danger to end up with popularity contest is existent.

D. Group Appraisal:

This involves the use of two or more managers who are familiar with employees' performance to evaluate them in a specified time. Though it creates objectivity, it diminished the role of immediate supervisor.

E. Self Appraisal:

Self appraisal is a way to elicit motivation and development. Those who understand expectation and standards of measures are in a position to evaluate them selves.

F. Combination:

The mentioned approaches are not mutually exclusive and can be used in combination.

Who should appraise an employee's performance is a controversial issue. However, the obvious answer would seem to be his or her immediate boss. By nature, a manager's authority has included appraising subordinate's performance. But that logic may be flawed since others may also actually be able to evaluate individuals better (Robbins, 1996:651).

However, Leap and Crino in Gebretensay (1998:12), suggest that appraisers must have the ability of avoiding biases that arises during the appraisal process; and they also need to have to observe the appraisees' full range of job behaviour for a long period of time. Thus, generally, employee's performance can be performed actually not only by the employee's immediate manager, but also appraised by peers, immediate subordinates, out side organization and self-evaluation. Because many organizations are recognizing the disadvantages of using immediate managers feel unqualified to evaluate the unique contribution of each of their subordinate (Robbins, 1996:651).

II. When Should the Appraisal be conducted?

Performance appraisal may be conducted monthly, quarterly, semi-annually and annually depending on the nature of work and the type of the organization. This however does not refer to the routine practice supervisor usually categorized as the informal evaluation (Saiyadain, 1995:286).

It is believed that the formal appraisal period should be as frequent as possible in order to bring better results. But the tension and the work load it creates on the supervisors made it difficult to conduct frequent evaluation. The supervisor has too many duties to do apart from evaluation.

Hence, the trade off exists between the work load and need to make frequent evaluation, this determines the optimal time period. In practice, however semi-annual period is the most commonly used type.

III. What to Appraise?

According to Ramasamy (1999:217) performance appraisal is done by adopting any one of the two approaches, that is the trait approach which refers to appraising the employee on the basis of his / her attitude; and the result approach refers to appraising the employee on the basis of his / her accomplishment of a job.

Furthermore, Robbins (1996:650) indicates three sets of criteria used when appraising employee's performance. These are:

- Individual task outcomes: if end counts, rather than the means, the management should evaluate an employee's task outcome;
- Behaviours: in many cases it is difficult to identify specific outcomes that can be directly attributed to any employee's action.
- Traits: individual traits is the weakest set of criteria to be used when appraising employee's performance since it may or may not be highly correlated with positive task outcomes, yet one still widely used by organization.

2.12. The Process of Performance Appraisal

Numerous surveys suggested that most organizations use some sort of appraisal systems for all levels of employees. However, according to Terry and Franklin (1997:368-369), a systematic process of any employee's performance appraisal comprises the following major steps.

1. The job description is the best basis for an objective appraisal. A description should be developed in writing for every position that will be evaluated.
2. Written policies should be established in 'when' and 'how' to appraise personnel and the purpose of appraisal.
3. The method of appraisal must be ascertained, including specific criteria for evaluation.

4. Who must does the rating must be determined i.e. one or several people and how much training they need to accurately evaluate performance.
5. Evaluations must gather substantial data on performance for each individual to be appraised.
6. Evaluators should then actually appraise employee performance and discuss the result with the employee; and
7. Management decision must then be made and implemented based on the appraisal (i.e., promotion, pay raise, fire, etc.).

The fundamental nature of sound evaluation system is to develop an orderly sequence of implementation stages and follows natural progression from intended purpose through actual use (Armstrong, 2001:378). Performance appraisal process is vital to any organizational operation so that it should carefully be design. It follows set of patterns with coherently linked steps. Hall and James (1986:419-420) identified the following steps in the process of performance evaluation. These are:

- Identifying objectives and establishes policies and procedures
- Analyze job (i.e. reviewing the existing job descriptions)
- Design measurement of performance
- Communicate performance standard
- Observe employee performance and result
- Document performance and result
- Evaluation performance and result
- Discuss the appraisal with employees
- Follow up

Appraisal process is a measurement of performance. It begins with establishment of performance standards. These should have involved out of job analysis and the job description provided under human resource planning. These performance standards should also be clear and objective enough to understood and measure (DeCenzo 1988:361).

2.13. Problems in Appraising Performance

There are many factors that contribute to the problem of appraisal. Performance appraisal is one of the most challenging managerial activities as indicated earlier, that could be benefit the organization, the appraisees and the appraisers, if it is monitored properly. However, especially in education, there is no such completely satisfying formula appraisal that smoothens the activity. In relation to this, Robbins (1996:65) further states that “What ever effort organizations exert to make the performance evaluation process free from personal biases, individual likes or dislikes, and personal mannerism, a number of potential problems will always be there.”

Moreover, Ramasamy (1999:216) lists the following ingredients that most likely contribute to unsuccessful appraisal.

- If the performance appraisal methods are unreliable;
- If the employee is well known to an employer, the performance appraisal may not be correct;
- The in ability of the appraiser to appraise an employee;
- Some qualities of an employee can not be easily appraised through any performance appraisal method;
- The appraiser may appraise an employee to be good to avoid incurring his displeasure; and
- Uniform standards are not followed by the supervisors in performance appraisal.

It is natural that no system is ideal or without drawback. It is more if it involves the broad amount of human emotion (Kumar, 1996:759). Concerning major problems in performance appraisal Gupta (1998:85-86) identifies seven points:

1. **Error in rating:** performance appraisal lacks some qualities to be valid indicators of performance duties. These are:
 - Similar to me: Tends to rate people up if they are similar to you (have same values, interests, likes), or rating them down if they are not similar to you.

- Positive leniency: Rating higher than a person deserves. “I give high ratings. It makes them feel good.”
 - Negative leniency: Being reluctant to assign high ratings to individuals. Rating people lower than they deserve. “Nobody’s perfect.”
 - Halo effect: Being unduly influenced by a single favourable or unfavourable trait, which colours the judgment of the individual’s other traits.
 - Decency effect: Rating some one down or up based on a recent event. Ignoring the performance of the entire period “What have you done for me lately?”
 - Stereotyping: Is generalizing across a class by not recognizing individual difference.
 - Contrast effect: Making comparisons. Evaluating employee relative to the person last evaluated.
 - First impression: Forming an initial positive or negative judgment and then ignoring or distorting subsequent information to support the initial impression.
 - Central tendency: Constantly placing people in the middle of the scale or close to the midpoint, to avoid extreme positions, staying safe.
2. **Lack of reliability:** The performance measurement lacks consistency across different evaluations.
 3. **Incompetence:** Is a situation when raters fail to evaluate performance accurately due to lack of knowledge and experience.
 4. **Negative approach:** Performance appraisal loses most of its value when the focus of management is on punishment rather than on development of employee.
 5. **Multiple objectives and unclear objectives:** Cause confusion in evaluation.
 6. **Resistance:** This happens when appraisal conducted on the ground that is involves discrimination and when employees understand this fault.

7. **Lack of knowledge:** It occurs when the evaluator lacks experience and knowledge about performance evaluation and when he/she has no information about objectives and climates of the organization.

Saiyadain (1999:204-205) further explains the problems related to performance appraisal can be of three general types. These are: human errors, problems of criteria, and problems of confidentiality.

I. Human Errors (Rating Biases)

Human errors are not called so because they just happen and supervisors may know about them nor have much control over them. To the degree that the following human factors are prevalent, an employee's evaluation is likely to be distorted.

A. **Single Criteria.** A typical employee's job is made up of a number of tasks. Where employees are evaluated on a single job criterion, and where successful performance on the job requires good performance on a number of criteria, employees will emphasize the single criterion to the exclusion of other job-relevant factors.

B. **Leniency Error.** Every evaluator has his/her own value system that acts as a standard against which appraisals are made. Relative to the true or actual performance an individual exhibits, some raters have a tendency to be liberal in their rating by assigning higher rates consistently. Such ratings do not serve any purpose. Equally damaging one is assigning consistently low rates.

C. **Halo Error.** This is the tendency for an evaluator to let the assessment of an individual on one trait influence his or her evaluation of that person on other traits. A person may be good in one trait but is generally rated as overall good. Halo effect takes place when traits are not clearly defined and are unfamiliar.

D. **Central Tendency Errors.** Some ratters follow play safe policy in rating by rating employees around the middle point of the rating scale and they avoid rating at both the extremes of scale. They follow play safe policy because of answerability to management or lack of knowledge about the job

and/or the employee rater or the appraisers' lack of interest in their job (Rao & Rao, 2004:247).

E. Recency VR Primacy Effect. One difficulty with many of the evaluation systems is the time frame of the behaviour being evaluated. Raters forget more about past behaviour than current behaviour (Ivancevich & Glueck, 1989:331). Recency refers to the proximity or closeness to appraisal period. Generally, an employee takes it easy for the whole year and does little to get by the punishment. However, as appraisal time gets closer, he or she becomes very active creating an elusion of efficiency in the rater there by affecting his or her appraisal decision.

Primacy is the opposite of recency. It refers to a situation where an employee's initial impression influences his or her rater's appraisal decision irrespective of whether the employee has been able to keep up the initial impression or not.

F. Similarity Error. This occurs when appraisers rate other people giving special consideration to those qualities they perceive in themselves. The similarity between the rater and rate may take one or more of the following forms: demographic similarity, affective similarity, perceived similarity and mutual liking (Schraeder & Simpson, 2006:34-35).

II. Problem of Criteria

Appraisal has to be against certain criteria. If a discrepancy between expected and actual performance is pointed out, the question is whether the expected was fully defined and communicated to the employee. In the absence of such an attempt, the appraisal reports can be questioned. The issue basically refers to job description. It is true that jobs can be clearly defined at the lower levels in the organizational hierarchy; it becomes more and more difficult to clearly specify the tasks one is supported to performance.

III. Problems of Confidentiality

One important issue in performance appraisal has to do with sharing or keeping secret the ratings on various items of appraisal report. While many organizations have a system of selective feedback to the employee, the general policy is not to share the total report with the employee. There are

many reasons for this. First, each employee expects rewards if the report is better than average, which may not be administratively possible, Secondly, very often supervisors pass the challenge to top management by saying that while they did give good ratings to the employee; top management did not take that into consideration. Thirdly, giving rewards is not the only objective of appraising employees. Given these reasons, it is emphasized that supervisory ratings of employees should be kept confidential.

While there has been considerable progress in improving the instruments of performance appraisal system, especially by shifting from the more subjective, often simplistic methods to more sophisticated, objectively based approach, the implementation of performance appraisal still tends to be resisted, if not avoided, by managers (Towers, 1998:215). In other words, what Towers tries to explain is that, even though certain improvements of performance appraisal schemes have been exhibited, they are found to be resisted by managers when come to implementation. Generally, organizations confront with a variety of challenges in assuring quality performance appraisal system.

Considering the problems that exist in the appraisal of principals, Duck and Stiggins (1985:86), identified the following:

- Insufficient time to observe and appraise principals,
- Inadequate standards or competencies,
- Lack of specified level of performance for each standard,
- Lack of rewards for outstanding performance.

These are the major problems that encounter the successful operation of performance appraisal systems of principals.

2.14. Overcoming the Problems of Performance Appraisal

Just because organizations can encounter problems with performance appraisal should not lead managers to give up the process. Some majors can be taken to overcome most of the problems (particularly those caused due to human errors) identified above. Robbins (1996:657-658) has suggested the following.

- I. **Use of Multiple Criteria.** The more complex a job, the more criteria that will need to be identified and evaluated. Only the critical activities, not every thing, that lead to high or low performance are the once that need to be evaluated.
- II. **Emphasizing Behaviours Rather than Traits.** Many traits often considered to be related to good performance may, in fact, have little or no performance relation ship. For example, individuals who rate high on such traits as loyalty, initiative, courage, reliability, etc., may be poor performers. Conversely, it is possible to find excellent performers who do not score well on such traits.
- III. **Documenting Performance Behaviours in Diary.** By a diary of specific critical incidents for each employee, evaluations tend to be more accurate (Greenberg, 1986, as sited in Robbins, 1996:657-658). Diaries, for instance, tend to reduce leniency and halo errors because they encourage the evaluators to focus on performance related behaviours rather than traits.
- IV. **Use of Multiple Evaluators.** As the number of evaluators increases, the probability of attaining more accurate information increases. If an employee has had nine supervisors, nine having rated him or her excellent and one poor, one can discount the value of the one poor evaluation. Therefore, by moving employees about within the organization so as to gain a number of evaluations or by using multiple assessors (as provided in 360-degree appraisals), the probability of achieving more valid and reliable evaluations can be increased.
- V. **Evaluate Selectively.** It has been suggested that appraisers should evaluate only those areas in which they have some expertise (Borman, 1974, as sited in Robbins, 1996:658). If raters make evaluations on only those dimensions on which they are in good position to rate, inter-rate agreement can be I ncreased and evaluation can be made a more valid process. This approach also recognizes that different organizational levels have different orientations towards rates and observe them in different things. In

general, therefore, it is recommended that appraisers should be also close as possible, in terms of organizational level, to the individual being evaluated. Conversely, the more levels that separate the rater and ratee, the less opportunity the rater has to observe the rater's behaviour surprisingly, the greater the possibility for inaccuracies.

VI. **Training Raters.** Rater training is an area which has recently shown some promise in improving the effectiveness of performance ratings. Smith (1986:22-23) reveals that researchers use three methods to present training: lecture, group discussion, and practice and feedback. Lecture presentation includes the traditional class room-type monologue (requiring little or no participation from the trainees in discussing the material being presented).

Authorities in the field of Human Resource Management have proposed various means and ways of alleviating these problems. Leap and Crino (1993: 362) are among these authorities. According to them, problems of performance appraisal will be minimized if the following measures are taken.

- Tailoring performance appraisal to an organization's specific set of jobs.
- Training appraisers to understand the importance of objective, error-free assessment of employee performance.
- Periodically monitoring and evaluating the operation of the organization's performance appraisal program, and
- Creating an atmosphere of teamwork, employee self-development, and continual involvement.

Moreover, Dessler (1982:214) confirmed that, providing appraising with instructions and training, and selecting the exact appraisal instrument will to alleviate some of the previously mentioned problems and improve the validity of appraisals. Emphasizing the importance of training, Hedge and Kavanagh (1988:68), have the following to say: ". . . rater training to avoid these errors is mandatory if one is to have accurate performance appraisals for organizational uses."

Meggison (1981:322), on his part, put forward the following suggestions as means of improving the effectiveness of appraisal schemes.

- Improving their validity and reliability,
- Using multiple appraisals,
- Training the appraisers,
- Basing the appraisals on specific work standards, and
- Providing better feedback.

Finally, Odiorne (1987:30-31), proposes the following guide lines which are helpful for all managers to conduct effective appraisal.

- Review the performance of every employee periodically.
- Develop an organization – wide review system.
- Conduct objective – centred performance reviews.
- Plan your performance reviews carefully.
- Take as much time as necessary.
- Focus on the future, not the past.
- Build self-esteem and increase motivation.

CHAPTER THREE

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter of the thesis deals with the data presentation, analysis, and discussion and have two sections. The first section presents the characteristics of the respondents. Section two of these chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the findings of the study.

3.1. Characteristics of the Respondents

A total of 139 questionnaires were distributed to the trainers, department heads, vocational counsellor, civil service officers, vice principals and principals in five TVET institutes in SNNPR. Out of these questionnaires, 52(80%) from trainers, 40(75%) from department heads, 4(80%) from vocational counsellors, 4(80%) from civil service officers, 5(100%) from vice principals and 5(100%) from principals' were properly filled in and collected. In addition, the interview made with three regional TVET officials and supervisors, five TVET principals', five vice-principals', five civil service officers and five vocational counsellors were also included. Based on the responses obtained from the respondents, the characteristics of the study groups were examined in terms of sex, age, service year and educational qualification of the individuals who are found in the TVET institution. These characteristics are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Characteristics of Respondents by Sex, Age, Service Years, and Educational Qualification

No	Characteristics	Respondents															
		Trainers		Department Heads		Vocational Counselors		Civil Service Officers		Vice Principals		Principals		Regional Officials		Total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Sex:																
	• Male	44	84.6	37	92.5	4	100	4	100	5	100	5	100	3	100	102	90.26
	• Female	8	15.4	3	7.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	9.74
	• Total	52	100	40	100	4	100	4	100	5	100	5	100	3	100	113	100
2	Age (in year):																
	• 20 & below	4	7.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	3.54
	• 21-30	33	63.5	30	75	1	25	-	-	1	25	-	-	-	-	65	57.52
	• 31-40	12	23.1	7	17.5	2	50	2	50	3	50	4	75	-	-	30	26.55
	• 41-50	3	5.8	3	7.5	1	25	2	50	1	25	1	25	3	100	14	12.39
	• Total	52	100	40	100	4	100	4	100	5	100	5	100	3	100	113	100
3	Total service year:																
	• 0-5	31	59.6	23	57.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54	47.79
	• 6-10	9	17.3	7	17.5	1	25	-	-	1	20	-	-	-	-	18	15.93
	• 11-15	8	15.4	5	12.5	1	25	-	-	3	60	2	40	-	-	19	16.81
	• 16-20	4	7.7	3	7.5	1	25	2	50	1	20	2	40	-	-	13	11.51
	• 21 & above	-	-	2	5	1	25	2	50	-	-	1	20	3	100	9	7.96
	• Total	52	100	40	100	4	100	4	100	5	100	5	100	3	100	113	100
4	Educational qualification																
	• 10+3(Diploma)	18	34.6	11	27.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29	25.66
	• BA/B.SC/B.ED	28	53.9	28	70	4	100	4	100	5	100	4	80	-	-	73	64.60
	• MA/M.SC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	20	3	100	4	3.55
	• Other	6	11.5	1	2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	6.19
	• Total	52	100	40	100	4	100	4	100	5	100	5	100	3	100	113	100

As can be seen from Table 2, greater proportions of TVET institution workforce are males. The low proportion of females might be due to their low involvement in TVET training program. That is why the sample lacks female appraisers. This is not a surprise in countries like that of ours where education and training participation in general and that of females' involvement in particular are relatively low. Melaku (1992:97) confirms this by citing "...participation of females in Ethiopia education and training had been low, resulting to their lower rate in employment too."

As far as age is concerned, majority of the respondents were matured. Regarding the service years, the respondents are classified along the period of time that ranges between 0 and 51 years & above. Table 2 shows that the largest proportion of the respondent have the capacity to brought change in/on the TVET system.

Pertaining educational qualification, the respondents are categorized into five groups, i.e., whether they have certificate, diploma, degree, master's degree and others (diploma or degree holders of other than Ethiopia) which are from lower to higher ranks as per Ethiopian educational and training system. Table 2 illustrates that majority of the respondents are qualified though some of them were working with less qualification that could harm the quality of the training.

Test on the Representativeness of the Samples

To see whether the representation of subjects of the study was fair or biased when frequency of population and samples are compared, chi-square test was employed. The representation of the samples were tasted against types of the respondents i.e., appraisers (trainers, department heads, vocational counsellors and civil service officers) & appraisees (principals and vice principals), sex and academic qualification. The test ought to have been conducted for the representativeness of the samples in terms of age and service years as well. This was not convenient, as it

demands ages and service years of the whole population. The details are revealed in Table 3.

Table 3: Test on Representativeness of the Respondents

No	Subjects of the Study	Population	Samples				$(f_o - f_e)$	$(f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e$	X^2
		f	f	% f_o	% f_e				
1	Appraisers	226	100	90.91	95.76	-4.85	0.2456	5.7933	
	Appraisees	10	10	9.09	4.24	4.85	5.5477		
2	Male	209	99	90	88.56	1.44	0.0234	0.2047	
	Female	27	11	10	11.44	-1.44	0.1813		
3	Diploma	64	29	25.66	26.78	-1.12	0.0468	2.2478	
	First degree	154	73	64.60	64.43	0.17	0.0005		
	Masters degree	4	1	3.55	1.68	1.87	2.0815		
	Other	17	7	6.19	7.11	-0.92	0.1190		

Key:

- **fe** – Expected frequency,
- **fo** – Observed frequency,
- **f** – frequency and
- **X²** – Chi-square

I. Hypothesis Test on Types of the Respondents

Null Hypothesis (H₀): There is no statistically significant sampling bias in sampling the appraisers and appraisees.

Alternative Hypothesis (H₁): There is statistically significant sampling bias in the sampling of the appraisers and appraisees.

The computation of chi-square for testing the representativeness of types of the respondents has yielded $X^2_{cal.}$ to be 5.7933. The table value or critical value of the chi-square at df of one and critical value of 0.05 (two tailed), however, is 3.84. Since $X^2_{cal.} > X^2_{crit.}$, the null hypothesis is rejected and there were appraisers representation bias over appraisees.

II. Hypothesis Test on Sex

The computed value of chi-square ($X^2_{cal.}$) has found to be 0.2047 which is far below the table value or critical value of the chi-square ($X^2_{cal.}$) at df of one and critical value of 0.05 (two tailed) that is 3.84. As $X^2_{cal.} < X^2_{crit.}$, the null hypothesis is accepted ensuring that the sampling of both sex groups was unbiased.

III. Hypothesis Test on Educational Qualification

As far as the representativeness of the respondents based on academic qualification is concerned, chi-square ($X^2_{cal.}$) is 2.2478. The table value of the chi-square ($X^2_{crit.}$) at df of 3 and critical value of 0.05 (two tailed) is 7.81. Here, $X^2_{cal.} < X^2_{crit.}$, ensuring the acceptance of the null hypothesis. It would, therefore, confidently be concluded that the respondents were proportionally sampled from the prevailing population composed of diploma, first degree, masters' degree and other qualification holders.

General speaking, some variations among the expected frequencies (f_e) and the observed frequency (f_o) as shown in Table 4 is / are obviously in the range of tolerable variations at critical value of 0.05; i.e. precision of 95%. Even, the variations are statistically not significant at critical value of 0.01 levels or perfection of 99% indeed.

3.2. Analysis and Interpretation of Data

This is the main section of the thesis where the data from the subjects of the study were presented, analyzed, and interpreted.

Table 4: Data Pertaining to the Purposes of Principals Performance Appraisal (PPA)

No	Purposes	Respondents												Weighted mean score		
		Rating scales														
		Appraisers (N = 100)						Appraisees (N = 10)								
		A 5	B 4	C 3	D 2	F 1	Mean	A 5	B 4	C 3	D 2	F 1	Mean			
3.2.1	What are the main purposes of appraising the performance of TVETI principals?															
a	To enhance professional competence of TVETI principals'.	55	34	5	3	3	4.35	5	4	1	-	-	4.40	4.36		
b	To build up self employment opportunities for the graduates of TVET.	44	31	17	7	1	4.10	5	3	2	-	-	4.30	4.12		
c	To develop job creation and innovative ability of the trainers and trainees in the TVETI.	60	30	8	1	1	4.47	4	3	3	-	-	4.10	4.44		
d	To have many / multiplied job creators rather than job seekers.	44	43	9	3	1	4.26	4	3	2	1	-	3.90	4.23		
e	To improve the quality of the training.	65	25	6	3	1	4.50	6	4	-	-	-	4.60	4.51		
f	To motivate, promote and give transfer for the competent principals'.	42	29	18	8	3	3.99	5	4	1	-	-	4.40	4.03		
g	To take corrective action on the academic and administrative systems.	52	29	7	4	8	4.13	5	4	1	-	-	4.40	4.16		
h	To decide on principals' rank in the career ladder and salary increment.	22	21	29	22	6	3.31	-	2	7	1	-	4.10	3.38		
i	To provide feedback to the principals' as to what their level of performance.	48	27	11	11	3	4.06	6	4	-	-	-	4.60	4.11		
j	To identify principals' training need and to select them for higher education.	43	30	13	10	4	3.98	3	3	3	-	1	3.70	3.96		
k	To reward competent TVET principals'.	30	35	14	17	4	3.70	2	5	2	-	1	3.70	3.70		
l	To fulfill administrative formalities.	40	25	13	8	14	3.69	3	4	3	-	-	4.00	3.72		
Total								4.05							4.18	4.06

As shown in Table 4, appraisers and appraisees were asked to identify the major purposes that they think PPA should serve. To this end, 12 purposes of which seven (a, b, c, e, f, i, j) are formative and the rest summative (d, g, h, k, l) were presented. The mean and weighted mean value of responses for each item is computed. The mean scores from the data analysis were interpreted as strongly disagree (0.5-1.49), disagree (1.5-2.49), undecided (2.5-3.49), agree (3.5-4.49) and strongly agree for 4.5 and above.

As can be easily noted from the mean values both groups of respondents rated the formative as well as the summative purposes with in and above the average, inclined towards the agreement end. The mean scores for the 12 assumed purposes of PPA range from 3.31 to 4.50 for appraisers and from 3.70 to 4.60 in case of appraisees with average mean scores 4.05 and 4.18 respectively.

The weighted mean score values confirm the same situation. It ranges from 3.38 to 4.51 showing the rating of appraisers and appraisees to the indicated items to be within and above the average range with more values falling within the agreement range. Out of 12 listed major purposes of PPA, the weighted mean score values of 10 purposes are within agreement range (3.5-4.49). This might imply that appraisers and appraisees perception to the intended purposes of the system were encouraging.

Enhance professional competence of TVETI principals', building up self employment opportunities for the graduates of TVET, developing job creation and innovative ability of the trainers and trainees in the TVETI, improving the quality of the training, motivating, promoting and giving transfer for the competent principals', and providing feedback to the principals' as to what their level of performance are the six leading purposes of PPA with weighted mean scores 4.36, 4.12, 4.44, 4.51, 4.03 and 4.11 respectively. These were all formative purposes, which PPA could be expected to serve as its primary purposes. This would,

therefore, enable to suggest that the majority of appraisees and the appraisers view PPA purpose to be primarily formative rather than summative.

Regarding, the summative purposes which were perceived as secondary, both groups of respondents rated each item, with almost similar manner as can be observed from their mean score values. To have many / multiplied job creators rather than job seekers, to take corrective action on the academic and administrative systems, to fulfill administrative formalities and to reward competent TVET principals' were the four better chosen items from the summative purposes with weighted mean score of 4.23, 4.16, 3.72 and 3.70 respectively. While, to decide on principals' rank in the career ladder and salary increment was the least rated item with weighted mean score value of 3.38. Examination of the mean score values for each item as rated by appraisees and appraisers also reveal similar trend.

The regional officials and supervisors view to the purposes of PPA were nearly similar in some points from the listed purposes in the Table 4 except a little divergence. According to most of these officials, building up self employment opportunities for the graduates of TVET, developing job creation and innovative ability of the trainers and trainees in the TVETI, improving the quality of the training, and providing feedback to the principals' as to what their level of performance were the major purposes for which the system was designed. The developmental aspects of the performance appraisal such as; motivating, promoting and giving transfer for the competent principals', and enhancing professional competence of TVETI principals' were hardly ever recognized by most of the officials and supervisors. According to Megginson (1981:311-313):

There are two general purposes of performance appraisal. First, it can be used for making administrative decisions such as selecting employees for transfers, promotions, and demotions; determining employees' training needs; offering merit salary adjustment; etc. Second, it can be used for

development purposes in that it provides employees with information about the performance expectations of their employers; feedback concerning subsequent performance; etc.

By and large the assessment of the data leads to the fact that, both participants perceived the purposes of the appraisal would be primarily developmental (formative) rather than administrative (summative) in nature. This is in line with Martin and Trica (2000:126) idea, that highlight the formative purpose of performance appraisal to be the first, considering the summative purposes as secondary that take place based on the information provided by the system.

Table 5: The Nature of Appraisal Criteria

No	Criteria	Respondents												Weighted mean score		
		Rating scales														
		Appraisers (N = 100)						Appraisees (N = 10)								
		A	B	C	D	F	Mean	A	B	C	D	F	Mean			
3.2.2 I	In the principals' performance appraisal system:	5	4	3	2	1	Mean	5	4	3	2	1	Mean			
a	The criteria used are clear and expressed in simple language.	10	9	11	23	47	2.12	1	1	1	4	3	2.30	2.14		
b	The criteria used are relevant to the purpose and objective of principals' performance appraisal.	10	11	15	31	33	2.34	2	-	2	1	5	2.30	2.34		
c	The criteria employed are better in promoting principals' professional responsibilities.	16	9	12	25	38	2.40	-	1	2	3	4	2.00	2.36		
d	The criteria employed are realistic to be performed by principals'.	13	12	13	33	29	2.47	2	1	-	3	4	2.40	2.46		
e	The criteria used are adequate to appraise principals'.	12	13	12	32	31	2.43	1	-	1	2	6	1.80	2.37		
Total average								2.35							2.16	2.33

Performance criteria are standards commonly used for testing or measuring performances. Since TVET training includes many jobs, duties and tasks, and so measuring performance usually requires more than one dimension. In line with this, if performance criteria leave out some important job and duties, they are deficient. If some irrelevant criteria are included, the criteria are said to be polluted.

In light of this, appraisers and appraisees were asked to identify the nature of the performance criteria that measures the performance of principals'. To this end, five criteria related to clarity, relevance, responsibility, realistic ness and adequacy were presented. The mean and weighted mean score value of responses for each item is shown in Table 5. The mean scores from the data analysis were interpreted as strongly disagree (0.5-1.49), disagree (1.5-2.49), undecided (2.5-3.49), agree (3.5-4.49) and strongly agree for 4.5 and above.

As can be easily noted from the mean values both groups of respondents rated the PPA criteria within the disagreement line, inclined towards the disagreement scale. The mean scores for the five assumed criteria of PPA range from 2.12 to 2.47 for appraisers and from 1.80 to 2.40 in case of appraisees with average mean scores 2.35 and 2.16 respectively.

The weighted mean score values confirm the same situation. It ranges from 2.14 to 2.47 showing the rating of appraisers and appraisees to the indicated items to be below average scale with more values fall within the disagreement range. This might imply that appraisers and appraisees perception to the intended criteria is completely unconstructive. According to Cascio, there are five key preconditions that any appraisal system has to fulfil. These are relevance, sensitivity, reliability, acceptability and practicality (2003: 336-338). The criteria listed in the appraisal of principals' performance lacks those basic listed points.

Table 6: Bodies involved in the Development of Appraisal Criteria

No	Criteria	Respondents									
		Rating scales									
		Appraisers (N = 100)					Appraisees (N = 10)				
II	Which of the following parties are in charge of developing appraisal criteria in your context?	A %	B %	C %	D %	F %	A %	B %	C %	D %	F %
a	Principal's (individual principal sets appraisal criteria of his/her own).	8	10	20	29	35	10	10	20	30	30
b	Principals' (collectively set performance plan).	42	40	9	7	2	40	40	10	10	-
c	Vice-principals'	19	22	19	22	18	20	20	20	20	20
d	Civil service officers	45	43	6	4	2	30	50	10	10	-
e	Vocational counselors	9	11	18	23	39	10	10	20	20	40
f	Department heads	24	25	10	21	20	20	30	10	30	10
g	Trainers	22	23	12	18	25	20	20	10	30	20
h	Trainees	4	6	8	37	45	10	-	10	40	40
i	Parents	-	7	8	39	46	-	10	10	30	50
j	Regional TVET officials and supervisors	52	40	4	3	1	50	40	10	-	-

It could clearly be seen from the Table 6 that 85% (39% disagree and 46% strongly disagree) of the appraisers & 80% (30% disagree and 50% strongly disagree) of appraisees and 82% (37% disagree and 45% strongly disagree) of the appraisers & 80% (40% disagree and 40% strongly disagree) of appraisees confirmed that parents and trainers respectively have almost totally not be involved in formulating performance plan for the principals'. Besides, the trend of designing performance plans by individual principals and vocational counselors had negatively supported by 64% (29% disagree and 35% strongly disagree) and 62% (23% disagree and 39% strongly disagree) of appraisers and 60% (30% disagree and 30% strongly disagree) and 60% (20% disagree and 40% strongly disagree) of appraisees respectively. The involvement of vice principals, department heads and trainers in designing and setting performance plan by which principals have been evaluated was not heartening; that it was supported by 41% (19% strongly agree and 22% agree), 49% (24% strongly agree and 25% agree), and 45% (22% strongly agree and 23% agree) of appraisers and 40% (20% strongly agree and 20% agree), 50% (20% strongly agree and 30% agree), and 40% (20% strongly agree and 20% agree) of the appraisees. So who are in charge of developing performance standards against which principals' performance have been appraised? The response to this question is briefly shown in Table 6 revealing the task to have been given to regional officials, civil service officers and principals collectively set the criteria. This is the fact as per 92% (52% strongly agree & 40% agree) of appraisers and 90% (50% strongly agree & 40% agree) of appraisees for regional officials & supervisors, 88% (45% strongly agree & 43% agree) of appraiser and 80% (30% strongly agree & 50% agree) of appraisees for civil service officers, and 82% (42% strongly agree & 40% agree) of appraisers and 80% (40% strongly agree & 40% agree) of appraisees for collective principals' that the three parties carryout the development of performance plan for principals'.

Table 7: Respondents Attitude towards PPA

No	Attitude	Respondents			
		Rating scales			
		Appraisers (N = 100)		Appraisees (N = 10)	
3.2.3 I	What attitude do you have towards principals' performance appraisal?	f	%	f	%
a	Highly positive	40	40	3	30
b	Positive	46	46	5	50
c	Neutral	10	10	1	10
d	Negative	2	2	1	10
e	Highly negative	2	2	-	-

In relation to the data in Table 7, 40% of appraisers and 30% of appraisees have highly positive outlook towards PPA; where as the majority of respondents i.e. 46% of the appraisers and 50% of appraisees respectfully have positive attitude towards it. There are also respondents taking the middle way having neutral attitude towards PPA. These groups constitute a total of 10% of appraisers and 10% of appraisees. On top of that 2% of appraisers and 10% of appraises have negative attitude towards PPA. Lastly, it was found to be the attitude of 2% of the appraisers have highly negative attitude; while there were no apraisees with highly negative attitude towards PPA.

A close observation to the data in the Table 7 shows that both appraisers and appraisees have similar (positive) attitude towards PPA.

Table 8: Reason for the Negative Attitude to PPA

No	Attitude	Respondents	
		Rating scales	
		Appraisers	Appraisees
II	Possible reasons for the development of highly negative or negative attitude towards principals' performance appraisal.	f	f
a	Lack of awareness	1	1
b	Recent experiences have shown its weaknesses	3	1
c	TVET institute born problems	-	-
d	Resulted in unnecessary work burden	1	-
e	Resistance to change	3	1

Table 8 depicts that four appraisers (2 negative and 2 highly negative) and an appraisee (negative) have negative attitude towards PPA. The reasons for the development of such behaviors are the recent experience of the institutes, results resistant to change, lack of awareness and resulted in unnecessary work burden accordingly. But no one is accepted TVET born problems. This shows that still there is a gap of outlook towards PPA.

Table 9: Respondents Response on the Process of PPA

No	Process	Respondents			
		Rating scales			
		Appraisers (N = 100)		Appraisees (N = 10)	
3.2.4	Which of the following parties evaluate principals' performance?	f	%	f	%
a	Principals'	25	25	3	30
b	Vice-principals'	37	37	3	30

c	Civil service offices	69	69	7	70
d	Vocational counselors	36	36	3	30
e	Department heads	62	62	6	60
f	Trainers	42	42	5	50
g	Trainees	21	21	1	10
h	Parents	15	15	1	10
i	Regional TVET officials and supervisors	78	78	8	80

Participants were asked to indicate their preference of appraisers whom they think are the right persons to appraise the performance of TVET principals. As shown in the Table 9, greater numbers of respondents (i.e. 78% of appraisers and 80% of the appraisees) chose regional TVET officials and supervisors as the pertinent appraisers of principals. Following regional TVET officials and supervisors, civil service officers were chosen by 69% of appraisers and 70% of appraisees. Moreover, as reported by 62% of appraisers and 60% of appraisees, department heads won the next most preferred alternative of respondents. In contrary, the data obtained from the two study groups reveal that the tendency of appraisers and appraisees to be uncertain in accepting trainees and parents as designated appraisers of principals' performance. In relation to this Stow and Jim (1981:539) cited as ... trained and dedicated appraisers shall carryout the performance appraisal. Additionally, Prased and Bannerjee (1985:118) stressed that, PA is the task to be carried out by some one who is familiar with the employees' performance. These all supports the exclusion of parents and trainees from appraisal of principals' performance.

Table 10: Problems Observed within PPA

No	Problems	Respondents									
		Rating scales									
		Appraisers (N = 100)					Appraisees (N = 10)				
		A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F
3.2.5	What were the major problems encountered in applying principals' performance appraisal?	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
I											
a	Conflicts / challenges concerning appraisal results (between appraisers and appraisees).	35	33	20	10	2	30	30	10	10	10
b	Interference of regional TVET officials concerning appraisal results.	43	27	14	12	4	30	40	30	-	-
c	Lack of adequate experience and knowledge on the part of the appraisers.	47	42	6	4	1	40	40	10	10	-
d	Poor administration of the overall appraisal process.	56	35	4	1	-	50	40	10	-	-
e	Lack of pre and post appraisal discussion between appraisee and appraisers.	42	42	8	3	5	30	50	20	-	-
f	The inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria to apprise the principals' of TVET institutes.	45	40	8	5	2	40	40	10	10	-
g	Lack of sufficient time to appraise principals'.	15	25	10	20	30	20	30	10	20	20
h	The purposes of the appraisal system being unrealistic.	36	28	18	13	5	20	40	30	10	-
i	Lack of rewards for outstanding performers.	32	30	20	14	4	30	30	10	10	20
j	The practice of Principals' performance appraisal is not well known in the TVET institutes.	49	31	12	6	2	50	30	20	-	-

It is shown in the Table 10, the major problems encountered according to the witness of the appraisers, in descending order includes poor administration of the overall appraisal process, lack of adequate experience and knowledge on the part of the appraisers, inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria to apprise the principals' of TVET institutes, lack of pre and post appraisal discussion between appraisee and appraisers, the practice of Principals' performance appraisal is not well known in the TVET institutes, and interference of regional TVET officials concerning appraisal results. Quantitatively, the six problems appeared in the item as options, were supported (strongly agree plus agree) by 91%, 89%, 85%, 84%, 80% and 70% of the appraisers respectively. The prevalence of the above problems was also witnessed by the interviewees as well. Except for the variations in percentage, the prevalence of the above problems was also witnessed by the appraisees as well. As to them, the seriousness of the problems in descending order include in the similar manner as the appraiser do i.e. poor administration of the overall appraisal process, lack of adequate experience and knowledge on the part of the appraisers, inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria to apprise the principals' of TVET institutes, lack of pre and post appraisal discussion between appraisee and appraisers, the practice of Principals' performance appraisal is not well known in the TVET institutes, and interference of regional TVET officials concerning appraisal results. The existence of these problems were supported (strongly agree plus agree) by 90%, 80%, 80%, 80%, 80% and 70% of appraisees respectively.

On the other hand some respondents have the same opinion that the following points have their own contribution in relation to the problems of PPA. In accordance with the witness of the appraisers and appraisees in descending order includes conflicts / challenges concerning appraisal results (between appraisers and appraisees), the purposes of the appraisal system being unrealistic, and lack of rewards for outstanding performers respectively. In percentile, the existence of the problems were

supported (strongly agree plus agree) by appraisers (68%, 64% and 62%) and 60% with the three groups of appraisees respectively.

Meanwhile, 62% of appraisers and 50% of appraisees oppose shortage of time. From this point of view nearly there was not lack of sufficient time to appraise principals’.

In this regard, it would be reasonable to presume that both appraisers and appraisees were dissatisfied with the principals’ performance appraisal system because of the aforementioned problems.

Table 11: Sources of Problems linked to PPA

No	Problems	Respondents									
		Rating scales									
		Appraisers (N = 100)					Appraisees (N = 10)				
		A	B	C	D	F	A	B	C	D	F
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
II	Whom do you blame for the prevalence of such problems (listed above), if any?										
a	Government (MOE)	67	21	6	4	2	40	40	10	10	-
b	Regional government and educational bureau.	50	46	4	-	-	50	50	-	-	-
c											
d	TVET institute management.	45	38	11	4	2	40	30	-	10	20
e	Parents / community.	14	13	8	32	33	10	-	20	40	30
f	Trainers	29	20	18	21	12	10	10	50	10	20
	Trainees	21	12	10	23	34	10	-	40	30	20

Data presented in the Table 11 presents that majority of the appraisers 96% (50% strongly agree and 46% agree) have responded that the regional government and educational bureau is to be blamed above all. Secondly, appraisers blame the government (MOE) with 88% (67% strongly agree and 21% agree) of them responding so. Thirdly, according to the view of appraisers 83% (45% strongly agree and 38% agree) of

TVET institute management bodies were also among the sources of the said problem.

Appraisees on their side pointed their fingers to the regional government and educational bureau as the main source of the problems associated with the implementation of PPA. The regional government and educational bureau was blamed by 100% (50% strongly agree and 50% agree) of the appraisees. While responding to the open ended questions, each of the three parties were blamed for different roles they played and also have been plying in the course of formulating and enforcing implementation of policy or directives pertaining to PPA. The regional government and educational bureau blamed for the making them the TVET department dependent on the educational bureau and the educational bureau still can't addressed appropriate and holistic evaluation format of principals' performance. Government (MOE) was blamed as a source of problem for its not formulating TVETI (principal) centered policy which deprives principals of their right of being beneficiary of the system. TVET management bodies on their side blamed for being they are implementers of the policy and directives even if with clear gaffes and for not value PPA. Since PPA is rather a type of MBO whereby appraisal is based on the attainment of the pre-set objectives (De Cenzo et al, 1988) in Berhanu (2005:6)

Conversely, parents, trainees, and trainers were almost not criticized with both respondent groups for they had no and little part they played. In TVET institute the contribution of parents and trainees in the process of performance appraisal compared to that of general education it is negligible.

Table 12: Problems Observed in the Process of PPA

No	Problems	Respondents												Weighted Mean Score		
		Rating scales														
		Appraisers (N = 100)						Appraisees (N = 10)								
		A	B	C	D	F	Mean	A	B	C	D	F	Mean			
III	Which of the following problems have you observed in the process of principals' performance appraisal?															
a	Rating high based on loyalty.	37	33	19	10	1	3.95	1	3	5	1	-	4.00	3.96		
b	Giving average ratings to avoid possible controversy or criticism.	28	50	17	3	2	3.99	1	4	3	2	-	3.40	3.94		
c	Rating based on recent relationship between appraisers and appraisee.	47	28	20	2	3	4.14	-	5	3	1	1	3.60	4.09		
d	Lack of the necessary knowledge, skill and experience.	43	29	18	5	5	4.00	5	4	-	-	1	4.20	4.02		
Total average								4.02							3.80	4.00

Appraisers and appraisees were asked to identify problems which are frequently occurs in the process of PPA. To this end, four common problems of performance appraisal process were presented. The mean and weighted mean score value of responses for each item is shown in Table 12. The mean scores from the data analysis were interpreted as strongly disagree (0.5-1.49), disagree (1.5-2.49), undecided (2.5-3.49), agree (3.5-4.49) and strongly agree for 4.5 and above.

As can be easily noted from the mean values both groups of respondents rated the process problems of PPA with in and above the average, inclined towards the agreement scale. The mean scores for the four assumed process problems of PPA rage from 3.95 to 4.14 for appraisers and from 3.40 to 4.20 in case of appraisees with average mean scores 4.02 and 3.80 respectively.

The weighted mean score values confirm the same situation. It ranges from 3.94 to 4.09 showing the rating of appraisers and appraisees to the indicated items to be above the average scale with more values fall within the agreement range. All of the weighted mean score values are bounded with in agreement scale (3.5-4.49). From the appraisers and appraisees point of view the intended process problems of the system needs improvement.

Table 13: Respondents Recommendation for the Improvement of PPA

3.2.6	What interventions need to be made to harness PPA into fruitful appraisal system?	Respondents Rating scales						D= r ₁ -r ₂	D ²
		Appraisers			Appraisees				
		f	%	r ₁	f	%	r ₂		
a	Practicing PPA by improving the difficulties within time limit.	63	63	2	5	50	5	-3	9
b	Providing training to appraisers.	65	65	1	9	90	1	0	0
c	Providing training to appraisees.	50	50	5	8	80	2	3	9
d	Sticking PPA to the training system.	39	39	6	7	70	3	3	9
e	Participating apprentice-ship providers in the PPA process.	55	55	3	6	60	4	-1	1
f	Participating the community and micro & small scale enterprise office in the PPA process.	52	52	4	4	40	6	-2	4
Sum of D² = 32									

It is clearly revealed in the Table 13 that the appraisers rated the decisions in the rank order of providing training to appraisers (65%), practicing PPA by improving the difficulties within time limit (63%), participating apprentice-ship providers in the PPA process (55%), and participating the community and micro & small scale enterprise office in the PPA process (52%). The appraisees on their part, ranked the recommendations as providing training to appraisers (90%), providing training to appraisees (80%), sticking PPA to the training system (70%), and participating apprentice-ship providers in the PPA process (60%). It was found in Table 13 that two options from the side of appraisers i.e. providing training to appraisees (50%) and sticking PPA to the training system (39%) and also two options from the side of appraisees i.e. Practicing PPA by improving the difficulties within time limit (50%) and participating the community and micro & small scale enterprise office in the PPA process (40%) were supported by less number of participants. The above less supported ideas are interchangeably selected as supporting idea. This is because of the difference in the opinion and understanding of the appraisers and appraisees in relation to their duties and responsibilities.

Whether the ranking of both respondents groups statistically differ or not, it is shown by applying the spearman-rank order correlation.

Hypothesis Test

H₀: There is no statistically significant ranking difference between the appraisers and appraisees in their recommendation.

H₁: There is statistically ranking difference in their recommendation.

The computation for spearman-rank order correlation (ρ) has yielded ρ_{cal} to be 0.0857; while the critical value of ρ at $N = 6$ and at the level of significance 0.05 (two-tailed) is 0.886. Here, it is shown that $\rho_{cal} < \rho_{crit}$. This is evidence to accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no statistically significant ranking difference between the appraisers and appraisees in their recommendation. That is, appraisees

and appraisees have almost similar interest in prioritization of the appeared recommendations.

In connection to the over mentioned points the interviewee and respondents of open ended questions given suggestion in various levels. In TVET level, there must be awareness creation program for both administrative and training staff concerning the clarity and objectivity of the sited criteria, adapting continuous follow up and creating conducive training environment. Activities done in regional level are based on the situation of the region and the vision, mission, and objectives of TVETI preparing out come based purpose, objectives and criteria, PPA should be scheduled and performed as one of operational plan, arranging experience sharing scheme, and carry out supervision quarterly. Lastly, MOE should distribute standardized policies and guide lines for all regions and make continuous follow up on the implementation.

CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This is the final chapter of the thesis that deals with the summary of the major outcomes of the study, the conclusions get in touch with / attained at, and the recommendations forwarded on the basis of the findings.

4.1. Summary

The key purpose of this study was to assess the perception of principals' on the system of appraising principals' performance in selected governmental TVET Institute in SNNPR. To this end, basic questions were raised which addressed areas such as the main purposes of appraising performance, the process of performance appraisal, the basic criteria of the performance appraisal, and the major problems encountered in appraising the performance of TVETI principals' and the interventions made. Questions were also raised in relation the above basic research questions.

The research was conducted in five governmental TVET institutes in SNNPR. In selecting the research subjects, both stratified, availability and Purposive sampling techniques are used. Sixteen trainers from Bonga TVET institute, 20 trainers from Butajira, 16 trainers from Dilla, 5 trainers from Tappi and 8 trainers from Wolkite were selected as representatives to answer the questionnaire. And also 54 department heads, 5 vocational counsellors, 5 civil service officers, 5 vice principals, 5 principals and 3 regional TVET officials were selected as representatives to respond the questionnaires and interview guidelines. This makes the total sample size 142. Field test was made with two institutes (i.e. Bonga and Teppi) and modified for distribution.

The data obtained were analyzed by using statistical tools such as chi-square test, spearman rank order correlation, weighted mean score,

mean and percentage. Based on the results of the data analysis, the major findings of the study are the following.

1. As disclosed from the results of the weighted mean score and mean value, the core purposes of the principals' performance appraisal are perceived by appraisers and appraisees comparably. Putting side by side the two purposes of PPA based on the value of their mean and weighted mean score; the formative purposes of PPA take the lead. More than five formative purposes out of the seven were prioritized by appraisees and appraisers. The regional officials and supervisors view to the purposes of PPA were almost comparable with a little deviation. So, it would be evident that there exists perceptual link between appraisers and appraisees that PPA should primarily developmental rather than administrative in purpose.
2. The study revealed from the results of weighted mean score (from 2.14 to 2.47) and mean values (from 2.12 to 2.47 for appraisers and from 1.80 to 2.40 for appraisees) that the rating of appraisers and appraisees for the indicated items to be below average scale with almost all values fall within the disagreement range. These might entail that the intended criteria are completely unconstructive and deficient in fulfilling important jobs, duties and tasks. According to Cascio (2003: 336-338), there are five key preconditions that any appraisal system has to fulfil. These are relevance, sensitivity, reliability, acceptability and practicality. The criteria listed in the appraisal of principals' performance lacks those basic points.
3. As to the majority of the respondents have assured that setting performance criteria have been left to the regional officials, civil service officers and principals' collectively. Interviewees answered that, once the performance plans were roughly prepared by regional officials there must be discussion with principals'

(collectively) and civil service officers up on the plan for reaching at an agreement which would be endorsed as requirement of appraisal. This agrees with the nature of MBO (PPA is a part) where performance plans, objectives and standards are set on the basis of mutual agreement between appraisers and appraisees.

4. Most of the respondents 96% (46% of the appraisers and 50% of appraisees) have positive attitude towards PPA and 70% (40% of appraisers and 30% of appraisees) have highly positive attitude towards it. But a little number of respondents have negative and highly negative attitude. This is because of lack of awareness, the recent experience of the institutes, resulted resistant to change and an increment of unnecessary work burden. Therefore, it was obvious that both appraisers and appraisees have similar (positive) attitude towards PPA.
5. It was evident that a greater numbers of respondents (78% of appraisers and 80% of the appraisees) chose regional TVET officials and supervisors as the pertinent appraisers of principals. Next to the regional TVET officials and supervisors, civil service officers were chosen (69% of appraisers and 70% of appraisees) and department heads won the last most preferred alternative of respondents (62% of appraisers and 60% of appraisees). Conversely, almost all respondents considered parents and trainees as being incompetent to appraise TVETI principals' due to their lack of compulsory knowledge, skill and experience.
6. As reported by considerable proportion of the two study groups, the major problems encountered in appraising the performance of TVETI principals were found to be, poor administration of the overall appraisal process, lack of adequate experience and knowledge on the part of the appraisers, inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria to apprise the principals' of TVET institutes, lack of pre and post appraisal

discussion between appraisee and appraisers, the practice of Principals' performance appraisal is not well known in the TVET institutes, and interference of regional TVET officials concerning appraisal results. The occurrence of the above problems was also witnessed by the interviewees as well.

7. According to the responses of the two study groups' regional government and educational bureau, the government (MOE), and TVET institute management bodies blamed from top to bottom for the prevalence of problems associated with the implementation of PPA. On the contrary, parents and trainees were almost not condemned with both respondent groups for they had insignificant involvement.
8. Finally, the following suggestions were forwarded by the participants. Likewise, providing training to appraisers, practicing PPA by improving the difficulties within time limit, participating apprentice-ship providers in the PPA process, providing training to appraisees, participating the community and micro & small scale enterprise office in the PPA process (appraisers), and sticking PPA to the training system (appraisees).

4.2. Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, a number of conclusions could be drawn. The following are, however, the major ones.

1. Regarding the purposes, it would be possible to conclude that there was a significant deviation between the purposes for which PPA was intended to serve and serving on. Even if, the appraisers and appraisees perceived the purposes of the appraisal seems good and in harmony. The PPA in those TVET institutions has not almost served both the formative and summative purposes. It seems simply a matter of fulfilling formality. As result, principals attach no value to their performance appraisal. It would, therefore,

be possible to expect principals to perform below their potential in generating creative and research-oriented generation.

2. The existing appraisal criteria of principals' were perceived to be mysterious, vague, irrelevant and unrealistic and this might lead to the dissatisfaction of principals. Thus, it could be said that the performance of TVETI principals has been appraised by the criteria which were incompatible with their duties and responsibilities. Moreover, it would be reasonable to presume that this inappropriateness has made TVETI principals develop negative attitude towards the appraisal scheme.
3. The positive attitude of the respondents towards PPA confirms that the presence of any evaluation system was encouraging, and results working genuinely for the sake of work i.e. in reality. But, in TVETI it is unwise to expect positive outcome from incomplete appraisal scheme, and relative failures would be inevitable unless meaningful amendments are made.
4. The finding of the study proved that the PPA process is not participatory and has not been properly implemented in the way it was expected to be. Principals' in order to develop constructive perception towards performance appraisal, they should be appraised by those who know the complexity of the job, and who have close contact with the training process and the day to day activities of TVETI principals. On the other hand, parents and trainees were not eligible to appraise TVET principals. This implies that both of the study groups do not have trust and confidence in these appraisers. This does not mean that constructive comments and suggestions could not be obtained from parents and trainers. The investigator believes that they should serve as sources of information but not to be straight appraisers.
5. Problems related to poor administration of the overall appraisal process, lack of adequate experience and knowledge on the part of

the appraisers, inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria, lack of pre and post appraisal discussion between appraisee and appraisers, the practice of Principals' performance appraisal is not well known in the TVET institutes, and interference of regional TVET officials concerning appraisal results were found to be the major ones encountered in the appraisal of TVET principals. Hence, it would be safe to conclude that due attention was not given to the over mentioned key points. It could also be said that both appraisers and appraisees have been dissatisfied with the system of PPA due to these and other problems of the appraisal scheme. This might further suggest the need for revising the major components of the appraisal scheme if effective operation of the system is to be realized.

4.3. Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of the study and the conclusion drawn, the following recommendations, which are thought to be feasible, were forwarded.

1. The appraisal system is required to be efficient; it should be used as an instrument of change and motivation rather than of punishment. In this regard principals' performance appraisal is supposed to be most effective when universal harmony exists among the purposes of the appraisal scheme and, when the perceived purposes coincide with the actual practices. However, the existing appraisal system of principals was found almost not serving the said purposes, though the perception of principals and appraisers had to what should be the purpose of PPA seems fair and in agreement. Poor administration of the overall appraisal process is among the major factors that make the system not to achieve its intended purposes. Thus, the administrative and developmental purposes of appraisal need to be understood by both the appraisers and principals.

2. The study revealed that the criteria presently employed to appraise the performance of TVETI principals are found to be inadequate and inappropriate and need to be revision, so as to reflect changes in the operational environment. The more the criteria become job-related, transparent and clearly defined, the better their measurability and objectivity in assessing principals' effort and the higher will be principals' motivation and commitment to exert their maximum effort. Hence, practical measures need to be taken to make the appraisal criteria compatible with the duties and responsibilities of the principals. The investigator suggests that, this could be done by,

- ❖ Giving responsibility to TVETI principals and civil service officers collectively to develop TVETI based appraisal criteria and get revised, examined and approved by the experts and supervisors at the regional level; and then will be used for the appraisal of principals. or
- ❖ Developing the draft of PPA criteria at the regional level and leave it open to discussion, criticism, and modifications by trainers, department heads, vocational counselors, civil service officers, vice principals and principals at TVETI level before putting into practice. or
- ❖ Preparing the appraisal criteria by the experts and civil service officer of TVET section at the central level and a draft set of appraisal criteria in view of various research findings on TVET success. Then the draft will be open for argument and adjustment by TVETI principals and other concerned educators and practitioners. The inputs obtained would be fittingly considered in the finalized appraisal criteria to be used in the scheme of PPA. or
- ❖ Combining the above three organized criteria.

3. More has to be done to effect changes in the attitudes of appraisers and appraisees towards the act of participative,

transparent and cooperative culture of PPA. Bearing this in mind, relevant training has to be arranged and provided to appraisers and principals regarding the purpose and importance of PPA, and its contents and application. This strengthens the system's acceptance and commitment by all the appraisers and appraisees.

4. The study indicates that the TVETI principals would be appraised by those who have close contact with the training process and who are familiar with the complication of the task. Therefore, it is possible to recommend that the MOE together with REB need to take necessary measures to revise the designation of appraisers in such a way that regional officials and supervisors, civil service officer and department heads are to be involved in the appraisal of TVETI principals. The rationale behind is that, those people have close contact with the usual activities of the principals and know the complexity of the job; they can pass valid judgments on the appraisal of principals' performance.
5. Problems encountered in appraising the performance of TVETI principals are wide and complex in nature and hence close attention and careful analysis is very essential to overcome these problems. Some of the major problems encountered in the appraisal of TVETI principals were poor administration of the overall appraisal process, lack of adequate experience and knowledge on the part of the appraisers, inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria to apprise the principals', lack of pre and post appraisal discussion between appraisee and appraisers, the practice of Principals' performance appraisal is not well known in the TVET institutes, and interference of regional TVET officials concerning appraisal results. Bearing this in mind,

- ❖ It would seem vital for experts, officials and supervisors, civil service officers and principals at the central, regional and

TVETI level to expend greater effort in organizing a series of long on-the-job training or short off-the-job training and orientation for appraisers and appraisees so as to enable them acquire adequate skill, knowledge and experience; and to acquaint them with the purposes, criteria, process and procedures of PPA scheme; and other relevant issues of the appraisal system.

- ❖ Providing principals with timely feedback on their past performance and conducting post assessment interview.
- ❖ Authorities at all levels should be open minded and respective to criticism and constructive ideas and bring to an end unnecessary interference.

Generally, policies, procedures and regulations written and documented alone do not guarantee a fruitful implementation of PPA in the TVET scheme. These provisions should be supplemented by adequate number of educated, trained and skilled human resources, reasonable budget supply and infrastructure for information and global technologies. Such optimum blend of the required resources can ensure the sustainability of TVET system and of PPA as a modern performance evaluation approach.

15. Chaube, S. P. and Chaube, A. (1996). **School Organization**. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing Company.
16. Clayton Jones, L. et al (1993). New Way to Assess the Performance of School Principals. Peabody Journal of Education Vol. 68, No. 2.
17. Cowling, A. (1998). **Managing Human Resource**, 3rd ed., Middlesex University Business School.
18. De Cenzo, D. (1988). **Human Resource Management**. 3rd ed., New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
19. Den Hartog, D. N., Boselie, P. & Paauwe, J. (2004). "Performance Management: A Model and Research Agenda" Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53(4), Journal.
20. Dessler, G. (1982). **Organization and Management**. Reston: Reston Publishing Company, Inc.
21. Donnelly, et al (1992). **Fundamentals of Management**. Homewood: Richard Irwin, Inc.
22. Duck, D. and Stiggins, R. (1985). "Evaluating the Performance of Principals: A Descriptive Study," Education Administration Quality. Vol. 21, No. 4, Journal.
23. Ed Snape, Tom Redman and Greg J. Bamber (1997). **The Best Techniques for Managing Managers**. New Delhi: Beacon Books.
24. Fidler, B. and R. Cooper (1992). **Staff Appraisal and Staff Management in Schools and Colleges: A Guide to Implementation**. Essex: Longman Group UK Ltd.
25. Fisher, M. (1995). **Performance Appraisals**, the Sunday Times Business Skills Series, Kogan Page Limited, London.
26. Fletcher, C. V. (2003). **Appraisal: Routes to Improved Performance**, 2nd ed., London: Short Run Press, Exeter.
27. Flippo, E. B. (1980). **Personnel Management**, 5th ed., McGraw-Hill Inc., New York.
28. Gebretensay Tesfay (1998). "The Practice and Problems of Parents Involvement in the Evaluation of Teachers in Some Senior

15. Chaube, S. P. and Chaube, A. (1996). **School Organization**. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing Company.
16. Clayton Jones, L. et al (1993). New Way to Assess the Performance of School Principals. Peabody Journal of Education Vol. 68, No. 2.
17. Cowling, A. (1998). **Managing Human Resource**, 3rd ed., Middlesex University Business School.
18. De Cenzo, D. (1988). **Human Resource Management**. 3rd ed., New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
19. Den Hartog, D. N., Boselie, P. & Paauwe, J. (2004). "Performance Management: A Model and Research Agenda" Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53(4), Journal.
20. Dessler, G. (1982). **Organization and Management**. Reston: Reston Publishing Company, Inc.
21. Donnelly, et al (1992). **Fundamentals of Management**. Homewood: Richard Irwin, Inc.
22. Duck, D. and Stiggins, R. (1985). "Evaluating the Performance of Principals: A Descriptive Study," Education Administration Quality. Vol. 21, No. 4, Journal.
23. Ed Snape, Tom Redman and Greg J. Bamber (1997). **The Best Techniques for Managing Managers**. New Delhi: Beacon Books.
24. Fidler, B. and R. Cooper (1992). **Staff Appraisal and Staff Management in Schools and Colleges: A Guide to Implementation**. Essex: Longman Group UK Ltd.
25. Fisher, M. (1995). **Performance Appraisals**, the Sunday Times Business Skills Series, Kogan Page Limited, London.
26. Fletcher, C. V. (2003). **Appraisal: Routes to Improved Performance**, 2nd ed., London: Short Run Press, Exeter.
27. Flippo, E. B. (1980). **Personnel Management**, 5th ed., McGraw-Hill Inc., New York.
28. Gebretensay Tesfay (1998). "The Practice and Problems of Parents Involvement in the Evaluation of Teachers in Some Senior

Secondary School of Addis Ababa.” Addis Ababa, Senior Essay, Unpublished.

29. Getnet Eshetu and Maru Shete (2005). Performance of Staff of Ethiopian Telecommunication: A Comparative Analysis between Conventional and Distance Model Accounting. In St. Mary University (ed.), **Proceedings of the 3rd National Conference on Private Higher Education in Ethiopia**, Addis Ababa, 20 August 2005.
30. Goel, S. L. & Rajhneesh, S. (2003). **Public Personnel Administration**, Theory and Practice, Deep & Deep Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
31. Gold, R. (2000). **Running a School**. London: Jordan University Press.
32. Gomez-Mejia and Luis R. (1995). **Managing Human Resource**. London: Prentice Hall.
33. Graham, H. T., and R. Bennett (1990). **Human Resource Management**, 6th ed., London: Pitman Publishing Ltd.
34. Gupta (1998). **Human Resource Management**. 2nd ed., New Delhi: Shukla Offset Press.
35. Hall, D. and James, G. (1986). **Resource Management Strategy Design and Implementation**. London: Scott Foresman and Company.
36. Hansen, D. (2005). Performance Appraisal Tips Page. Retrieved (March 10, 2007): [http://1509.kl.hot.att.net/per/performance appraisal.html](http://1509.kl.hot.att.net/per/performance%20appraisal.html).
37. Hattersley, M. (1992). **The Appraisal of Head Teachers**. London: Cassell.
38. Healy, M. (1994). **The Experience of Head Teacher Appraisal**. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
39. Hedge, J. W. and M. J. Kavanagh (1988). Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 73, No. 1.
40. Ivancevich, J. M. (1997). **Foundation of Personnel**, 4th ed., Richard D. Irwin Inc, USA.

41. Ivancevich, J. M. & Glueck, W. F. (1989). **Foundations of Human Resource Management**, IRWIN Inc., Homewood / Boston.
42. Jonathan Sutherland and Diane Canwell (2004). **Key Concepts in Human Resource Management**. Macmillan Distribution Ltd., England.
43. Keeley, M. (1978). "A Contingency Framework for Performance Evaluation." *The Academy of Management Review*, 3(3), Journal.
44. Kumar, J. (1996). **How to Create Winning Organization**. London: UBS Publishers.
45. Leap T. L. and M. D. Crino (1993). **Personnel / Human Resource Management**. 2nd ed., New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
46. Lee, C. (1985). "Increasing Performance Appraisal Effectiveness: Matching Task Types, Appraisal Process, and Ratter Training", *Academy of Management Review*, 10(2), Journal.
47. Martin, M. and Tricia, J. (2000). **Personnel Practice**. London: Crom Well Press.
48. Mathis, R. L. and Jackson, J. H. (1997). **Human Resource Management**. New York: West Publishing Company.
49. Megginson, L. C. (1981). **Personnel Management: A Human Resources Approach**. 4th ed., Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
50. Melaku Yimam (1992). "Appraiser-Appraisee Perception of Teachers Performance Appraisal." AAU (Unpublished Masters' Thesis).
51. MOE (1987). **Guidance of School Administration**. Ministry of Education, Addis Ababa, Vol. 2.
52. Mondy, R. W. and Robert, M. (1990). **Human Resource Management**. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
53. Montgomery, D. and Hadfield, N. (1989). **Practical Teacher Appraisal**. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
54. Mullins, J. (1996). **Management and Organizational Behaviour**. London: Pisman Publishing.

55. Odiorne, G. S. (1987). **The Human Side of Management: Management by Integration and Self-Control**. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company.
56. Paul, E. Spector (2000). **Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Research and Practice**, 2nd ed., University of South Florida, New York.
57. Philp, T. (1992). **Appraising Performance for Result**. Maidenhead: McGraw Hill Book Company (UK) Ltd.
58. Prased, L and Bannerjee (1985). **Managements of Human Resources**. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
59. Ramasamy, T. (1999). **Principles of Management**. New Delhi: Himalaya Publishing House.
60. Rao, V. S. P. & Rao, P. Subba (2004). **Personnel / Human Resource Management-Text**, Cases and Games, 8th ed., Konark Publishers Pvt. Ltd. Co. New Delhi.
61. Robbins, S. P. (1996). **Organizational Behaviour: Concepts-Controversies-Applications**. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
62. Rue, L. W. and L. L. Byars (1990). **Supervision: Key Link to Productivity**. 3rd ed., Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
63. Rush, C., et al (1988). **Effective Managerial Action: A Case in Organizational Behaviour**. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice Hall Canada Inc.
64. R. Wayne, Mondy and Robert M. Noe (1990). **Human Resource Management**, 4th ed., Simon and Schiter, Inc, USA.
65. Saiyadain, M. S. (1995). **Human Resource Management**, 5th ed., New Delhi: McGraw Hill.
66. Saiyadain, M. S. (1999). **Human Resource Management**, 10th ed., Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. Ltd., New Delhi.
67. Schermerhorn, J. R. (1989). **Management for Productivity**. 3rd ed., New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
68. Schraeder, M. & Simpson J. (2006). "How Similarity and Liking Affect Performance Appraisals" *The Journal for Quality and Participation*.

69. Smith, D. E. (1986). "Training Programs for Performance Appraisal: A Review." *Academy of Management Review*, 11(1), Journal.
70. SNNPR-ECBB (2004). *Result Oriented Performance Appraisal of Teachers and Principals'*. Awassa (Unpublished).
71. Stoner, J. A. F. and Freeman, R. E. (1989). **Management**. 4th ed., New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.
72. Stow, B. and Jim, S. (1981). "Developing and Teachers Performance Appraisal System." **Educational Leadership**. Vol. 38 No. 7.
73. Szilagyi, A. and Marc, J. (1983). **Organizational Behaviour**. London: Scott, Foresman and Company.
74. Terry, G. R. and S. G. Franklin (1997). **Principles of Management**. 8th ed., New Delhi: Nice Printing Press.
75. Thomason, R. (2000). **Managing People**. 2nd ed., Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd.
76. Torrington, D., Hall, L., and Taylor, S. (2003). **Human Resource Management**. Rotolito Lombarada.
77. Towers, B. (1998). **Human Resource Management**. New Delhi: Beacon Books.
78. Tuner, G. and Philip C. (1988). **Studies in Teachers Appraisal**. London: Falmer Press.
79. Webb, L. D. and M. Scott (1999). **Human Resource Administration**. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
80. Werther, W.B. and Keith, D. (1993). **Human Resource and Personnel Management**. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
81. Zawdneh Yimtatu (1987). *Personnel System in Education*, Addis Ababa University, Unpublished.
82. ትምህርት ሚኒስቴር (1974) "ኢንስፐክሽን መግለጫና የሥራ አፈጻጸም መመሪያ" አዲስ አበባ (ያልታተመ)፤
83. ትምህርት ሚኒስቴር (1979) "ኢንስፐክሽን መግለጫ ፣ መመሪያና ዘገባ" አዲስ አበባ (ያልታተመ)፤

APPENDICES

Appendix – A
Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
College of Education
Department of Business Education

A Questionnaire for Trainers and Management Bodies of TVETI

Dear Respondent,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather data for the thesis entitled **“An assessment on the system of appraising principals’ performance in selected governmental TVET Institute in SNNPR.”** Apart from the researcher’s endeavor and other factors, the success of the study also depends up on your honest and genuine responses.

In responding to the questions, please note the following:

1. All the questions raised here are equally important to attain the objectives of the study. Failure to complete any of them will affect the overall study.
2. Provide your responses by putting “√” or “X” marks in the spaces provided for objective type of questions and by writing your opinion to the open ended questions.
3. Be sure that all your response will be kept confidential; and would only be employed in the analysis of the data to reach on some finding.
4. You need not write your name.
5. PPA: Means Principals Performance Appraisal.
6. In case, you have problem on any of the question please do not hesitate to contact me or use my mobile number 09-13-30-74-51.

Thus, the student researcher gently requests your sincere response and acknowledges your cooperation to a greater extent.

Thank you in advance for your kind cooperation!

Lidetu Gizaw Gobena

Section One: Short Answer Questions

Part I:

Background Information

1. Fill all the Necessary Information on the Space Provided.

1.1. Name of the TVET Institute _____

Level _____

1.2. Location of the TVET Institute:

Zone _____ Woreda _____ Kebele _____

1.3. Sex: Male Female

1.4. Age (in years):

20 and below 21 - 30

31 - 40 41 - 50

51 and above

1.5. Service (in years):

A. In training: 0 - 5 , 6 - 10 , 11 - 15 ,
16 - 20 , 21 and above

B. In other: 0 - 5 , 6 - 10 , 11 - 15 ,
16 - 20 , 21 and above

C. Total: 0 - 5 , 6 - 10 , 11 - 15 ,
16 - 20 , 21 and above

1.6. Educational qualification:

10+1 , 10 +2 , 10 + 3 (Diploma)

BA/B.SC/B. Ed , MA / M.SC , Other

1.7. Field of specialization _____

1.8. Current post in the TVET Institute:

Trainer , Principal

Department Head , V/principal

Vocational Counselor , Stream Head

Civil Service Officer , Supervisor

Other

PART II:

2. Data pertaining to the perception of principals' towards the purpose of principals' performance appraisal (PPA).

Direction: Please read each of the items carefully and indicate your agreement / disagreement by putting "✓" or "X" mark in each column using the following rating scales:

Strongly agree (A) , Agree (B) , Undecided (C) , Disagree (D) , and strongly disagree (F). On top of that use: Very highly (VH), Highly (H), Moderately (Mo), Minimally (Mi) and Very Minimally (VM).

No	Purposes	A	B	C	D	F
2.1	What are the main purposes of appraising the performance of TVETI principals'?	A	B	C	D	F
A	To enhance professional competence of TVETI principals'.					
B	To build up self employment opportunities for the graduates of TVET.					
C	To develop job creation and innovative ability of the trainers and trainees in the TVETI.					
D	To have many / multiplied job creators rather than job seekers.					
E	To improve the quality of the training.					
F	To motivate, promote and give transfer for the competent principals'.					
G	To take corrective action on the academic and administrative systems.					
H	To decide on principals' rank in the career ladder and salary increment.					
I	To provide feedback to the principals' as to what their level of performance.					

J	To identify principals' training need and to select them for higher education.					
K	To reward competent TVET principals'.					
L	To fulfill administrative formalities.					

PART III:

3. Questions on the Appraisal Criteria of PPA.

3.1	In the principals' performance appraisal system:	VH	H	Mo	Mi	VM
A	The criteria used are clear and expressed in simple language.					
B	The criteria used are relevant to the purpose and objective of principals' performance appraisal.					
C	The criteria employed are better in promoting principals' professional responsibilities.					
D	The criteria employed are realistic to be performed by principals'.					
E	The criteria used are adequate to appraise principals'.					
3.2	Which of the following parties are in charge of developing appraisal criteria in your context?	A	B	C	D	F
A	Principal's (individual principal sets appraisal criteria of his/her own).					
B	Principals' (collectively set performance plan).					
C	Vice-principals'					
D	Civil service officers					
E	Vocational counselors					
F	Department heads					
G	Trainers					
H	Trainees					
I	Parents					
J	Regional TVET officials and supervisors					

Part IV:

4. Attitude Related Questions

No	Attitude	
4.1	What attitude do you have towards principals' performance appraisal?	Only one choice
A	Highly positive	
B	Positive	
C	Neutral	
D	Negative	
E	Highly negative	
4.2	If your attitude towards principals' performance appraisal is highly negative or negative, what is the possible reason?	More than one choice
A	Lack of awareness	
B	Recent experiences have shown its weaknesses	
C	TVET institute born problems	
D	Resulted in unnecessary work burden	
E	Resistance to change	

Part V:

5. Questions Related to the Process of PPA.

No	The Process of PPA	
5.1	Which of the following parties evaluate principals' performance?	More than one choice
A	Principals'	
B	Vice-principals'	
C	Civil service offices	
D	Vocational counselors	
E	Department heads	

F	Trainers	
G	Trainees	
H	Parents	
I	Regional TVET officials and supervisors	

Part VI:

6. Problem Related Questions.

No	Problems	A	B	C	D	F
6.1	What were the major problems encountered in applying principals' performance appraisal?	A	B	C	D	F
A	Being overloads principals'.					
B	Conflicts / challenges concerning appraisal results (between appraisers and appraisees).					
C	Interference of regional TVET officials concerning appraisal results.					
D	Lack of necessary knowledge of the appraisers.					
E	Lack of adequate experience on the part of the appraisers.					
F	Poor administration of the overall appraisal process.					
G	Lack of pre-appraisal discussion between appraisee and appraisers.					
H	Lack of post appraisal discussion between appraisee and appraisers.					
I	The inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria to apprise the principals' of TVET institutes.					
J	Lack of sufficient time to appraise principals'.					
K	The purposes of the appraisal system being unrealistic.					
L	Lack of rewards for outstanding performers.					

M	The practice of Principals' performance appraisal is not well known in the TVET institutes.					
N	Unclear objective of principals' performance appraisal.					
O	Multiple objectives of principals' performance appraisal.					
6.2	Whom do you blame for the prevalence of such problems (listed above), if any in your institute?	A	B	C	D	F
A	Government / MOE (policy and policy makers).					
B	Regional TVET bureau.					
C	TVET institute management.					
D	Parents / community.					
E	Trainers					
F	Trainees					
6.3	Which of the following problems have you observed in the process of principals' performance appraisal?	A	B	C	D	F
A	Rating high based on loyalty.					
B	Giving average ratings to avoid possible controversy or criticism.					
C	Rating based on recent relationship between appraisers and appraisee.					
D	Lack of the necessary knowledge, skill and experience.					

Part VII:

7. Questions Related to Interventions to be Made.

No	Interventions	A	B	C	D	F
7.3	What interventions need to be made to harness PPA into fruitful appraisal system?	More than one choice				
A	Practicing PPA by improving the difficulties within time limit.					
B	Providing training to appraisers.					
C	Providing training to appraisees.					
D	Sticking PPA to the training system.					
E	Participating apprentice-ship providers in the PPA process.					
F	Participating the community and micro & small scale enterprise office in the PPA process.					

Section Two: Open ended Questions

These questions are forwarded to gather information that are not raised under objective question (section one).

1. What was the time (in year) that principal performance appraisal (PPA) is first introduced in your TVET institute?

2. What interventions need to be made to improve the implementation practices of PPA?

❖ TVET institute level recommendations.

❖ Regional level recommendations.

❖ National level recommendations.

3. Any thing you want to add (if any?)

Appendix – B

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
College of Education
Department of Business Education

Interview Guidelines

Interview Questions organized for the TVET Institute Principals, Vice-Principals, Civil Service Officers and Vocational Counselors.

1. Are you familiar with PPA? How?
2. What is the process you follow to undertake PPA?
3. Is the judgment of PPA free from external and internal influences?
4. What is your general recommendation about PPA?

THANK YOU!

Appendix – C

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
College of Education
Department of Business Education

Interview Guidelines

Interview Questions organized for the Regional TVET Officials & Supervisors

1. What was the time (in year) that principal performance appraisal is first introduced in your region?
2. What are the purposes that PPA scheme is intended to serve in your institution?
3. Are the criteria listed in PPA sounding and all necessary?
4. What problems are encountered in PPA?
5. What is your general recommendation about PPA?

THANK YOU!

Appendix – D

Test on Representative-ness of the Respondents

No	Subjects of the Study	Population	Samples			$(f_o - f_e)$	$(f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e$	$X^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e$
		f	f	% f_o	% f_e			
1	Appraisers	226	100	90.91	95.76	-4.85	0.2456	5.7933
	Appraisees	10	10	9.09	4.24	4.85	5.5477	
2	Male	209	99	90	88.56	1.44	0.0234	0.2047
	Female	27	11	10	11.44	-1.44	0.1813	
3	Diploma	64	29	25.66	26.78	-1.12	0.0468	2.2478
	First degree	154	73	64.60	64.43	0.17	0.0005	
	Masters degree	4	1	3.55	1.68	1.87	2.0815	
	Other	17	7	6.19	7.11	-0.92	0.1190	

Appendix - F

In SNNPR Government Public TVET Providers

