

**RESULT-ORIENTED APPRAISAL OF PRINCIPALS'
PERFORMANCE IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF GUJI ZONE**

**BY
DEREJE ABEBE**



**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

**JULY 2007
ADDIS ABABA**

**RESULT-ORIENTED APPRAISAL OF PRINCIPALS'
PERFORMANCE IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF GUJI ZONE**

**BY
DEREJE ABEBE**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE
STUDIES OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND
MANAGEMENT**

**JULY 2007
ADDIS ABABA**

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

RESULT-ORIENTED APPRAISAL OF PRINCIPALS'
PERFORMANCE IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS GUJI ZONE

BY
DEREJE ABEBE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND
MANAGEMENT



APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Yekunoamlak Alemu

CHAIRMAN, DEPT, GRADUATE COMMITTEE

Yekunoamlak Alemu

SIGNATURE

WOSSENU YIMAM (Ph.D)

ADVISOR

Wosenu Yimam

SIGNATURE

Lemma Setegn

EXTERNAL EXAMINER

Lemma Setegn

SIGNATURE

Ayalew Shiberhi
INTERNAL EXAMINER

Ayalew Shiberhi
SIGNATURE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Of all, I express my deepest gratitude ~~to those who~~ to my thesis advisor Wossenu Yimam (Ph.D) whose guidance, constructive comments and useful suggestions were invaluable throughout my work.

I would like to thank my sister Sinidu Abebe who in various ways rendered her constant help and sympathetic encouragement towards the completion of my study.

I am grateful to Oromia Education Bureau and Oddo Shakiso Education and Capacity Building Office for their sponsoring, and the school of graduate studies of Addis Ababa University for its financial services.

Sincere thanks also go to all individuals, who contributed to the research by filling in the questionnaire and in providing me information during my research work. I wish to extend my thanks to those of my acquaintances on the sampled woredas who helped me in distribution and collection of the questionnaires.

Finally, I would like to thank Hiwot Kefelegn for the secretarial services she provided me.

Dereje Abebe Dadi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
ABBREVIATION	v
ABSTRACT	vi
 CHAPTER ONE	
THE PROBLEM AND ITS APPROACH	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3 Objectives of the Study	6
1.4 Significance of the Study.....	7
1.5 Delimitation of the Study	7
1.6 Limitations of the Study	8
1.7 The Research Design and Methodology.....	8
1.7.1 Method	8
1.7.2 Source of Data	9
1.7.3 Data Gathering Instruments.....	9
1.7.4 Sampling Techniques.....	9
1.7.5 Data Analysis.....	10
1.7.6 Procedure of the Study.....	10
1.8 Operational Definition of Key Terms	11
1.9 Organization of the Study.....	11
 CHAPTER TWO	
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	12
2.1 Definitions and Major Concepts of Performance Appraisal	12
2.2 Result-Oriented Performance Appraisal (ROPA).....	14
2.3 Purposes of Result-Oriented Performance Appraisal	16

2.4 Process of Result–Oriented Performance Appraisal.....	19
2.4.1 Planning Work and Setting Expectations	19
2.4.2 Monitoring of Performance	21
2.4.3 Examining Results	22
2.4.4 Actions Based on Performance Result.....	24
2.5 The Appraisal Criteria	25
2.6 Who Should Appraise Principals?	28
2.7 Problems of Result-Oriented Performance Appraisal	32

CHAPTER THREE

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	37
3.1 Characteristics of the Respondents	37
3.2 Analysis and Interpretation of Data on the Major Variables	40

CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	69
4.1 Summary	69
4.2 Conclusion	72
4.3 Recommendation	74
REFERENCES	76

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Sample Questionnaire

APPENDIX B: Sample Interview Questions

APPENDIX C: Sample Performance Plan

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Page
1. Population and sample size.....	10
2. Respondents by Sex and Age	37
3. Respondents by Qualification and Certification.....	38
4. Respondents by years of Service	39
5. What purposes should ROAPP serve?.....	40
6. Purposes the Current System of ROAPP Serving	44
7. Extent of Achievements of ROAPP Purpose	46
8. Process of ROAPP	48
9. Development of the Appraisal criteria for ROAPP	51
10. Appropriateness of the Appraisal Criteria of ROAPP	53
11. Satisfaction to Appraisal Criteria of ROAPP	56
12. Competence of Appraisers.....	57
13. Reasons for the Incompetence of Appraisers	58
14. Appraisers Chosen to Appraise Principals' Performance	60
15. Training Given Related to ROAPP.....	62
16. Effectiveness of ROAPP.....	63
17. Problems of Implementation of ROAPP	64
18. Proposed Interventions for the Problems of ROAPP.....	67

ABBREVIATIONS

FCSC: Federal Civil Service Commission

MBO: Management By Objectives

MOE: Ministry of Education

OECBB: Oromia Education and Capacity Building Bureau

PTA: Parent-Teacher Association

ROAPP: Result-Oriented Appraisal of principals' Performance

ROPA: Result-Oriented Performance Appraisal

WECBO: Woreda Education and Capacity Building Office

ZECBO: Zonal Education and Capacity Building Office

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to examine the practices of the current Result-Oriented Appraisal of Principals' Performance in Guji Zone and determining its effectiveness. To this end answers to basic questions pertaining to the purpose, process and criteria of ROAPP, competence of appraiser, and major problems of implementing ROAPP were sought. The study encompassed 7 woredas of the zone selected based on purposive sampling technique. Information was solicited from the sample respondents; 113 appraisees and 24 appraisers through questionnaire which were field-tested before distribution in woredas not included in the sample. Interviews were also held with 7 WECBO officials and 1 ZECBO expert. Statistical tools such as chi-square, spearman- rank order correlation, mean and percentage were used for analyzing the data. The finding of the study showed that though, both appraisees and appraisers seems to have awareness about the intended purposes of ROAPP, the extent of achievement of these purposes: formative and summative purposes were found to be inadequate; the former being more dissatisfactory than the latter. The administration of the process of ROAPP was also a mixture of poor and fair. The appraisal criteria were found to be defective, and hence inappropriate to measure the performance of principals fairly and objectively. It was also found out that the designated appraisers lack competence to appraise effectively, mainly because of their number being small compared to principals, and their workplace being far from schools. Nevertheless, most of the appraisees preferred to be appraised by them if problems for the incompetence are to be improved or solved. In general, the system was perceived to be ineffective in attaining the overall objective which it was intended to serve. It would be, therefore, recommended that necessary revisions and adjustments in which the process of ROAPP is administered as required by the system ought to be made. Of these solving problems related to appraisers, improving technical and conceptual capacity of participants are the major ones.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM AND ITS APPROACH

This chapter deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem; objectives, significance, delimitation, and limitation of the study; the research design and methodology, definitions of terms, and organization of the study.

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 side 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 and Trica, 2000:7).

Human resource management is thus, the core and the largest part of the overall management of an organization. It deals with the concepts and techniques needed to carry out the human resource aspect of management position including recruiting, screening, training, rewarding and appraising the performance of employee (Dessler, 1991:2).

Performance appraisal is therefore, one of the issues under human resource management. It is the system through which an employee's performance capabilities can be matched to the job requirements and career plan over a period of time (Reddy, 1991:35). Thus, it is a tool that is helpful to manage people at work through evaluation of their performance using appropriate techniques of performance appraisal over a period of time.

The different kinds of appraisal techniques, that commonly include graphic rating scale, critical incident, behaviorally anchored rating scale, behavioral observation scale, assessment centers and the result-oriented according to Stress and Black (1994:200), have their own limitation, advantages and disadvantages, and hence it is up to the organization to select and use the appropriate technique or their combination that best fit to the purpose of the appraisal. Shortly, the appropriateness of a particular appraisal technique is part of a function of the purpose of appraisal.

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 these same purposes of performance appraisal in to groups. For example, Mathis and John (1997:344) classify the purpose of performance appraisal into 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 layoffs. Others still classify the purpose of performance appraisal in terms of beneficiaries into organizational and participants perspectives (Fletcher, 2003:5; Philp, 1992:6).

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

The Result-Oriented performance appraisal as indicated earlier is one of the techniques of performance appraisal, which involves the processes where the subordinates and the boss together identify organizational goals, define each individual areas of work responsibility, set objectives and performance standards in terms of result expected of them (Henry, 1982:127; Dessler, 1992:510-511). As far as possible these objectives and performance standards are stated in quantified and time limited terms. It is against these predetermined performance standards that employees' actual performance is compared at the end of the appraisal period for examining the result.

Almost all social organizations use performance appraisal to manage their human resources. Schools are of these institution created for provision and production of qualified man power to a country through and with a variety of people, including principals, teachers, students, 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 process.

This is because of the role and the responsibility of the principal in a school to manage all these resources. The position of principals in school is like that of a commander in chief in an army,

they are the life blood of the school in which his/her feelings and thought affect the individuals and all the activities of the school (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 further 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 and et al., 1993:24).

However the performance appraisal of school principals' is proved to be the most difficult area to deal with, both conceptually and in practice. The main reasons behind this are the problem in defining principals' line manager, complexity and diversity of the role of principals (Hewton and West, 1992:25; Fidler, 1992:134; Hatersley, 1992:1). Hence, developing the appraisal criteria and determining who should actually do the appraisal are major difficulties observed in appraisal of the performance school principals. As a result different countries of the world might have different experience and approach to appraise the performance of school principals.

In Ethiopia, much emphasis was not given to performance appraisal of school principals for some years even with the introduction and expansion of modern education in the country. However with growing number of schools and experience obtained from other countries, inspectors were trained and assigned at provincial education offices to carry out the appraisal of principals' performance, since 1946 E.C. (Wossenu, 1997:48-49). The major purpose of the then appraisal system was to ensure whether the schools perform their tasks as per MOE'S policies, regulations and directives (Zewdie, 1984, cited in Wossenu, 1997: 49).

Latter on, this centrally administered way of appraising the performance of school principals' was replaced by relatively localized or decentralized approach in 1986 E.C., where school principals' performance appraisal was made to be carried out by students, parents of students', school department heads and educational personnel from province or woreda education offices (OECBB:2004:23). The system was introduced on the basis that it can better measure principals' performance than the previous one.

However, it had been criticized for its being process oriented, increase subjectivity, measure personal character than the result and hence replaced by the current system of result-oriented principals' performance appraisal (OECBB, 2004:23). According to this system which has been in effect as of 2002, the performance appraisal of principals' is assessed on the basis of their success in achieving the stated goals they establish through discussion with their appraiser. It specifies plan, indicates resources (human, material, time) required to execute the job, mention achievement criteria before the job started, has tracking and follow up activities, and measure results rather than behavior (Getnet and Maru, 2005:128).

Guji Zone which was located at about 610 km south east of Addis Ababa has been implementing ROAPP since then. However there are no studies conducted following its implementation to assess the status of the system. Thus, to examine what is going on and to come up with some recommendations, a study in zonal context is indispensable.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The result-oriented performance appraisal of employee in general and that of the school principals and teachers in particular is a recent phenomenon in our country. According to FCSC (1999:3), it is the dissatisfaction with traditional approach of performance appraisal that had been criticized for its lack of clearly defined objectives and expectation, and being process oriented than measuring outcome, which enforces the government to introduce the new system of performance appraisal.

As against the past traditional approach of appraising principals' performance, where the performance appraisal criteria are fixed centrally, in ROAPP, there are no centrally prepared appraisal criteria. Instead, principals are required at times to set their own appraisal criteria in joint with their appraiser at school level based on overall education objective and school plans, and arrives at consensus regarding these performance criteria with their appraisers before implementation (OECBO, 2004:18). Supervisors from WECBO are the appraisers assigned to appraise the performance of principals according to this new system. These supervisors are required to have diploma in teaching, and a certificate in educational supervision.

This new system of principals' performance appraisal according to OECBO (2004:18), has an advantage over the past technique of appraising principals' performance in motivating and development of school principals. Therefore, it is assumed to contribute more to the effectiveness of teaching learning process in schools.

However, the effectiveness of such a system as many literatures suggest among other things mainly depends on technical and conceptual skills of the implementers, the resource available and how the system is perceived and implemented by the concerned bodies. Experiences for example, show the failures of the ROPA in numerous organizations, perhaps because of mis-applications (Henry 1982:29). This is probably the case for it goes through stages that these organizations fail to follow: setting goals, defining individual areas of responsibility, setting standards in measurable terms, continuous follow-up and feedback to employee on work.

Thus, for an institution to employ a ROAPP 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)

The above stated requirements for effective implementation of result-oriented performance appraisal system are questionable to be in place in poor countries like ours in general and the zone under study in particular. Hence, looking at the status of the system in relation to these factors is important and recommendable.

More over, problems related to the designated appraiser is the one raised by principals and other concerned individuals in zone under study. The ratio of supervisors to principals is low and hence one supervisor is responsible to appraise the performance of an average of about 10-15 principals. Besides, these supervisors make their seat at WECBO where the frequency of contact between them and principals is very low. Further more, fulfilling the requirement necessary to the post by appraisers in terms of qualification, certification and experience as put by the directive is again questionable.

In addition, the following complaints were observed concerning the manner in which the appraisal system was administered:

- there was no mutual involvement of supervisors and principals in developing the appraisal criteria, besides the difficulty to prepare appropriate performance criteria;
- inadequate follow-up and feedback mechanisms in the process of appraisal;
- sufficient training /orientation was not given for those who are involved in the process;
- the appraisal result was not valued or followed by any action, either positive or negative.

Looking at the status of the system in attaining the purposes for which it was intended to serve under all these constraints is thus vital. Furthermore, there were no adequate studies made so far following the implementation of ROAPP in general and to Guji Zone in particular. From this point of view, this study was designed to deal about the system with the following objectives.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The major objective of this study was to examine the actual practices of ROAPP operating in primary schools of Guji zone of Oromia region and determining its effectiveness with the following specific objectives.

Specific Objectives

1. To identify the extent to which the purposes of ROAPP is known among the appraisees and appraisers;
2. To assess the extent to which the purposes of ROAPP have been achieved;
3. To investigate how the process of ROAPP was under use;
4. To assess the appropriateness of the appraisal criteria used to measure principals' performance;
5. To examine the perception of appraisees towards the competence of their designated appraiser;
6. To identify major problems of implementation of ROAPP;
7. To suggest some possible means and ways for improvement of the practices of ROAPP in the zone under study.

To achieve these objectives, the study attempts to answer the following basic questions:

1. What are the major purposes of ROAPP and to what extent are these purposes being achieved?
2. To what extent does the process of ROAPP operate successfully in implementation of the system?
3. To what extent are the performance criteria appropriate to measure principals' performance?
4. What is the perception of principals towards the competence of their designated appraisers?
8. What are the major problems encountered in implementation of ROAPP, and what interventions need to be made?

1.4 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study may not exhaustively provide solution for the problem under consideration; however, it is believed to have the following significances.

- It could enable educational officials and experts at woreda, zonal, and even the regional level to recognize the actual practices and problems of implementing the ROAPP in the zone so that possible measures that improve the conditions can be taken.
- Since the study is new with regard to result-oriented principals' performance appraisal, it might be helpful for collection and compilation of information on the status of the system in Guji zone in particular and for the region in general.
- It might draw the attention of others to undergo more comprehensive studies on related issues.
- It could also raise awareness of individuals who are involved in the appraisal process

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

The study was delimited to government primary schools of Guji zone; one of the zonal administration, in Oromia national regional state. Primary schools were selected, assuming the problems under consideration to be more serious there than the other levels of government schools, mainly, because of their number being large, and inadequacy of personnel to implement

the system both in number and qualification. The non-government primary schools in the zone were not included, since they had not employed this new system of appraisal technique still.

The zone was chosen on the basis that it is one of the deprived, remote area in which much of its problems had not been studied. Besides, it has a shortage of qualified and experienced educational personnel to implement the new system as desired. More over, being familiar with the pains of performance appraisal related problems when serving there, it was needless for me to go farther for searching other title and target site.

Though there were a number of issues that should be addressed through research in result-oriented appraisal of school principals' performance, this study tried to treat the topic by focusing only on the purpose, the appraisal process, competence of appraiser, the appraisal criteria, and major problems of implementing ROAPP as independent variables.

In terms of time dimension, the study was delimited to cover the years between 2002/3 and 2007. The delimitation was so bounded to the situation five years back since the time when ROAPP had been introduced along with the national reform of the civil service program in the country.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

As result-oriented performance appraisal system is newly adapted appraisal approach in our country, local research in the area of principals' performance appraisal is scanty and there is shortage of domestic reference materials related to the study. Consequently, the student researcher has been forced to rely on foreign sources. In addition, the reluctance of some of the respondents, particular of WECBO officials for the interview and some of the supervisors and principals to fill in and return the questionnaire on time were the challenges facing the researcher. As a result, the scope and depth of the information desired were limited and thus, had an implication on the outcome of the study.

1.7 The Research Design and Methodology

1.7.1 Method

Descriptive survey method was employed in order to get relevant and sufficient information on the research problem. It is an appropriate method to investigate the current practice of appraising

the performance of principals' in terms of conditions that exist, opinions that are held by the subjects of the study.

1.7.2 Source of Data

Data were gathered from bodies that were claimed to have proximity or exposure to the ROAPP. Accordingly, primary school principals, educational supervisors of WECBO, head of WECBO, and ZECBO expert were included as primary sources of data. As supplement to primary sources, secondary sources of data like regionally and nationally produced directives and statistical data were used.

1.7.3 Data Gathering Instruments

As relevant data gathering instrument, questionnaire was employed for collection of data from school principals and supervisors. The questionnaire which was prepared in English had been translated to Afan Oromo language before administration to reduce errors that may appear because of the language barrier. Unstructured interview was used for WECBO heads and ZECBO expert.

1.7.4 Sampling Techniques

There are 12 woredas in the zone under study. Of these, five were newly established since 1998 E.C. Hence, the WECBO in these newly established woredas are not well equipped with educational personnel (supervisors, education officials) both in experience and in number that can provide relevant and adequate information required. As a result, only seven were taken based on purposive sampling technique.

There are a total of 338 primary schools in the seven sampled woredas. Out of these 103 primary schools (30%) were included as the sample based on quota sampling technique, i.e. 30% from each of seven woredas. The specific school from each woreda was selected using simple random sampling method. All supervisors of the sampled woredas were included in the study due to their manageable size. Similarly 7 WECBO heads one from each woreda and one ZECBO expert were included in the sample purposefully to get relevant and adequate information from the concerned individuals. Generally, 103 primary school principals, 24 WECBO supervisors, 7 WECBO heads and 1 zonal expert were included as sample of the study. The following table presents the details.

Table 1: Population and sample size

No	Woreda	Population			Sample		
		School/ Principal	Super Visors	WECBO Head	School/ principal	Supervisors	WECBO Head
1	Adola	63	4	1	19	4	1
2	Bore	65	4	1	20	4	1
3	Kercha	40	4	1	12	4	1
4	Liben	55	4	1	17	4	1
5	Shakiso	54	3	1	16	3	1
6	Uraga	35	3	1	11	3	1
7	Wadera	26	2	1	8	2	1
	Total	338	24	7	103	24	7

1.7.5 Data Analysis

The data collected through questionnaire were tallied, organized and tabulated so as to make it manageable for analysis. As far as analysis is concerned, mean, standard deviation, percentages, chi-square, spearman rank order correlation were used for analyzing data.

1.7.6 Procedure of the study

The study was carried out at different stages. At the initial stage of the investigation a review of related literature was made to develop an introductory theoretical background. In the second stage, a contact was made with zonal education office responsible expert in the area to secure relevant information for future understanding.

In the third stage, based on the literature review and information obtained through preliminary discussion with zonal education office experts, data collection instruments were developed and piloted. The purpose of pilot test was to ensure whether the questionnaire was free from vague and irrelevant items. To this effect, draft questionnaire was prepared and distributed to few respondents in two woredas other than those selected for the study.

In accordance with the feedback obtained, revisions were made and clarification included in the questionnaire. Accordingly, two items were deleted, one item was modified, and the order of a 5 point likert type scale which at the beginning developed 'scale1' to strong agreement, and 'scale 5' for strong disagreement was reversed for all items of such nature. Hence, the total numbers of

questions were reduced from 27 to 25. Then, reviewed questions were administered. Besides, interviews were conducted with WECBO heads and ZECBO expert. Finally, based on collected data, analysis and discussion were made followed by summary, conclusion and recommendations.

1.8 Operational Definitions of Key Terms

Appraisers: Primary school supervisors who are involved in appraising the performance of primary school principals.

Appraisees: Primary school principals whose performance is subject to appraisal.

Appropriateness : refers to level to which the appraisal criteria under use serve the purposes of ROAPP.

Competence: Ability of appraisers to apply practical situations the essential principles and techniques of ROAPP.

Performance Appraisal: A periodic evaluation of employee's job performance measured against the job's stated or presumed requirements.

Primary School Principal: a person in charge of primary schools, giving to administrative duties full time in large and carrying a teaching load in small one.

Result-Oriented Appraisal: A technique of performance appraisal by which employees' performance is evaluated by their contribution, not on employees' activities or behavior

1.9 Organization of the Study

The study consists of four chapters. The first chapter deals with the introductory part of the study. The second chapter focuses on the review of related literature that provides a basic framework for the study. The third chapter provides data presentation, analysis and discussion. Chapter four winds up the study by presenting the summary of the major findings, conclusion reached at, and recommendations forwarded. References and appendices are also included lastly so as to acknowledge the sources cited.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents the review of related literature on different aspects of performance appraisal in general and that of ROAPP in particular. It comprises definitions and major concepts, purposes, process, criteria, appraiser of principals, and problems of result-oriented performance appraisal.

2.1 Definitions and Major Concepts of Performance Appraisal

The term performance appraisal has different definitions in different literatures. Various authors define the term based on their own experience, knowledge and understanding as well as on the purpose the appraisal is intended to serve. The following are the definitions by some of these authors.

Terry and Stephen (1991:386), define performance appraisal as “systematic, continuous review and analysis of employees’ performance against the job stated or presumed requirements.” Allen (1998:1), on his side defines performance appraisal as a formal structured system of evaluating employee’s performance in terms of predetermined criteria by superior who is familiar with tasks performed by employee.

According to these definitions, performance appraisal of employees is not an on and off activity, rather it is something performed continuously in systematic manner demanding adequate knowledge of individuals who are to carry out the appraisal. The definitions also emphasize to pre-determined performance criteria against which the actual performance of employee will going to be compared, indicating the objectivity of performance appraisal in evaluating individuals' performance.

There exist also other definitions of performance appraisal, which indicates performance appraisal to include subjectivity; the dependence on employee’s behavior and the processes he/she passes through when performing the tasks, involving individualized judgment of appraiser to employee’s performance. The definition forwarded by Graham and Bennett, 1990 (in Wossenu 1997:16), partly shows such aspects of performance appraisal. According to these authors,

performance appraisal is a judgment made on employee performance based on the factors contributed to performance in addition to the final output.

As to Rue and Byars (1990:201), performance appraisal is the process that involves communicating to an employee how well he/she is performing the job followed by establishing a plan of improvement. This implies that performance appraisal acts as information processing system by which progress towards the objectives can be monitored and errors can be spotted, including the identification of under achievers whose weakness can be corrected efficiently and rationally.

On the other side, there are writers who define and explain performance appraisal from administrative aspect as a tool used for decisions concerning pay, promotion and, demotion, which mostly done by comparing the performance of one employee with that of another. The definition given by Winston and Creamer (1997:2) to performance appraisal, “a process of assessing and recording staff performance for the purpose of making judgment about staff that led to decision,” confirms this idea.

Finally, Torrington, Hall and Taylor (2003:225-226) define performance appraisal as an important and integral part of human resource management in which organizations use 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 function, which must be carried out in line with organizational goals.

More over, aforementioned definitions of performance appraisal imply the existence of different methods of measuring employees' performance. Caron (2007:1), explain the existence of various methods 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 a common (Getenet and Eshetu, 2005:128).

The traditional method, mainly deals with the traits or behavior such as loyalty, honesty, integrity, cooperation, accuracy, job knowledge, and proficiencies and base the assessment of the appraisal of the employee on the bases in which they exhibit these (FCSC,1999:1). It lacks objectivity and job related performance criteria, and hence more liable to subjectivity that results

with less advantage an employee or an organization get from performance appraisal (Torrington, Laura and Tayler, 2002:301).

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 within a given period of time (Hanson, 2005:4). Put another way, the focus is on what employee is supposed to accomplish on the job rather than a consideration of subordinates trait or on-the-job behavior. Result-Oriented Performance Appraisal is such an approach of performance appraisal having its own principles, advantage and disadvantages as briefly explained in the next section.

2.2 Result-Oriented Performance Appraisal (ROPA)

The ROPA technique is commonly known, and written in many literatures by the name management by objective (MBO). However, the concept behind management by objective is wide and is assumed to be beyond the technique of appraising employee's performance. Rather, it is a comprehensive managerial system, which incorporates many key activities in a systematic manner including evaluation of individual performance (Koontz and Wehrich, 1993:149).

The definitions given by some other authors to MBO also underline its superiority to ROPA. Seevers (1997:1) explain MBO as a system of management where the top managers of an organization identify common goals, define departmental major areas of responsibility in terms of result expected and use these measures as guides for operating the unit and assign the contribution of each of its members. The appraisal session is, hence the one where the given employee together with his/her nearest boss set specific objectives to be achieved by employee within a given appraisal period.

Similarly, Fletcher (2003:20-21) describes ROPA as less systematic and comprehensive aspect that originated from management by objective to emphasize the difference between these two concepts. He more indicates the term ROPA to appear under several names including outcome-oriented performance appraisal, management by objective based performance appraisal, and even as management by objective.

ROPA is therefore, a technique of performance appraisal, which depends on the extent to which individual objectives have been met as measured by predetermined criteria (Attwood and Stuart, 1996:5). The individual objectives are derived from the organizational objectives and plan. That

is why this technique has been recognized as a device for ensuring that employee in an organization are all engaged in work which is consistent with the organizations overall objectives (Seever, 1997:5).

Currently, the ROPA system has been used widely as alternative to other methods of appraising employee performance in many organizations including school (Lunenburg and Ornstein, 1991:486; Silver, 1983 cited in Ayalew, 1991:103). The effectiveness of system in most of these organizations as some authorities depict, however, remains questionable. Henry (1983:129) indicated that one of the reasons behind the ineffectiveness to be a failure of such organization to follow and implement the system as its principle allows. The following are some of the basic principles of ROPA that an organization needs to follow to its effective implementation.

- Results are measured on the bases of achievements of output, outcome and impacts;
- Measures are developed inline with the organizational strategic plan;
- The strategic plans are derived from national and organizational vision and mission;
- The criteria prepared should be specific, measurable, achievable, tangible, and relevant which could be performed within a specific period of time;
- Under tangible and compelling situations, performance plans could be revised and improved;
- Feedback, counseling and training should be essential parts of it;
- Fair allocation and use of available resources;
- Commitment of top management is crucial (FCSC, 1997 E.C.: 34-39).

ROPA has both the merits and demerits in measuring performance as any other appraisal techniques. It is mainly popularized by its greater objectivity, participatory nature and job-relatedness (Fletcher, 2003:21). This makes it more advantageous than the other methods in improving motivation and commitment, decreasing conflict and ambiguity between appraisees and appraisers, fair evaluation based on results, improving supervisory skills and ensure accountability to what is done.

On the other side, ROPA has its own inherent limitations to measure some dimension of individual performance. Under emphasizing behavioral dimension of the job, over emphasis individual rather than group, over emphasizing of end at the expense of means, failure to compare

the performance of employees, ignorance of non-quantifiable but important jobs are some of its major disadvantages (Stress and Black, 1994:214-215).

Henry (1982:125) on his side pointed out ROPA to be more expensive than other methods as it demands manpower that are acquainted technically and conceptually with the system to develop and implement effective performance criteria. He further claims the system to be costly that often consumes time and creates too much paperwork.

2.3 Purposes of Result-Oriented Performance Appraisal

Obviously, any performance appraisal scheme has a purpose to serve that has to be determined during its design. These purposes might be perceived differently by the participants of the appraisal process. Appraisers might see it in terms of their need to manage staff, while the appraisees might see the appraisal more in terms of their own professional development and benefits. Hence, defining the purpose of a given performance appraisal and communicating to all concerned in relation to what an organization intends to achieve is therefore important before implementation. Because the purpose determines: the technique, who should be the appraiser(s), criteria to be used, the role of participants, the timing and frequency of evaluation (Melaku, 1992:52).

Performance appraisal serves a variety of functions (Torrington, Laura and Taylor, 2002:304). Authorities explain these functions from different directions, but all revolve around similar concepts. Mondey, et al. (1997: 337), broadly put the central and major purpose of any appraisal system to be improving performance. This improvement in performance can occur when certain administrative decisions that enhance performance are addressed, or any support which enable appraisee, improve his/her performance capacity is made.

Based on these, Bratton and Gold (1994: 170), classify the purpose of performance appraisal into administrative; to make decision concerning pay, promotion and career, work responsibilities, and developmental; improvement of performance capacity of employee and hence an organizational success through the discussion of development needs, identifying training opportunities and the planning of actions.

Similarly, Heck and Marcowides (1992:7) summarize the purposes of performance appraisal to be formative and summative. The summative purpose emphasizes on current performance in

particular; job often linked to pay, selection, promotion, redeployment and dismissal of employees. While the formative one is developmental in that it involves career planning and development through provision of information about performance expectation, feedback and discussion, remedial action to meet expectation that have not been achieved.

Moreover, Goss (1994:44) categorizes the purposes of performance appraisal into three considering the policy and program evaluation as one aspect of the purpose of performance appraisal. According to him the first purpose of performance appraisal is to make administrative decisions about employee; such as for promoting employee, choosing employee for layoff or transfer, making salary increase recommendation. Second, to provide employee feedback and development that is to let employee know where they stand relative to performance objectives and organization expectation. Finally it is used for evaluation of polices and programs.

Martin and Tricà (2000:126) have laid down three major groups of purposes for performance appraisal, which are usually practical if the technique of appraising the performance is an outcome based performance appraisal. These are,

Performance reviews- managers discuss with employees progress in their current posts, their strengths, and the areas requiring further development in order to improve current performance.

Potential reviews- mangers discuss with employee 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 pay, benefits, promotion, and self-fulfillment are fed by the information provided by system.

This classification emphasizes the purpose of performance appraisal to be primarily developmental focusing on how employee performance capacity has to be improved, considering the administrative one as a secondary.

It would therefore possible to presume that performance appraisal in general, and to ROPA in particular has two roles; developmental (formative) and administrative (summative). These roles are often seen as potentially conflicting, but must go side by side to address both organizational and staff members need (Mathis and John, 1997:344).

The aforementioned explanations indicate, Purposes of performance appraisal to have a relationship with the overall objectives for which a given organization has been established. Hence, the purposes of performance appraisal around school system are not far from creating conducive environment suitable for production of skilled and educated work force through effective instruction (Melaku, 1985:106).

Principal as key person in this system should have performance appraisal scheme with definite purposes. Based on the main purpose of performance appraisal to school, that is improving the functioning of school Hewton and West (1992:26-27) enumerates the following as the purposes of appraising the performance of head teachers.

- To provide an opportunity for an outsiders to offer feedback, support, and encouragement
- To assist principal to explore his/her vision for the school
- To identify ways of improving the management of school
- To consider the heads professional development
- To identify and discuss, frankly and openly, concerns about the school, from whatever source they come.

Hattersley (1992:38) also argued the purpose of appraising principals' performance primarily be developmental; to assist in raising professional standards, on one hand and professional accountability; to enable decision on demotion redeployment or sacking on the other hand.

With regard to the current system of appraising the performance of employee, including school principals in our country the policy paper on performance appraisal by FCSC (1999:3) put the overall objective of the ROPA as follows. "To enable institutions objectively measure and give feedback on the performance of employees throughout the civil service, using open transparent and output based criteria in order to bring about improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of the organizations."

The specific purposes of ROPA according to this policy paper include; provision of feedback to employee, identification of training needs and development, to transfer and promote potential employee, provision of information for payment, and to enable management make fair decision on employee matters.

2.4 Process of Result–Oriented Performance Appraisal

ROPA is a process containing several logical steps to be followed. It is a systematic process of planning work and setting of expectations, monitoring performance and examining results (Philp 1991:13). Philp, further indicates the existence of specific activities under each steps of the process that need to be implemented logically one after the other to enable the process continue.

Artley (2001:1) and FCSC (1997 E.C: 27) explain ROPA as a process including employee rating, taking actions based on performance result in addition to the planning and continuous review of performance. Accordingly, the ROPA process comprises of the planning of work and setting expectation, monitoring, Examining the result and taking action based on performance result stages.

2.4.1 Planning of Work and Setting Expectations

The base for individual performance plan is an organization's yearly plan, which is derived from the strategic plan of the organization. Strategic plan of an organization according to OCSC (2004:5), is long term plan (5-10 years) consisting of organizations, mission, vision, strategies and objectives prepared based on overall national vision, mission and polices.

The planning of work and setting expectations according to Kassaye and Kokeb (2004:39) is the step where what the employee has to do and how well he/she has to do is determined by the joint participation of employee and his line manager. Stated differently, it is the stage of developing the performance criteria against which employees' performance going to be evaluated; deriving tasks to be performed by employee plus setting its measuring standards. Hence, there are two major duties under this step; derivations of tasks and developing measures.

1. Derivation of Tasks

Tasks to be performed by employees as already seen are derived from organizational short-term objectives based on employee major areas of work responsibilities. These tasks according to (FCSC, 1996:12) have to be arranged in accordance of their importance by categorizing them into key, major and minor tasks.

- **Key tasks:** refers to critical tasks of an organization such that failure in accomplishing these tasks leads the organization to crisis and unsatisfactory performance in it alone, will result in

determination that employee's overall performance to be unsatisfactory. They must be accomplished for the organization to exist and continue as organization. Key tasks carry a minimum of about fifty percent of the weight given for all the three kinds of tasks.

- **Major tasks:** are important tasks of an organization next to key tasks. Failure in accomplishing these tasks can also cause significant problems on both organization and employee, though not serious as the key tasks.
- **Minor tasks:** they are tasks with lower importance that are not included within major and minor tasks.

2. Developing Performance Standards

The performance standards are expressions of the performance threshold (s), requirement(s), or expectations that must met for each task at particular level of performance (Artley, 2001:6). The level of performances according to FCSC (1997: E.C.:48), are very high-top level standard, high-above average standard, satisfactory- minimum level standard, poor-below minimum level standard ; carrying a rating score of 4,3,2, and 1 respectively. The standards at each level of performance according to (FCSC, 1991:14) developed using performance measures: quality, quantity, cost and time. It further explains each of these measures as follows:

- **Quality-** addresses how well the employee is expected to perform or the appearance, accuracy or effectiveness of the final product. Measures can include error rates (such as number or percentage of errors allowable per unit of work) satisfaction rates (determined through customer survey/ feedback).
- **Quantity-** addresses how much task the employee is expected to produce. Measures are expressed as a number of products or services expected or as general results to achieve.
- **Timeliness-** addresses how quickly, when, or by what date the employee is expected to produce the work.
- **Cost- effectiveness-** addresses money savings or cost control. It measures such aspects of performance as maintaining or reducing unit costs, reducing the time it takes to produce or provide a product or service, or reducing waste.

According to FCSC(1999:11), each task should at least be measured with the three of the four measures, under each of the four levels of performance(very high, high, satisfactory, and poor) The level of performance hence, indicate the result expected of employee as measured by quantity, quality, time and cost for each task.

Generally, planning tasks and setting expectations step employee make an agreement of performance with his nearest boss for each task as measured by quality, quantity, time and cost at different levels of performance (very high, high, satisfactory and unsatisfactory) using the format of performance plan (see the sample performance plan format at appendix C). In other words, the planning stage is the stage at which performance criteria are to be developed, agreed and approved by officials for future performance. In addition, decision has to be made at this stage of the process on how the planned activities has to be monitored continuously whether, they are implemented as intended or not, to take timely remedial actions (OCSC, 2004: 68).

2.4.2 Monitoring of Performance

Monitoring performance is the stage in ROPA where employees' actual implementations of the planned tasks are assessed continuously to give employee support and feedback. Through monitoring, deficiencies in performance become evident and can be addressed, and even, according to Artley (2001:12) areas of good performance also stand out, and action can be taken to help successful employees improve even further. That is why Kassaye and Kokeb (2004:41) shortly put monitoring performance as a system of information and action. It covers all efforts made to foster employee ability of performance either formally or informally; providing employees' with training and developmental opportunities.

The major objectives for the follow-up should not be for taking actions after the failure as many individuals think and act, rather it should serve to identify early the possible barriers that might appear and soon followed by corrective actions; provision of necessary support for employees that ensure the success of implementing the plan (FCSC, 1997 E.C: 112).The document further explains the mechanisms of follow-up to be observation of the task when it is being implemented, study and analysis through sampling, examination of work reports, discussion through meeting, examining customers' suggestion, and using follow-up format.

Follow up reveals deficiencies in performance calling for feedback and support. Employees need to be aware of the status of their performance in relation to the established expectation, either to continue if the performance is satisfactory or take correction to bring performance up to standard if not (Philp, 1991:59). Effective and timely feedback during the performance appraisal period addressing employee performance in relation to established performance criteria is therefore essential for success of ROPA.

Effective feedback, according to Reddy (1990:41-42) should be; related to tasks that are performed by employee, given in a manner that will best help improve performance, given on time (timeliness), have an eventual meaning in terms of training, development actions, rewards or punishment.

Other important activity during monitoring stage of the process is a data collection, organization and usage (FCSC, 1997 E.C.:201-121). In addition to records of agreement made at the planning stage, keeping on a record of evidences during the implementation period concerning difficulties encountered, possible action taken is again crucial. According to OCSC (2004:90-91) it enables both appraisees and appraisers to remember what strength and weakness they had during implementation period. Secondly, it helps as evidence when any problems or confrontation happens concerning the appraisal. Finally, it encourages accountability and transparency in work place and confirms the appraisal being fair and correct that has been done based on evidence.

2.4.3 Examining Results

It is the stage of reviewing the subordinates overall performance at scheduled time after certain appraisal period usually, 6 or 12 months (FCSC, 1999:12). It is not totally considered as a unique step of performance appraisal, because the appraiser and employee do not necessarily wait to this scheduled time to review performance (Mathis and John, 1996:358), rather performance criteria are reviewed, modified, progress is discussed and actions are taken in between at the monitoring stage.

However, the final review as a cumulative of continuous and periodic review, enables to view more the improvement obtained and major difficulties encountered during the implementation period as a whole (Koontz and Weihrich, 1993:398). Hence, it is the stage, at which an organization also evaluates its overall plan improvement. More over, it is the stage of rating; an

evaluation of employee performance against the performance criteria in an employee's performance appraisal plan and assigning a rating record (Artley, 2001:14).

In ROPA, individuals are rated by comparing their actual performance against clearly defined and agreed standards that must be supported by evidence (Fletcher, 2003:23). He more emphasized the rating given should be checked against the following tests before commitment: validity, reliability and fairness. Ratings based on actual performance as measured against the stated requirements or standards of performance will usually meet the test of validity while, it is reliable if others appraisers in the similar situation would give the same rating, and fair if it takes into account circumstances beyond the employee's control.

To come-up with acceptable rating fulfilling the above criteria rating should be done following the steps indicated hereunder.

1. Compiling performance data and review the total performance;
2. Identify areas that stand above or fall below the agreed standard;
3. Identify the most likely causes for any differences;
4. Discussion and check-up on the above steps with employee;
5. Weigh up the total situation;
6. Rating (Philp, 1991:106).

According to the current ROPA of employee practiced in our country the performance of employee is rated out 100% to fall on one of the following categories: very high (95-100%), high (75-94%), satisfactory (50-74%) and poor (25-49%) (FCSC, 1997 E.C.:123). In case of complain to the rating result, according to this document, an employee has a right to apply his/her grievance to the next responsible body that is, 'woreda education and training board' in the case of principals, where the decision made at that level would be the last.

Rating systems are often used to provide an input for salary administration, a measurable record of achievement, recognition of accomplishment and an indicator of improvement required (Philp, 1993:102). This indirectly shows promotion and dismissal to be its consequence. It is therefore, critical that rating has to be done with careful judgment and in accordance with information and data in hand and against clearly defined and agreed standards to enable the management take necessary actions followed.

2.4.4 Actions Based on Performance Result

A basic principle of effective performance appraisal is that all behavior is controlled by its consequences (Artley, 2001:18). These consequences can and should be positive; rewards, recognition, promotion, with in grade increase, or negative consequences: counseling reassigning removing or downgrading the employee. In other words performance appraisal should create a condition where strong performers are acknowledged average performance are encouraged and poor performers are coached and counseled towards improvement or ultimately separated from the organization (Scott, 2001: 4).

The policy paper by FCSC (1999:8), regarding the current ROPA system also declare that performance result should be followed by the reward system if it is to bring efficiency in the organization. The system should reward the employee according to their results, the outstanding performer get the highest followed by the above the average and average performers. It also adds that the amount of pays should be substantial enough to encourage them to be more productive.

The action to be taken, above all depends on the employee's level of performance as rated by appraiser(s) based on the agreement made at planning stage and the data or evidences collected during monitoring period (Altman, 1997: 34).The rate of employee fall in one of the four categories indicated earlier. Hence, the type and magnitude of action taken relates to this category. According to (FCSC, 1996 E.C.: 125 and OCSC, 2004:93), the following actions are indicted to follow each category after the rating.

Very high (95-100%) - an employee demonstrates exceptionally an excellent performance, all standards are consistently met and the achievement is at an accelerate rate beyond expectation. Only minimal supervision is required. His contribution to the organization is distinguished. Hence, he should be awarded, recognized, and promoted. In addition, such an employee rate has to be announced as an exemplary for the others.

High (75-94%) - an employee demonstrates unusually good performance that exceeds expectation in critical areas and exhibits a sustained support of organizational goals. Objectives are generally met and achievement is of high standard. A limited amount of supervision and direction are required for more improvement in performance for this employee. Such employee has to be appreciated and rewarded next to 'very high' performer.

Satisfactory (50-74%) - the employee carries out good, sound performance that meet organizational goal. All tasks are completed according to the minimum requirements expected. Contribution to the organization is to the expected form a person in that position. Normal supervision and counsel required.

Poor (25-49%) - the performance do not met the minimum requirement expected from employee by organization. Contribution to the organization goal is none or insignificant. An abnormal amount of supervision is required to maintain any real contribution to organization. Specific improvement must be achieved by a specific date to justify continued employment at the current job level. An employee with such level of performance is ineligible for any performance recognition, instead the following three consecutive actions has to be taken according to the directive of civil service commission in relation to ROPA. These are, (1) providing an opportunity to improve performance for the first time, (2) reducing salary, if same result is to be repeated for the second appraisal period, and finally, (3) dismissal if no improvement has to come for the third appraisal period.

2.5 The Appraisal Criteria

A key component of any performance appraisal process is the creation of specific performance criteria against which the individuals performance will going to be monitored and evaluated (Scott, 2001:1). They vary across organizations and the method of performance appraisal used. Mathis and John (1997:341), classify them into three. The first one is trait-based criteria which focus on individuals personal character or trait such as having “good attitude,” or “confidence”, or “cooperative,” and the like which may or may not be correlated with position outcomes and has little to do with specific job. The second one is behavior-based criteria which focus on specific behaviors that led to job success; and finally result-based criteria that looks at what the employee has done or accomplished rather than his personal trait or behavior.

Whatever type of criteria used, they should be effective to the purpose for which they have been designed. Their effectiveness is characterized by their level of validity, reliability, and utility (Melaku, 1992:49-50). That is, the extent to which the criteria actually measure what it intends to measure (Validity), the extent to which the criteria yield to same results each time it is used

(reliability), and the utility which refers to the balance between the resources spent in administering the criterion and the advantage gained.

Smith, 1985 (in Schermerhorn, 1996:34) further pointed out the following as basic characteristics of effective criteria: unbiased-based on characteristics not on the person, significant-directly related to organizational goal, practical-measurable and achievable. Moreover, Dattner (2002:5) cited performance criteria to be under employees' control yet challenging, specific but comprehensive enough to cover major areas of employees work responsibility, and subject to changes when needed.

In relation to ROPA technique, the performance criteria for each employee is set from institutional plan in accordance with individual area of work responsibility (Henry 1982:122). These areas of work responsibility are known as main result areas from which tasks (key, major and minor) to be performed by employee will be derived and standards of performance for each task set by mutual participation and agreement of appraisee and the appraiser (Koontz and Weihrich, 1993: 128).

Hence, the performance criteria development in ROPA technique constitutes identification of tasks followed by setting standards of measure for each task. These criteria according to Philp (1991: 23) should fulfill the four important requirements indicated below.

- a. **Relevant-** the performance criteria should be related to the duties and responsibilities of the employees, focus on results, and measure what it intends to measure.
- b. **Comprehensive-**the appraisal criteria should cover all important aspects of tasks that are to be performed by employee.
- c. **Realism-** the criteria developed should not be too easy to be achieved and at the same time not too difficult and unattainable by employee. However, a level which is challenging but realistic that take into consideration of different factors like individuals record of improvement over past periods, standards achieved by other competitors, the existing facilities and so on.
- d. **Clear definition-** the appraisal criteria should be objective as much as possible as in practical, that is capable of being observed and defined to avoid doubt or ambiguity about whether the standards have been achieved or not.

As indicated earlier the criterion used in appraising the performance of employee depends among other factors mainly on purposes of appraisal and employee areas of job responsibility. Concerning school principals, developing appraisal criteria is a difficult task as their role is ambiguous and complex involving many diverse responsibilities (Hewton, 1992:30). Barth, 1980 (in Sergiovanni, 2001:13) describes the extent of such complex task responsibilities of principals as follows:

The principal is ultimately responsible for almost everything that happens in school and out. He is responsible for personnel-making sure that employees are physically present and working to the best of their ability. He is in charge of program-making sure that teachers are teaching and what they are supposed to and students are learning it. He is accountable to parents making sure that each given opportunity to express problems and that those problems are addressed and resolved. He is expected to protect physical safety of children. . .

Thus, an attempt to deal with them all in the limited time available in any appraisal cycle would be difficult. It is necessary then to focus down on key areas to develop meaningful appraisal criteria for principals. Healy (1994:33) recommends the following as a framework to select these key areas, which will again take account of individual circumstances and priorities. They should be broad enough to cover the range of tasks and roles commonly undertaken by principals, specific enough to aid the process of selection, sufficiently differentiated acceptable by principals and their appraisers, and complement the existing job description.

He further stated the major areas of focus form which specific criteria for appraising the performance of primary school principals to cover. These includes management and development of; teaching, learning and the curriculum, staff, finance and physical resources, external relations and professional development. Lockheed, Marlaine and Verspoor (1994:124), on their side add the appraisal criteria for school principals should incorporate the classroom teaching aspects in addition to administration, since principals also involved in teaching, especially in small rural primary schools.

Moreover, the report of the National Steering Group in England as stated by Week (1992:15) emphasizes that, the criteria for head teacher appraisal to be selective, and yet probably encompass a wide range of information. Accordingly, it includes curricular policies, links with outside bodies and other schools, the patterns of meeting with staff, school activities and routines including assessment and recording systems, calendar of events, and staff appraisal and development.

2.6 Who Should Appraise Principals' Performance?

Determining who should be the appraiser is another significant factor in designing performance appraisal system. The immediate supervisor, peers, employees themselves, subordinates, and multi-source appraisers are the most common people and groups who usually do the appraisal (Fletcher, 2003:56). Which of these appraisers is best depends on the purpose of the appraisal, the kind of criteria used, and nature of employees' job being evaluated (Szilagy and Marc, 1983 in Habtamu, 2005:27).

The issue who should appraise school principals is still a problem in school system. This is mainly due to the position of principals in school as well as the complexity and diversity of the role of school principals (Fidler, 1992: 134). In other words, a principal has no easily identified line manager and it is not immediately clear who the appraiser (s) should be. Moreover, principal carries out a complex job involving responsibilities for several different areas of school management. Who could handle and appraise principals effectively in relation to all these multi-faceted and complex tasks is another difficulty concerning who should appraise principals' performance (Hewton and West, 1992:12).

Hence identifying and designating competent appraiser(s) for principals who able to recognize and handle these challenging situations is difficult but critical. In support of this idea, Hackett (1992, 145-146), underline the criticality of 'quality' appraiser(s) for success of principals' performance appraisal and pointed out the following as requirement to be an appraiser(s) for principals. Experienced and professionally credible, must inspire trust and confidence, must possess good interpersonal and technical skills, has enough time to familiarize with schools and principals.

Depending on the aforementioned requirements plus the technique of appraisal used different educationalists suggest the priority of one appraiser over the other. Healy (1994:28) is one to say peer appraisers to be the most preferable approach whatever technique of appraisal used. Champion (1992:139) on his side recommends the appropriate appraisers of principals to be of the local education officer and another principals with recent and relevant experience in the same phase, as they can play inspectorial role and developmental role respectively.

Generally, there is no clear and underlined answer for who should appraise principals, however what is critical in assigning appraiser (s) are the skill, knowledge, experience and information the appraiser has about the school and principals (Heck and Marcoulides, 1992:162). The following are the common appraisers, which can also be applicable to school principals according to the aforementioned concepts with regard to who should appraise principals' performance.

1. Supervisors as Immediate Boss

In this case, an appropriate person with relevant experience would be appointed to appraise the performance of school principals by the local education offices, which is usually referred to as supervisors or inspectors (Hellowell, 1992:39). They are considered to be an immediate boss with relatively better information about principals' performance based on the assumption that immediate boss usually has the best knowledge of the individual job content, objectives and overall performance (Hume, 2000:44).

However, this principle may not always be applicable especially in case of principals' performance appraisal mainly because of two reasons. For one thing, supervisors are not solely the line manager or immediate supervisors of school principals (Champion, 1992:149), secondly the skill and competence of this single individual to handle all those roles of principal and appraise effectively and efficiently is questionable (Healy, 1994:31).

Other difficulties of this approach according Hellowell (1992:40) is the discrepancies between the ratio of inspectors/ supervisors to head teacher in most of the cases, i.e. less number of supervisors to principals, causing less frequent contact between the two. This has a negative impact on success of appraisal as formal or informal day-to-day contact between appraiser and appraisee is crucial (Hewton and west, 1994:32; Steers, 1997:5). Moreover, the concerns about the appraisers' objectivity and fairness in assessment have made this approach more problematic in that a performance appraisal by a single appraiser is liable to subjectivity more than multi or greater than one appraiser (Roome, 1994:34).

2. School Governors

These are outsiders involved in governing schools. They are the representative of the local community that usually exists in the form of committee or board to govern the school in collaboration with local education authorities (Levacic, 1989:79). According to MOE (1994:18),

the nearest governing bodies of school next to Woreda Education and Training Board are the Kebele Education and Training Board (KETB), and Parent Teacher Association (PTA).

These bodies have the responsibilities to participate in school planning, implementation and evaluating the overall performance of the plan (ibid.). This implies that, they have awareness about the duties and responsibilities of school principals and hence recommended in some cases to appraise the performance of school principals.

There are some other writers who support this idea. Hellowell (1992:4) is among these who suggest that the local governors to be in a position to appraise the performance of school principals, since most of the performance results affect or reported to them. Champion (1992:141), on his side explain the necessity for involving local governors in head teacher performance appraisal as they are the representatives of school beneficiaries.

However, this approach is found to be problematic due to lack of acceptance with the side of principals. As the study conducted by Hellowell (1992:41), on “who principal would like to be appraised by?”, most principals, view governors as they have no sufficient and relevant knowledge to appraise their performance, and hence cannot stand by their own to appraise principals’ performance unless supported by others who can play professional role.

3. Self-Appraisal

It is an appraisal process that involves both appraisee and appraiser completing nearly identical appraisal forms, discussing them in an interview, and filing a single agreed report (Towers, 1998:205). It is impossible to prevent self-appraisal because any one being appraised will have personal views on his/her own performance. Nevertheless, people become more responsible to assess their own past performance and future potential with reasonable degree of accuracy when self-appraisal is made part of formal procedure (Robbins, 1997:223)

According to Mathis and John (1997:350), this approach is advantageous over the other in that it reduce defensiveness by encouraging the appraisees to take lead in reviewing their performance, secondly it enables appraisees to think about their own performance and development needs in a focused way and finally, it results in more objective assessment by giving the perspective of two people appraisee and appraiser than if it is rested on either one alone.

However, some problems inhibit the use of self-appraisal. The greatest of these is the danger of inflated or excessively lenient self-assessments (Schermerhorn, 1997:350). This can certainly happen sometimes through a fundamental lack of objectivity on the part of the appraisees, because the situation is not one that motivates the individual to accurately assess themselves, and sometimes because the nature of exercise does not facilitate accurate self-assessment.

The other problem in relation to self-appraisal according to Schermerhorn is, if the invitation to self-appraisal is not framed appropriately it can promote inaccuracy. This happens when they are asked to compare themselves with others, especially if others concerned are not all that familiar to them.

Generally self-appraisal do best where the immediate boss doesn't see enough appraisees, and when the nature of the appraisal technique is such that the employee compare themselves against their own individual standard, and not against other peoples' performance standard (Fletcher, 2003:59).

4. Fellow principals As Appraiser

It is an appraisal of a principal's performance by other principals with same level of school, mainly known as peer appraisal. Peer appraisal is encouraged mainly in academic and teaching institutions, where there is often a dislike of formal hierarchical structure (Chaube,S. and Chaube,A., 1996:57).it has advantage over other methods in reducing the problem to whom the principal is accountable for the appraisal of his performance. Moreover, they have better knowledge and experience on what is to be done by principals, and hence appraise better than others.

Some studies also indicate this approach to be preferred by principals than the other approaches. According the study conducted by Clayton-Jones, et. al. (1996:14), fellow school principals with successful experience of working in a school similar to their own who would be in a position to understand the complexities of work is more acceptable among many school principals.

There are however problems related to the implementation of this approach. One of this is work overload on principals, secondly there exists unwillingness to appraise one another from bases of friendship, and finally it is too time consuming specially in large groups to rate one another (Robbins, 1997:222).

5. Subordinates as Appraiser

This is an upward appraisal of principals' performance, different from horizontal appraisal of the peer group and the appraisal by such groups as supervisors and governors which may be viewed as a top-down appraisal. It is an approach where the school staffs take a position in appraising their principals. After all, some would argue that they are much more likely than any other categories so far considered being in a position to observe the heads management performance on a daily basis and to evaluate the quality of management (Hellawell, 1992:48). However, a negative reaction many principals have to be appraised by their subordinates, again subordinates lack of knowledge about the role of their boss and unwillingness to appraise due to lack of confidence in resisting the sequence that might follow are the disadvantages of this approach (Schermerhorn, 1997:348).

6. Multiple-Source Appraiser

This is a comprehensive approach in which the appraisal depends on the feedback provided by various stakeholders that might have a contact with the appraisees (Robbins, 2000:289). It is also known as 360-degree appraisal. In case of principals' performance appraisal, these sources of feedback might include teachers, students, parents, supervisors, and local governors, as they are the main stakeholders of school system (Levavic, 1989:57).

The approach is believed to be advantageous if it is mainly used for developmental purpose rather than administrative one (Mathis and John, 1997:351). Unless it remains a collection of conflicting ideas that originate from personal interests or needs which contribute little or no to individual future performance.

2.7 Problems of Result-Oriented Performance Appraisal

Even though, the need for ROPA system has long been popularized and accepted to be more objective method of measuring individuals performance by reducing bias and favoritism that might occur when traditional approach to performance appraisal used, it has also proved not to be out of difficulties with different nature hindering its effectiveness (Knootz and Weihrich, 1993:394). Some of these common problems are briefly explained hereunder.

a. Problems Related to the Design and Operation of the System

The design of a given performance appraisal may be the cause for problems of the system. Lack of clarity and specificity on purpose and criteria, the manner in which the evaluation will going to implemented, including who will be the appraiser, when and how frequently to appraise are some of the design related problems of the performance appraisal (Melaku, 1996:30). Stated differently, if the purpose, criteria who to appraise, frequency of appraisal, ways of feedback, actions based on performance, and the like are not clearly indicated at the beginning, the creation of problems at implementation stage will be expected.

Failure to participate appraise and appraiser in the design of the system is another cause for the problem (Torrington, et al.,2003:307). It contributes more to come up with better design in addition to the reduction of problems that may occur during the implementation of the system. Moreover, absence of adequate monitoring and feedback mechanisms followed by appropriate remedial action during the implementation period ,which make the process of the performance appraisal not to operate effectively are problems related to the operation of the system (Henry, 1982:162).

b. Problems with Appraisees

An appraisees perception and knowledge about performance appraisal are important factors in the process of its operation. If apprasiees are not clear with the important concepts of performance appraisal such as; the purpose, and the criteria they feel uncomfortable and usually view the appraisal as a zero-sum game in which there must be a winner and a loser (Mathis and Johnson, 1997:362).

In addition to problems created because of ambiguity on appraisal purpose and criteria, the effectiveness of appraisal depends on appraisees' perception of appraisers' authority, expertise, professionalism, sensitivity, trust and worthiness (Stufflebeam, 1986 in Berhanu 2006:18).

Lack of conceptual and technical capability of appraisees to prepare performance criteria is another problem. Winston and Creamer (1997:3) pointed out that appraisee should be knowledgeable enough to prepare performance criteria mainly in those performance appraisal methods which are participatory in nature. Philp (1990:3) on his side pointed out the causes of problems in appraisal from the side of appraisees to be suspicion of why they are being appraised,

concern for fair appraisal, very little happening, if anything, as a result of being appraised, what use is a once or twice a year even anyway.

c. Problems Related to Appraiser

Appraisers are more responsible for accomplishment of the appraisal process. However, they subject to certain errors knowingly or unknowingly in strive to achieve these responsibilities. The following are the rater errors common to all techniques as explained by Mathis and John (1997:359-361).

1. **Problems of varying standards**-occurs when different standards used for employees performing similar jobs. Such errors are likely to exist when ambiguous criteria and subjective weighing by superiors are used.
2. **Recency effect**- it occurs when a rater gives greater weight to recent occurrences when appraising an individual performance.
3. **Central tendency error**- it is an error that happen when an appraiser rate all employees in a narrow band in the middle of the rating scale. Likewise, rating patterns may exhibit *leniency* or *strictness*. The leniency error occurs when rating of all employee are at the high end of the scale, whereas the strictness error occurs when an appraiser uses only the lower part of the scale to rate employee.
4. **Halo effect**- occurs when an overall impression of the appraisees is judged on the basis of single trait.
5. **Contrast error**- occurs when employee is rated relative to other employee rather than to performance standard.

In addition to the above listed problems, Heneman (1996:161) stated appraiser ability and motivation as factors to appraisal problems. As to him appraiser's knowledge to the actual performance dimension and to performance of employee are critical. Ability to appraise is not only restricted by the knowledge of appraiser there might exists other factors affecting it, for example, the managers may have to many subordinates, the subordinates may geographically dispersed or in some instances the dimension of jobs themselves may be so numerous that the appraiser has difficulty to observe them (Hellawell, 1992:40).

On the other hand, if appraisers are not encouraged through different reinforcement such as provision of incentives, recognition and reward for effort they have invested, they become demotivated, secondly the appraisers lack interest to evaluate unless performance appraisal is recognized as important dimension of their job (Ibid.), a dimension that if performed well will be rewarded.

In relation to schools, the above indicated problems of performance appraisal are usual and even suggested to be more serious. Hansen (2005:1) state that, performing performance appraisals on highly technical people is more difficult and calls for error than doing for employees that are performing routine or production- oriented tasks. The problem is again more serious with regard to school principals than all other school staff. Difficulty to select a sound able criteria and appointing suitable appraiser for school principal are the serious among other all (Willis, 1992:30-31).

The policy paper in relation to ROPA, cited the following as the main problems of implementing the system: difficulty of preparing standards that can objectively measure the performance of employee, failure of appraisers to take the appraisal process seriously, their lack of honesty, sincerity, and appraisal skills, inability to give feedback, and failure to reward substantially outstanding employee (FCSC, 1999:1)

However, these problems, which hinder the effectiveness of performance appraisal discussed so far, can be reduced if not eliminated at all. Different authorities have suggested means to reduce or alleviate these problems. Stress and Black (1994:204-205) are among the authorities who proposed the following as a mechanisms to reduce errors in performance appraisal.

1. Ensure that the rater observe subordinates on a regular bases throughout the evaluation period,
2. Keep the number of subordinates evaluated by one rater to a reasonable number,
3. Ensure that the performance criteria is "SMART"; specific ,measurable, achievable ,relevant, and time bounded,
4. Training rater so that they can recognize various sources of error.

Another approach to overcome problems in performance appraisal according to Rue and Byars (1990:215), is to make refinements in the design of performance appraisal system, which

includes undergoing possible revision on the clarity of the purpose, appropriateness of performance criteria and the designated appraiser (s). Moreover, involving the appraisees and appraisers in the design of as system, communication on all dimensions of the performance appraisal before its implementation, greatly reduce the problems that may happen latter (Heneman, 1996:160).

Finally, Winston and Creamer (1997:3), cited the training of apprasiees in addition to appraisers especially where the technique of appraisal under consideration is participatory that involve subordinates in appraisal process to be important. They further pointed out that the involvement of more than one appraiser in a system as a means to reduce the problems of performance appraisal.

CHAPTER THREE

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter comprises two major parts. The first part presents the characteristics of the respondents by sex, years of service and academic qualification. Part two of the chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the data on the major variables of the study.

A total of 127 questionnaires; 103 to appraisees, and 24 to appraisers were distributed. Out of these, 92 (89.3 %) from appraisees, and 24 (100%) from appraisers were filled in and collected. In addition, the interviews made with a zonal education expert and woreda education and capacity building heads were included. Based on responses obtained from the sample respondents, the analysis and interpretation of the data are presented following each table

3.1 Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 2: Respondents by Sex and Age

No	Characteristics	Respondents					
		Principals		Supervisors		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	Sex						
	Male	84	91.3	24	100	108	93.1
	Female	8	8.7	0	-	8	6.9
	Total	92	100	24	100	116	100
2	Age (in years)						
	20 years and below	-	-	-	-	-	-
	21-30 years	42	45.7	7	29.2	49	42.2
	31-40 years	43	46.7	14	58.3	57	49.1
	41-50 years	7	7.6	2	8.3	9	7.8
	51 and above	-	-	1	4.2	1	0.9
Total		92	100	24	100	116	100

As can be seen from Table 2, the number of females both at principal and supervisory posts is much less than those of male counterparts. Indeed, the table shows that no female appointees have been serving at supervision post. Female principals account only about 6.9% of the total sample respondents with rest 93.1% are males. Hence, females' involvement in supervisory position as well as in principal ship in the zone under consideration is very low. This is the reflection of low participation rate of females in the education system.

Regarding the age distribution, all the appraisees were of age group ranging ≤ 21 -50 years of age limits. Most of them were age groups of 21-30 (45.7%) and 31-40 (46.7%) that sum up 92.4% of the appraisees sample; where as other age groups altogether add up to the rest 7.6%. On the other hand, the appraisers' age range from ≤ 21 to ≥ 51 years of age limits in which the age intervals 21-30 (29.2%) and 31-40 (58.4%) together account about 87.6% of the appraisers' sample. Thus there are more mature supervisors in place than principals

Table 3: Respondents by Qualification and Certification

No	Items	Respondents					
		Appraisees		Appraisers		Total	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Qualification						
	a)TTI	37	40.2	-	-	37	31.9
	b)Diploma	55	59.8	24	100	79	68.1
	c)1 st degree	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	Do you have necessary certificate to your present post?						
	a)Yes	43	46.74	9	37.50	52	44.83
	b)No	49	53.26	15	62.50	64	55.17

As revealed in the Table 3, 40.2% of appraisees were TTI holders while the rest (about 59.8%) were diploma holders. This happens due to the fact that principals for first cycle primary schools are TTI holders; where as diploma holders for the second cycle primary schools. All appraisers were diploma holders which are also in line with the directive that invites a diploma qualified teachers as requirement to be an appraiser of the performance of primary school principals (OECBO, 2004:18). More over, this directive recommends a certificate in educational supervision to be assigned as an appraiser to the post. Principals are also required to have a certificate in principalship to serve as principal. Hence, respondents were asked whether they have been certified to the post or not.

As depicted by item 2 of Table 3, more than half (53.26%) of principals had no training related to school the post. More surprisingly, 62.5% of the appraisers were assigned to appraise the performance of principals with out relevant training; only about 37.5% fulfilled the requirement.

Hence it is possible to infer that participants mainly the appraisers were assigned to the post without fulfilling the necessary requirements. This might indicate that necessary preparation were not made with regard to training of participants before implementing the ROAPP system. Furthermore, it is possible to infer that the task of appraising the performance of principals might have been challenging for both appraisees and appraisers to accomplish as needed, since they had no necessary training as per the directive says.

Table 4: Respondents by years of Service

No	Respondents	Service	Service in years											
			5 and below		6-10		11-15		16-20		21-25		26 and above	
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Appraisees N= 92	at present post	49	53.3	34	37.0	6	6.5	3	3.2	-	-	-	-
		at teaching	8	8.7	40	43.5	22	23.9	17	18.5	5	5.4	-	-
		Total	-	-	49	53.3	27	29.3	12	13.1	4	4.3	-	-
2	Appraisers N=24	at present post	17	70.8	7	29.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		at teaching	6	25.0	12	50.0	4	16.6	1	4.2	1	4.2	-	-
		Total	-	-	18	75.0	4	16.6	1	4.2	1	4.2	-	-
Total (116)			-	-	67	57.8	31	26.7	13	11.2	5	4.3	-	-

Concerning the work experience, Table 4 shows that both the appraisees and appraisers had a teaching experience before they were assigned to their present post. The years of service at present post and at teaching do not directly add up together to give the total year of service, since they are indicated by the interval in the table. The largest proportion of appraisees as well as appraisers total experience falls in the range of 6-10 and 11-15 years; 82.6% appraisees, and 91.6% of appraisers. However, most of the appraisees (53.3%), and appraisers (70.8%) had five years and below service at their present post. This indicates the experience they had at their present post also to be low.

No appraisee or appraiser was in total years of work experience of five and below. This again goes with the requirement that says a minimum of five years of experience is necessary to be assigned as a principal or supervisor for primary schools. Hence both principals and supervisors were assigned to the position according to the requirements with regard to years of service.

3.2 Analysis and Interpretation of Data on the Major Variables

Table 5: What purposes should ROAPP serve?

No	Purposes	Respondents															
		Appraisees (N =92)						Appraisers (N=24)						Weighted mean score	χ^2		
		SA (5)	A (4)	UD (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	Mean	SA (5)	A (4)	UD (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	Mean				
a	To improve the quality of education	58	18	15	1	-	4.44	16	7	1	-	-	4.62	4.47	3.03		
b	To improve professional competence of principals	57	30	4	1	-	4.45	12	8	2	1	1	4.20	4.39	6.49		
c	To motivate principals to their work	56	20	9	3	4	4.31	12	5	4	1	2	4.00	4.24	3.33		
d	To decide on principals' salary increment	31	17	31	9	4	3.67	8	5	7	2	2	3.62	3.65	1.22		
e	To decide on principals' transfer	26	22	18	13	13	3.38	6	5	7	4	2	3.37	3.37	1.34		
f	To reward competent principals	44	26	9	9	4	4.05	8	8	4	3	1	3.79	3.99	1.94		
g	To take disciplinary actions on principals	20	16	20	17	19	3.01	5	5	7	3	4	3.16	3.04	1.18		
h	To identify principals' training needs	44	22	17	5	4	4.05	9	6	3	3	3	3.62	3.96	4.01		
i	To select principals for higher education	45	20	15	8	4	4.02	7	5	7	4	1	3.54	3.92	4.73		
j	To provide feedback to principals	39	31	18	4	-	4.14	10	6	7	-	1	4.00	4.11	6.35		
Total								3.96							3.79	3.92	

Appraisers and appraisees were asked to identify the major purposes that they think ROAPP should serve. To this end, ten purposes of which five (a, b, c, h, j) are formative and the rest summative (d, e, f, g, i) in purposes were presented. The mean, weighted mean scores and the chi-square test values 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 easily be noted from the mean values both groups of respondents rated the formative as well as the summative purposes within and above the average, inclined towards the agreement scale. The mean scores for the ten assumed purposes of ROAPP range from 3.01 to 4.45 for appraisees, and from 3.16 to 4.62 in case of appraisers with average mean scores 3.96 and 3.79 respectively.

The weighted mean score values also confirm same situation. It ranges from 3.04 - 4.47 showing the rating of appraisees and appraisers to the indicated items to be within and above the average scale with more values fall within the agreement range. Out of ten listed major purposes of ROAPP, the weighted mean score values of eight purposes are within the agreement scale (3.5 - 4.49). This might imply that appraisees and appraisers perception to the intended purposes of the system to be encouraging.

Comparing the two purposes of ROAPP based on the value of their mean scores, the formative purposes of ROAPP take the lead. All the five formative purposes were prioritized by appraisees. Appraisers on their side rated four out of the five formative purposes better than the summative purposes, except one that is to identify principals' training needs (mean =3.62) rated next to rewarding competent principals (mean= 3.79), which is summative in purpose.

Improving quality of education, improving professional competence of principals, motivating principals to their work, and to provide feedback to principals are the four leading purposes of ROAPP with the weighted mean scores 4.47, 4.39, 4.24, and 4.11 respectively. These were all formative purposes, which ROAPP could be expected to serve as its primary purposes. This would, therefore, enable to suggest that the majority appraisees and the appraisers view ROAPP purpose to be primarily formative rather than the summative.

Only one item from the listed formative purposes of ROAPP, which is ‘to identify principals’ training needs was less favored by appraisers. It is found on the sixth from ten listed items according to their mean score values next to rewarding competent principal, which is summative in purpose.

Regarding, the summative purposes which were perceived as secondary, both groups of respondents rated each item, with almost similar way as can be observed from their mean score values. To reward competent principals, selection of principals for higher education, and decision on principals’ salary increment were the three prioritized items from the summative purposes with weighted mean scores 3.99, 3.92, and 3.65 respectively. While, to make decisions on principals’ transfer, and to take disciplinary actions were the least rated items by both group of respondents with weighted mean score values 3.37, and 3.04 respectively. Examination of the mean score values for each item as rated by appraisees and appraisers also disclose similar trend.

The zonal education expert and woreda education and capacity building heads view to the intended purposes of the system, were not far different from the listed purposes in Table 5, except a little deviation with the side of woreda education officials. As to most of these officials, improvement of the quality of education, motivating principals to their work, and enabling education officials objectively make decisions on principals’ salary increment, reward, transfer, selection for further education, and discipline problems using open, transparent and output based criteria were the major purposes for which the system was designed.

The developmental aspects of the performance appraisal such as; identification of principals’ training needs, improving principals’ professional competence and provision of continuous feed back were rarely recognized by most of the officials. Hence, the formative purposes of ROAPP have been less emphasized by woreda education heads which is in contrary to the perception by appraisees and appraisers to the intended purposes of ROAPP indicated so far. The zonal expert view to the intended purposes of the system, however, mutually incorporates both the formative and the summative purposes as was presented in the Table 5.

The overall examination of the data leads to the fact that, both participants, mainly the appraisees perceived the purpose of the appraisal to be primarily formative with summative being secondary. 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. However, the formative purposes of the ROAPP system had been less emphasized by the majority of the woreda education officials than the summative purposes in contrary to appraisees and appraisers.

Whether or not appraisers and appraisees have perceptual differences as far as the purposes ROAPP should serve, analysis was made by employing a chi-square test for both the items. As shown in Table 6, the calculated chi-square value (χ^2_{obt}) for each item is less than the tabled value ($\chi^2_{\text{crit}} = 9.49$) at $df = 4$ and 0.05 level of significance, indicating absence of significant differences in rating pattern of appraisees and appraisers concerning the purposes that ROAPP should serve.

Hence, there is no significant difference in perceptions between appraisees and appraisers regarding the purposes ROAPP should serve. Thus, it would be evident that there exists perceptual relationship between appraisees and appraisers that ROAPP should primarily be formative (developmental) rather than summative (administrative) in purpose.

Table 6: Purposes the Current System of ROAPP Serving

No	Purposes	Respondents														
		Appraisees (N =92)						Appraisers (N=24)						Weighted mean score	χ^2	
		SA (5)	A (4)	UD (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	mean	SA (5)	A (4)	UD (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	mean			
a	To improve the quality of education	2	6	30	31	23	2.27	2	4	8	4	6	2.67	2.35	5.22	
b	To improve professional competence of principals	4	9	26	30	23	2.35	2	3	7	7	5	2.58	2.40	1.72	
c	To motivate principals to their work	6	10	26	30	20	2.47	2	3	8	6	5	2.62	2.50	0.55	
d	To decide on principals' salary increment	12	14	25	21	20	2.75	3	4	8	4	5	2.83	2.77	1.98	
e	To decide on principals' transfer	9	17	28	20	18	2.77	3	4	8	6	3	2.91	2.80	3.82	
f	To reward competent principals	14	14	18	23	23	2.70	4	5	6	7	2	3.08	2.78	5.93	
g	To take disciplinary actions on principals	9	10	28	26	19	2.61	4	6	4	5	5	2.95	2.68	2.14	
h	To identify principals' training needs	1	7	29	36	19	2.29	1	4	8	6	5	2.58	2.35	4.77	
i	To select principals for higher education	14	25	25	18	10	3.16	4	5	8	6	1	3.20	3.17	2.14	
j	To provide feedback to principals	3	3	26	30	30	2.11	1	1	6	8	8	2.12	2.11	1.18	
Total							2.53							2.73	2.33	

As reported in table 6, all the sampled appraisees rated the extent of achievement of the formative purposes of ROAPP below the average with mean score values ranging from 2.11 to 2.47. The summative purposes were rated relatively better than the formative purposes. The mean score for all items, which are summative in purpose appear within the average scale ranging from 2.61-3.16. Hence, the summative purposes of ROAPP have been better achieved than the formative purposes as perceived by the appraisees.

With regard to appraisers, both the summative and four out of five formative purposes of ROAPP, as can be observed from their mean score values, were rated within the average scale (2.5-3.49). The only item rated below the average within the disagreement scale is provision of feedback to principals, with a mean score 2.12. Here also the summative purposes are relatively better rated than the formative purposes same to that of the appraisees rating.

The weighted mean score values range from 2.11 to 3.17, indicating the extent of achievements of the over all purposes of ROAPP to fall below and within the average. The only purpose rated best from the provided options by the two groups of respondent was to select principals for higher education with weighted mean scores 3.17. This happens because the criteria for competing principals for higher education, that takes place every year demands the performance appraisal result, that accounts about 30%of the total requirements. Hence, using the nearest three consecutive semester results of the performance appraisal of principals' is must as far as the competition takes place.

The chi-square test was computed to detect difference or relationships between appraisees and appraisers in rating the extent of achievement of the purposes of ROAPP. The value calculated for all items as indicated in Table 6, are less than the tabled value; 9.49 at df of 4 and $\alpha = 0.05$ (two-tailed) level of significance.

Hence, there is no statistically significance difference in response pattern of the study groups regarding the purposes ROAPP have been serving. This implies that, both groups of respondents respond relatively in similar manner favoring better achievement of the summative purpose of ROAPP than the formative purposes.

Generally, the purposes for which ROAPP have been serving in zone under study show deviation from the purpose which it ought to serve as indicated on literature, and perceived by participants.

The purpose of appraising principals' performance will primarily be developmental; to assist in raising professional standards, on one hand and professional accountability; administrative on the other hand (Hattersley, 1992:38). However, the finding of the study is the reverse, underemphasizing the developmental aspects of ROAPP than to the administrative purposes.

The total weighted mean score value (2.33), as calculated from the rating of appraisees and appraisers for each item is also below the average. This might indicate that, the extent of achievement of the overall purposes of the system to be unsatisfactory. To ensure this, appraisees and appraisers were again requested to rate the degree of agreement on ROAPP in meeting the overall purposes for which it was intended to serve using a 5 point likert type scale as shown next.

Table 7: Extent of Achievements of ROAPP Purpose

No	Respondents	Rating Scores							Weighted mean score	χ^2
		SA	A	UD	D	SD	mean	S.D.		
1	Appraisees (N=92)	-	14	33	31	14	2.51	0.926	2.52	4.83
2	Appraisers (N=24)	1	4	7	8	4	2.58	1.076		
Total							2.54			

As revealed by mean score values in Table 7, the extent of achievements of the over all purposes current ROAPP system was rated as average inclined to the lower values of the average scale by both appraisees and appraisers. The values for the weighted mean score and the average mean score; 2.52, 2.54 respectively confirm the situation. In this regard, it is evident that there is a mismatch between the purpose for which the system has been designed and the actual situation. The standard deviation in case of appraisees (0.926) is less than that of appraisers (1.076), indicating the difference in opinion among the appraisee respondents to extent of achievements of ROAPP being less than appraisers. The mean scores calculated for appraisees (2.51) is less than that of appraisers (2.58) which again shows the extent of agreement to the over all achievement of the purpose of ROAPP of appraisees to be less than the appraisers.

However, the chi-square calculated to look for a difference in views of the two groups of respondents confirms that, there is no significant difference in perceiving the degree of

achievement of the purposes of ROAPP. The calculated chi-square value (χ^2_{obt}) which is equal to 4.83 is less than the value on the table that is 9.49 at $df = 4$, and 0.05 (two-tailed) level of significance. Hence, there exist opinion agreements between appraisees and appraisers that there have been deviations between the purposes for which the system was designed and the manner by which it has been operated in primary schools of zone under consideration.

The discussion made with zonal education expert with regard to the extent of achievements of the purposes of ROAPP, in the zone under study also indicated the existence of weakness in employing the system for the intended purposes. According to an expert, principals did not get necessary support to improve performance as per the system entails. Besides, the magnitude of relevant administrative decisions; promotions or demotions made based on the performance result were insignificant. Termination of pay with the introduction of the system was the evidence repeatedly cited by an expert to ensure the weakness of employing the system for the intended purpose.

Most of the woreda education and capacity building office heads, however, argued the extent of achievements of the purposes of ROAPP in their respective districts better than indicated by zonal education expert, appraisees and appraisers. As to these officials, one of the factors behind the changes currently observed in schools, including improvement in quality of instruction, is the introduction of the new system of appraising principals' performance.

Generally, the aforementioned opinions and the statistical data imply the existence of gap between the intended purposes of the system and its actual situation. The mismatch between the intended purposes and the real practices might occur due to different factors of these, lack of clarity on the purposes, poor way of administration of the appraisal process, lack of resources, autonomy, policy integrity, technical and conceptual skill to prepare performance criteria as pointed out by Henry (1982:29), might be the reasons behind the deviation.

However, as discussed under Table 5, both appraisees and appraisers responded as they have clarity on purposes that ROAPP should serve. Hence, it could be possible to assume that factors cited by Henry above and others, different from perception to the purpose of the system related problems, are the leading factors behind the system not to achieve its purposes as intended.

Table 8: Process of ROAPP

No	Process	Respondents												Weighted mean score	χ^2
		Appraisees (N=92)						Appraisers (N=24)							
		SA	A	UD	D	SD	mean	SA	A	UD	D	SD	mean		
1	Planning of tasks and setting expectations	-	15	36	24	17	2.53	1	2	10	7	4	2.54	2.53	4.09
2	Monitoring performance	-	4	24	41	23	2.05	-	2	9	6	7	2.25	2.09	4.12
3	Examining result of performance	1	16	30	28	17	2.52	-	4	9	6	5	2.50	2.51	0.46
4	Actions based on result performance	-	10	24	36	22	2.23	-	2	10	8	4	2.41	2.26	2.16
Average							2.33						2.42	2.35	

Planning tasks and setting expectation, monitoring performance, examining result and taking actions based on performance result as the major steps of the process of ROAPP were examined based on the opinion of the respondents obtained through a five point likert type scale. Table 8 presents the ratings by appraisees and appraisers to the extent of accomplishment of these activities in frequency with their respective mean scores and chi-square values.

The mean score achieved from the data analysis were interpreted as 0.05-1.49 for strongly disagree, 1.5- 2.49 disagree, 2.5-3.49 undecided, 3.5-4.49 agree, 4.5 and above strongly agree. Therefore, mean scores below 2.5 were taken as weakness and above 2.5 were thought as strengths.

As depicted in Table 8, planning of work and setting expectations in the process of the system was a little more than the average, but far below the maximum as rated by both groups of respondents with the weighted mean score of about 2.53 and no significant differences in opinions between the two groups of respondents appear, since the chi-square value calculated (4.09) is less than the tabled value (9.49).

Various issues under planning stage were exposed to respondents for their responses. The joint discussion made by principals and supervisors on school plan and objective to identify principals' major areas of work responsibilities seems to be unfair as rated by respondents. However, classifying tasks to be performed by principals into key, major and minor tasks, followed by development of performance standards and mechanisms of follow-upon and finally making

agreement on developed performance criteria were rated around the average scale by both group of respondents.

The responses secured from interviews and informal discussion made with some of the respondents showed that joint discussion and planning by principals and supervisors is a rare happening event, rather one of them, mostly the principals have been responsible, to plan or prepare the performance criteria and invite supervisors to make agreement. According to WECBO head of most of the sampled woredas, a general guideline around which principals key, major and minor tasks turn has been provided to principals, from which they start to prepare their own performance criteria by assimilating to their school situation. The supervisors in this case are responsible only for approval of planned or prepared performance criteria. The reason officials put to such way of planning is that, the number of supervisors they had were very less in number to plan jointly with each and every principal.

Besides, the zonal expert commented that the performance plan being defective. Principals as well as supervisors lack skill and knowledge to identify tasks to be performed by principals and develop appropriate measuring standards for each. As a result, principals make use of same performance criteria created once from semester to semester, and even copy from each other.

Concerning monitoring of the actual performance of the planned tasks, the data showed poor accomplishment with weighted mean score of 2.09, and no significant differences in opinions between the respondents of the two groups. All issues exposed to respondents for their responses under the monitoring stage were mostly inclined to the disagreement position as rated by both group of respondents.

The interviewees' response in relation to monitoring and follow-up of the principals' actual performance as per the agreement made indicated the same situation. Not continuous follow-up and support, according to the response woreda education officials, the face to face contact between the supervisors and principals to discuss about the appraisal and other school work is negligible. A maximum of two or three times contact have been familiarized between the two per semester. Though, mechanisms for follow up and feedback have been well indicated early on the plan they were rarely employed.

According to the response of some of the woreda education officials, a 'check list', and monthly reports made by principals are the mechanisms of monitoring work performance. A 'check list' is a format with a list of tasks to be performed by schools within a given period of time usually two weeks, or a month. It is prepared at woreda education office to be distributed for schools. However, the check list method has been claimed by principals as well as by supervisors as it has less relationship with the planned tasks; rather it is full of unintended events irrelevant to the school teaching learning process.

ROPA above all requires follow-up, followed by effective and timely feedback addressing employees' performance in relation established performance appraisal criteria (FCSC, 1997 E.C.:112). However, the actual situation at hand in the zone under study as indicated above has found to be inconsistent with this; principals were not aware of their strength and weakness and got necessary support in due of the appraisal process, and ultimately forced to accept rating supported by no evidence.

With regard to examination of the actual performance at the end of the year or the semester, the data relatively revealed a little bit fairness, with weighted mean scores of 2.51 and again no significant differences observed in opinion between the respondents of the two groups. For issues raised under this stage of administering the system which include revision of the past actual performance, comparing these actual performances with planned standard and identifying the most likely cause for the difference were rated below the average by both groups of respondents. What brings up this stage to the average scale were a fair rating on two last issues; which are discussion on rating, and the final agreement on the rating between appraisees and appraisers.

The interview made also assured that, no logical procedures as indicated on the question was followed in examining the result, rather supervisors fill or rate principal's performance result based on the information they had in hand. Principals were then made to know their rate result with one copy of the rating format. The relative fairness of the response to this stage happened from the fact that, examining the result or rating is a 'must' activity, that every civil servant including schools' principals had twice a year as per the directives of the country (FCSC, 1997: 124). That is, there has long been a trend that principals' performance has been evaluated per semester.

Finally, the action to be taken based on performance result, both respondents exhibits the disagreement with weighted mean score of 2.26. The chi-square test for this item also indicates the absence of significant differences in opinions of the two groups of respondents. The discussion made with interviewees confirm similar situation. There were no sound able actions either positive or negative that has taken place following the result of the appraisal except very minor discussion made, and rewards provision provided to some principals in some of the woredas in zone under study.

This is, however in conflict with the policy of performance appraisal by FCSC (1999, 8) of our country, that says performance appraisal related pay should be given to employee timely, and amount of pay should be substantial enough to encourage them to be more productive. Accordingly, the system should reward employees according to their performance results, the outstanding performers getting the highest reward followed by above the average and the average performers.

The average mean score for appraisees (2.33), and appraisers (2.42), and their weighted mean score (2.35) all fall below 2.50, indicating weakness in administrating the process of ROAPP. Hence, the system is not on the way to fulfill what is expected of it. The result-oriented appraisal system fails to fulfill the expectations, and has led to results far different from sought unless administered following necessary logical steps (Philp, 1992:14).

Table 9: Development of Performance Criteria for ROAPP

Items	Respondents			
	Appraisees (N=92)		Appraisers (N=24)	
	No	%	No	%
Who develop the performance appraisal criteria for ROAPP?				
a. Principals	42	45.65	11	45.83
b. Supervisors	12	13.04	1	4.16
c. Principals and supervisors together	17	18.48	8	33.38
d. Woreda education and capacity building office	21	22.83	4	16.67

As can be seen from Table 9, all options were rated as a body to develop the appraisal criteria for ROAPP. About 45.65% of appraisees and 45.83% appraisers rated principals as a body to prepare the performance criteria. Woreda education and capacity building office (22.83%) principals and

supervisors together (18.48%), and supervisors (13.04%) were rated as the second, third and fourth respectively next to principals by the appraisees. While appraisers on their part rated, principals together with supervisors next to principals followed by woreda education and capacity building office, and supervisors at the end with percentages.33.38%, 16.67% and 4.16% respectively.

The responses of woreda education officials to same question agree with the above response of appraisees and the appraisers. The way the performance criteria for appraisal of principals' performance have been developed, according to the officials response varies from woreda to woreda. In four of the seven sampled woredas (Adola, Shakiso, Liban, and Kercha) principals have been responsible to develop their own performance criteria under the general guideline given by WECBO. The guideline helps principals to identify areas from which key, major and minor tasks have to be drawn.

However, in two of these sampled woredas (Bore and Uraga), the woreda education and capacity building offices provides all school principals with a list of key, major and minor tasks. Principals are then responsible to set their own standards of performance for these tasks and reach on agreement with the supervisors. An attempt to develop the performance appraisal criteria of principals with mutual participation of principals and supervisors as required by the system has been practiced in only one of the woredas under the study (Wadera).

From the data in Table 9 and responses of the interview, it might be possible to deduce that, the way appraisal criteria develop vary in the zone under study from woreda to woreda. Principals have been responsible to prepare their own appraisal criteria in most of the Woredas, under the general guideline provided by WECBO. This is however, not in agreement with the principle of result-oriented appraisal that recommends mutual participation of appraisee and appraiser in developing appraisal criteria (Reddy, 1991: 35). The appraisal criteria for ROAPP have, therefore, a defect from the starting point of its development. Hence, create a suspect on its convenience to measure principals' performance accurately in its latter use.

Table 10: Appropriateness of the Appraisal Criteria

No	Basic Features	Respondents	Rating Frequency					Mean	Weighted mean scores	χ^2
			5	4	3	2	1			
a	Criteria are related to the purpose of the appraisal system	Appraisees (N=92)	-	10	39	35	8	2.55	2.57	6.41
		Appraisers (N=24)	-	-	17	6	1	2.67		
b	Criteria are related to the duties and responsibilities of principals	Appraisees (N=92)	2	17	26	37	10	2.61	2.63	3.43
		Appraisers (N=24)	2	2	10	8	2	2.75		
c	Criteria are realistic to be performed by principals	Appraisees (N=92)	2	12	47	24	7	2.76	2.76	3.17
		Appraisers (N=24)	-	3	16	5	1	2.79		
d	Criteria are specific and measurable	Appraisees (N=92)	-	11	42	36	35	2.67	2.65	5.46
		Appraisers (N=24)	-	3	11	7	3	2.58		
e	Criteria measure principals' competence in instructional leadership	Appraisees (N=92)	6	9	27	9	21	2.46	2.47	7.45
		Appraisers (N=24)	1	3	8	7	55	2.50		
f	Criteria measure principals' competence in administrative leadership	Appraisees (N=92)	13	13	19	254	3	2.67	2.64	5.28
		Appraisers (N=24)	-	5	8	6	5	2.54		
g	Criteria measure principals' competence in teaching	Appraisees (N=92)	1	8	29	36	18	2.32	2.28	2.43
		Appraisers (N=24)	-	2	9	6	5	2.16		
h	Criteria enable to take fair administrative decision on principals	Appraisees (N=92)	3	6	32	29	22	2.34	2.31	1.71
		Appraisers (N=24)	-	2	8	7	7	2.21		
i	Criteria enable to identify competent principals form incompetent ones	Appraisees (N=92)	0.7	6	44	25	17	2.42	2.42	2.90
		Appraisers (N=24)	1	3	70	7	6	2.42		
j	Criteria enable to identify principals' training needs	Appraisees (N=92)	9	4	30	29	20	2.48	2.44	4.21
		Appraisers (N=24)	-	2	9	7	6	2.29		
k	Criteria focus on school plan and objectives	Appraisees (N=92)	-	9	41	31	11	2.52	2.52	4.89
		Appraisers (N=24)	-	2	16	5	3	2.54		
Total		Appraisees (N=92)						2.53	2.52	
		Appraisers (N=24)						2.49		

It was also the intention of this study to examine the appropriateness of the appraisal criteria of ROAPP. To this end, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which the basic features of the criteria are integrated in the appraisal criteria in use to appraise principals' performance in the

zone under consideration using a 5 point likert type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). For the purpose of analysis again, the mean score values were interpreted as very minimum 0.05-1.49, minimum 1.5-2.49, moderate 2.5- 3.49, high 3.5-4.49, and very high for 4.5 and above.

Table 10, shows the frequency, mean scores and chi-square results for the appropriateness of the appraisal criteria as rated by appraisees and appraisers. As can be seen from the table, the weighted mean scores of six out of eleven basic features of the appraisal criteria are below the average range (2.5-3.49), while the rest are above the average with much inclination towards the lower values of the average range.

The average means score of appraisees and appraisers 2.53 and 2.49 respectively reveals same situations. That is the rating to the basic features of the appraisal criteria by respondents concentrated slightly below and above the average. It also implies a relatively better rating by appraisees than appraisers to the basic features of the appraisal criteria. This might happened as a result that they were appraisees who had been responsible to develop the appraisal criteria in most of the woredas taken as a sample. In case, they might consider the appraisal criteria developed by them to be good enough to measure their own performance, since they have done to the extent possible and appropriate to them.

The overall weighted mean score which is 2.52 also confirms the level of the appraisal criteria in incorporating the indicated basic features to be a little above the minimal, but very far from maximum intention.

A look to the rating frequency of respondents to each basic feature of the appraisal criteria by omitting the middle category (moderate) clearly reveals the inclination of the rating by both groups of respondents towards below the average scales. This again might imply, the extent to which the basic features are included in the appraisal criteria under use to be minimal.

The interview made with zonal education expert with regard to performance criteria also indicated the existence of conceptual and technical problems to develop appropriate performance criteria; difficulty to identify tasks related to the duties and responsibilities of school principals followed by establishing clear and measurable standard. According to him, the content and quality of the performance criteria developed varies from woreda to woreda, and even between schools of same woreda depending on experience and ability of principals and the supervisor who

would develop the appraisal criteria. Hence, the overall quality of the appraisal criteria varies across the schools which could create problem to take decisions common to all based on the appraisal result.

Moreover, he indicated that easily observable and measurable tasks such as monthly report to WECBO, number meetings held at school and the like have been emphasized leaving other important aspects works of principals in developing the appraisal criteria. As a result, key tasks which contribute to the effectiveness of school instruction might leave out.

Likewise, discussion with some of school principals and WECBO officials indicated developing the appraisal criteria for ROAPP to be a difficult and a tedious work consuming much resource. Lack of adequate knowledge by appraisees and appraisers to identify important tasks and establish measuring standards for each task, and the inherent limitation of the system by itself in measuring some dimension of tasks; tasks which can not be easily quantified were cited as the factors behind the defects of the appraisal criteria. This is in line with the literature, that claims the result-oriented appraisal system to have weakness in measuring some dimension of individual performance; ignorance of non-quantifiable but important jobs (Stress and Black, 1994:214-215).

Thus, from foregoing data and interview made with education officials and expert it can be said that the criteria employed to appraise principals' performance in primary schools of Guji zone did not incorporate the basic characteristics expected of appropriate appraisal criteria to the extent necessary to the achievement of the appraisal purposes.

In order to identify whether there exists difference in rating pattern to basic features of the appraisal criteria by two groups of respondents, chi-square test were employed for each basic features of the appraisal criteria. The result of chi-square tests for all basic features, as indicated in the Table 10 are less than 9.49 which is the table value of chi-square at four degrees of freedom and 0.05 level of significance. Hence, it is concluded that there is no significant difference in rating pattern of appraisees and appraisers to basic features of the appraisal criteria. There exists opinion agreement on the extent to which the basic features of the appraisal criteria are incorporated in the appraisal criteria

Table 11: Satisfaction with the Appraisal Criteria

Respondents	Frequency	Degrees of agreement					mean	Weighted mean	χ^2
		5	4	3	2	1			
Appraisees (N=92)	Observed	-	10	39	30	13	2.50	2.48	3.25
	Excepted		12	34	33	13			
Appraisers (N=24)	Observed	-	5	6	8	5	2.45		
	Excepted		3	9	8	4			

Appraisers and appraisees level of satisfaction with the appraisal criteria under use, as revealed by the weighted mean score; 2.48 in Table 11, is below the average indicating their dissatisfaction to the appraisal criteria under use. The mean score 2.50, 2.45 for appraisees and appraisers respectively shows the discontent to the appraisal criteria under use by both groups of respondents with the latter being more dissatisfied than the former one.

This might imply what the participants would have expected the criteria to be and the actual feature of the existing criteria have been in compatible to a considerable degree. It would be, therefore, possible to note that principals has been appraised with criteria which both appraisees and appraisers perceived to be considerably inadequate and dissatisfactory to measure principals' performance.

Principals who felt dissatisfied with the appraisal criteria, however, even if rated high, would not improve performance, but would give up, or would not bother about ratings (Healy, 1994:31). Weakness to incorporate the basic features of the appraisal criteria as indicated in the analysis made under Table 10 might be the source for the dissatisfaction of appraisees and appraisers to the appraisal criteria.

The chi-square test result at four degree of freedom and 0.05 level of significance is 9.49, that is greater than calculated value which is, 3.25, indicating absence of significant difference between the two groups of respondents regarding their level of satisfaction to appraisal criteria of ROAPP. That is, both groups of respondents are more dissatisfied with the criteria employed to appraise principals' performance.

Table 12: Competence of Appraisers

No.	Items	Respondents				χ^2
		Appraisees (N=92)		Appraisers (N=24)		
		No.	%	No.	%	
1	Do you have trust and confidence to the competence of designated appraiser?					
	a. Yes	11	12	6	25	2.43
	b. No	74	80.4	13	54.2	
	c. Not sure	7	7.6	5	20.8	
	Total	92	100	24	100	

Table 12, depicts that appraisees and appraisers who accounted for 80.4% and 54.2% respectively, felt that the individuals who were involved in the appraisal of the performance of primary school principals in zone under study lack necessary competence to appraise. On the other hand, about 12% of appraisees admitted that the designated appraisers to have competence in appraising principals’ performance, similarly 25% of appraisers positively acknowledge their competence. The rest 7.6% and 20.8% of the appraisees and appraisers respectively reacted neither positively nor negatively to competence of the designated appraiser.

It would be, therefore, possible to deduce that the majority of the appraisees and even the appraisers themselves had no trust and confidence to the competence of the designated appraisers. This is however, inconsistent with the fact that, performance appraisal of principals successfully achieved when the appraisees have confidence and trust on their designated appraiser (Hellawell, 1992:38).

The discussion made with the zonal education expert and woredas education and capacity building office heads also indicated the incompetence of the designated appraisers to carry out the responsibilities of appraising principals’ performance as needed.

Whether there exists a difference or not in view to the competence of designated appraisers between appraisees and appraisers, chi-square test was employed. The chi-square test shows that for 2 degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance, the critical value (χ^2_{crit}), which is 5.99 is grater than the calculated value($\chi^2_{obt.} = 2.43$). This implies that, there is no perceptual difference among the appraisees and appraisers regarding the competence of designated appraiser of

principals. That is, the larger proportions of both groups of respondents perceive the appraiser as incompetent to appraise primary school principals efficiently.

Table 13: Reasons for the Incompetence of Appraisers

No	Reasons	Appraisees (N=92)			Appraisers (N= 24)			D= r ₁ -r ₂	D ²
		f	%	r ₁	f	%	r ₂		
a	They are found far away from the school	92	100	1	19	79	2	-1	1
b	They are overburdened by many subordinates	90	97.8	2	23	95.8	1	1	1
c	They lack necessary skill and knowledge	74	80.4	3	18	75.0	4	-1	1
d	They are overloaded by other office works	38	73.9	4	19	79	3	1	1
e	They do not recognize the value of appraisal	57	61.9	5	18	75	4	1	1
f	They lack willingness to appraise	41	44.6	6	7	29.1	6	0	0
g	They tend to maintain bias and favouritism	11	11.9	7	2	8.3	7	0	0
								$\Sigma D^2 = 5$	

Respondents were also requested to indicate the reasons for the incompetence of the designated appraisers of principals’ performance. As is indicated in Table 13, location of supervisors’ work place at a distance far from school and overstraining of supervisors by many subordinates are the leading reasons for the incompetence of supervisors as ranked by both groups of respondents. The third, fourth and fifth reasons cited by appraisees respectively were lack of skill and knowledge (80.4%), emphasis to office works rather than the work of appraisal (73.9%) and failure to appreciate the value of appraisal (61.9%).

Appraisers on the other side rated overloading of appraisers by office work (79%) as the third, lack of necessary skill and knowledge, and failure to appreciate the value of appraisal equally on the fourth (75%) as reasons behind the incompetence of the designated appraisers. Lack of willingness to appraise and the practice of bias and favoritism were the least reasons reported by both groups of respondents.

Moreover, in responding to the interview a considerable number of woreda education officials have emphasized overload of supervisors by other office works in addition to the work of appraisal and their seat being at the main city of the woreda which is far from most of the schools to be the main reasons behind the incompetence of appraisers. The officials also touched the problem related to experience and knowledge of the appraisers as one factor behind the incompetence. Most appraisers lack necessary knowledge and skill as they were assigned newly without having adequate experience and qualification to the post and hence challenged, especially in task of developing appropriate appraisal criteria for principals.

The existing data also confirms the same situation; the ratio of supervisors to the number of schools (principals) according to the data obtained from ZECBO was 1:14 indicating, wide discrepancies between the number of supervisors to principals. Moreover, the supervisors make their seat on WECBO which is far from schools to supervise. Hence prioritizing supervisors' location and over burdening by many subordinate are the actual reasons behind incompetence of appraiser. These agree with the literature that pointed out the geographical dispersion and large in size of subordinates that are appraised by one supervisor to be a hindrance for effective appraisal process (Hellawell, 1992:40).

Whether there exists perceptual relationship or not between appraisees and appraisers in perceiving the reasons behind the incompetence of appraisers the spearman rank order correlation coefficient was computed.

The test result of the spearman rank order correlation coefficient showed that for N of 5 at the 0.05 level of significance the critical value (ρ_{crit}) = 0.714; and the calculated value (ρ_{obt}) = 0.911. Hence, there exists relationship between appraisees and appraisers in perceiving factors that contribute to the incompetence of the designated appraisers. That is, appraisees and appraisers have similar views in prioritizing the appeared reasons for the incompetence of the designated appraisers.

Table 14: Appraisers chosen to Appraise Principals' Performance

No	Appraisers	Appraisees (N=92)			Appraisers (N= 24)			D= r ₁ -r ₂	D ²
		f	%	r	f	%	r		
a	Supervisors	87	94.5	1	16	66.7	4	-3	9
b	Parent-Teacher Association (PTA)	71	77.1	2	19	79.2	2	0	0
c	Teachers/Department Heads	65	70.6	3	22	91.7	1	2	4
d	Multiple Appraisers	51	55.4	4	18	75.0	3	1	1
e	Students	33	35.8	5	14	58.4	6	-1	1
f	Peer Appraisal	19	20.6	6	12	50.0	7	-1	1
g	Kebele Education and Training Board (KETB)	17	18.4	7	15	62.5	5	2	4
h	Self Appraisal	17	18.4	8	4	16.7	8	0	0
								$\Sigma D^2 = 20$	

Appraisees and appraisers were asked to indicate their preferences that they think are the right person/group to appraise the performance of primary school principals. They were also given a chance to write additional choice that has been left to be added if they felt the list is incomplete. As shown in Table 14, the higher proportion of appraisees chose supervisors (94.5%) as the pertinent appraisers of principals' performance followed by parent-teacher association (71.1%), teachers/department heads (70.6%), and multiple appraisers (55.4%) up to the fourth rank respectively. While, the rest options; students, peer appraisal, school education and training board and self appraisal were chosen by below 50% of the appraisees rated to have the rank from five to eight with the percentages; 35.8%, 20.6%, 18.4% and 18.4% respectively.

On the appraisers' side, teacher/department heads was a choice of about 91.7% of appraisers followed by parent- teacher association, supervisors, multiple appraisers, school education and training board, students and peer appraisal with the percentage 79.2%, 66.7%, 62.5%, 58.4% and 50.0% respectively. The self appraisal option was the only option chosen by less than 50 % of appraisers (16.7%).

Significant number of respondents, particularly the appraisees have commented, supervisors in joint with parent teacher association to be preferable appraisers of school principals on the blank space provided to list other possible appraiser(s) than provided as options on the question.

It is clearly indicated in Table 14 that appraisees prefer supervisors as appropriate appraisers of their performance, while appraisers preferred department heads to be the most with supervisors ranked on the fourth. This implies that the currently designated appraisers (supervisors) lack interest to carry out the responsibility, though they were preference of most appraisees. The reasons behind this can be a discomfort that lifts up from overloading, and the distance from the school rather than the question of willingness, because they already indicated that the problem of over burdening and the distance from the schools to be serious than the problem of willingness in analysis made under table 13.

Appraisees' choice of supervisors, PTA, and the department heads as their first, second, and third appropriate appraisers of their performance indicates the desire they have to be appraised by the relatively professional and skilled personnel as argued by Hellawell (1992: 42).

Relatively large difference is observed between appraisees and appraisers in rating 'Kebele Education and Training Board' as an appropriate appraiser of the performance of principals. It was more favored by appraisers than appraisees. This might be attached to the fact that principals have no trust to the knowledge and skills of such appraisers as was indicated in the literature, while supervisors might look only to educational structure that kebele education and training board is the responsible body to schools next to WECBO (MOE, 1991:12).

Whether these differences in opinion are significant or not spearman rank order correlation coefficient was again employed. The computation for spearman rank order correlation coefficient (ρ) has yielded ρ_{obt} to be 0.238; while the critical value (ρ_{crit}) at $N = 8$ and $\alpha = 0.05$ is 0.738. Hence, there exists statistically significant difference between appraisees and appraisers in their suggestion who should appraise primary school principals' performance. There is opinion difference between appraisees and appraisers on whom they think are the right person or group to appraise the performance of primary school principals.

Table 15: Training Given Related to ROAPP

Items	Respondents			
	Appraisees		Appraisers	
	No	%	No	%
A. Have you participated in short term training related to ROAPP?				
a) Yes	63	68.48	18	75.00
b) No	29	31.52	6	25.00
Total	92	100	24	100.00
B. Was the training sufficient to know about ROAPP?				
a) Yes	1	1.58	-	
b) No	56	88.89	14	77.78
c) not sure	6	9.53	4	22.22
Total	63	100.00	18	100.00

Item A of Table 15, shows that the majority of appraisees (68.48%) and appraisers (75.00%) had training related to ROAPP. It was only about 31.52% of appraisees and 25% appraisers who reported that they had no training concerning the concept of ROAPP. Hence, it seems that as there had been a better ground to implement the system because most of the major participants; appraisees, and appraisers responded as they had training related to the system.

However, the quality as well as the frequency of the training given to those participants should be considered before underling the above assumption. That is, to what extent the training was sufficient enough for participants to acquire adequate knowledge and skill related to the system.

Item B of Table 15 reveals this situation, i.e. the adequacy of short-term training given to respondents.

The data disclose that it was only about 1.58% of appraisees and no appraisers found the training they had to be adequate. The rest, 88.89% of appraisees and 77.78% of appraisers suggested the training to be insufficient, while 9.53% appraisees and 22-22% of appraisers were not sure to rate.

It would be therefore, detectable that the participants; appraisees and appraisers have no necessary training related to ROAPP, and hence lack conceptual and technical skills to implement the system properly. Designing appraisal system by participating appraisees and

appraisers is not sufficient unless the training for both appraisees and appraisers follow for thorough understanding of the process (Stress and Black, 1994:205).

Table 16: Effectiveness of ROAPP

Variables	Respondents				Total	χ^2
	Appraisees (92)		Appraisers (24)			
	No	%	No	%		
Very high	0	-	0	-	0	4.25
High	9 (7)	9.8	0 (2)	-	9	
Medium	34 (34)	36.9	9 (9)	37.5	43	
Low	39 (39)	42.4	10 (10)	41.7	49	
Very low	10 (12)	10.9	5 (3)	20.8	15	
Total	92	100%	24	100%	116	

Numbers in brackets represent the expected frequencies.

Table 16 shows the rating in frequency and percentage of appraisees and appraisers perception to level of effectiveness of ROAPP. As one can easily see from the table, 53.3% of appraisees and 62.5% of appraisers rated the effectiveness of the system below average as low and very low; with the latter being more dissatisfied than the former. Only 9.8% of appraisees agreed the level of effectiveness of the system to be above the average. The proportion of respondents who rated the effectiveness of the system above the average was negligible. About 36.9% of appraisees and 37.5% of appraisers rated the effectiveness of the system within the average scales.

This would indicate that the ROAPP system operating in primary schools in the zone under consideration was perceived by participants to be deficient in attaining the purposes for which it was intended to serve. It might have been considered as having little contribution to the improvement of teaching learning process and professional competence of principals.

The interview made with a zonal education expert support the rating by the respondents. The interviewee underlined the ineffectiveness of the system of ROPA in general which is also true for principals. He further reasoned out the ineffectiveness of the system by the fact that no

actions, either demotion or promotion followed the appraisal result. In case, the system would have been made to happen for formality, if no actions either positive or negative to follow it.

The performance related pay according to the zonal education expert was made to happen deliberately by the government/MOE on the pretext that they had no belief or trust with worthiness of appraisal process and its result.

Thus, it was evident to say the system of appraising principals' performance which has been operating in primary school of Guji zone is not effective as desired in attaining the purpose for which it was intended to serve.

The chi square test also reveals that for four degree of freedom at 0.05 level of significance, the critical value of ($\chi^2_{crit} = 9.49$) is greater than the calculated value ($\chi^2_{obt.} = 4.25$). Thus, it would be concluded that there is no statistically significant difference between appraisees and appraisers in perceiving the level of effectiveness of ROAPP operating in primary schools of Guji zone.

Table 17: Problems of Implementation of ROAPP

Problem		Respondents											Weighted mean score	
		Appraisees (N=92)						Appraisers (N=24)						
		5	4	3	2	1	mean	5	4	3	2	1		mean
a	Lack of necessary knowledge, skill and experience of appraisers	16	27	26	13	10	3.28	4	6	7	4	3	3.16	3.26
b	Difficulty of developing appropriate performance criteria	24	32	12	17	7	3.53	9	4	7	2	2	3.67	3.56
c	Poor administration of the overall appraisal process	25	32	22	12	-	3.72	7	8	6	1	2	3.71	3.72
d	Lack of necessary knowledge and information about the system by appraisees	16	27	30	12	7	3.35	6	5	7	6	-	3.45	3.37
e	Less contact and communication between appraisees and appraisers	30	24	24	4	-	3.97	10	7	5	1	1	4.00	3.98
f	Unrealistic purposes of the appraisal system	8	22	30	14	18	2.86	2	4	7	5	4	2.54	2.79
g	Negative attitude of appraisees towards the system	7	14	21	30	20	2.54	4	7	6	5	2	3.25	2.68
Average mean value		3.30						3.29					3.30	

The major assumed problems in implementing ROAPP as listed in Table 17, can be grouped as, problems related to the appraiser (items a and h), problems related to appraisees (items d and g), and problems related to the design and operation of the system (items b, c, e and f).

The major problems of implementing ROAPP were listed to be rated using the five point likert type scale of extremely serious (5), very serious (4), somewhat serious (3), observed but not serious (2), and not observed (1). Respondents were also asked for additional choices that have been left to be added if they felt the list is incomplete. For the purpose of analysis, the responses were rated as 4.5 and above (extremely series), 3.5-4.49 (very series), 2.5- 3.49 (somewhat serious), 1.5-2.49 (observed but not serious), and 0.05-1.49 not observed.

From the weighted mean score, three items (b, c, e), both related to the design and administration of a system were rated as very serious problems, the rest items (a, d, f, g and h) were rated to be somewhat serious.

Among those three which were rated as very serious difficulties, less contact and communication between appraisees and appraisers was the most with weighted mean score of 3.97. As far as the contact between principals and supervisors is concerned the interview made with woreda officials and the data showing the ratio of the number of supervisors to principals in each woreda under the sample supports the respondents rating.

One supervisor is responsible to appraise an average of 10-15 principals who are geographically distributed far away from each other by making his center of work at a woreda education office located at the main city of the woreda. Such a condition is not in line with the principles of ROPA that recommends the day to day contact between appraisees and appraiser for effective implementation of the system. For ROPA system to be successful in terms of agreed performance criteria there has to be adequate follow up and feed back system, and these aspects of appraisal usually require much more contact between appraisees and appraisers (FCSC, 1997 E.C: 39).

Poor administration of the process of ROAPP was also found to be a very serious barrier to implement ROAPP with weighted mean score of 3.71 as rated by the respondents. It could be recalled from the previous discussion under the process of ROAP that the logical steps through which the process of ROAPP should pass through has not been followed and administered to the extent required by the system to come up with achievement of the intended purposes. In this

regard the appraisal would have been simply made to happen in unplanned and uncoordinated manner without following and doing logical activities that realize it. This implies that, the way the process of ROAPP needs to be implemented and its actual practice in schools differ significantly. It would therefore, be evident that principals were not aware of their strength and weakness and got necessary support in due of the process and, ultimately forced to accept rating supported by no evidence which they might not value it even if rated high. In addition appraiser would become subjective in rating same to that of the traditional approach of appraisal technique. Consequently, principals would not strive to improve performance; they would rather give up since they had dissatisfaction with the appraisal process.

The third problem cited by appraisees and appraisers by weighted mean score of 3.56 was difficulty of developing appropriate performance criteria. Here, it was also seen under the foregoing discussion that the way the appraisal criteria for ROAPP developed is not participatory ,rather it has been done only by principals in most of the schools. Moreover it was cited that developing the appraisal criteria is a difficult task that requires resources, conceptual and technical capacity of participants which is not in place adequately.

Lack of necessary knowledge about the system by appraisers and appraisees respectively are problems rated next to criteria related problems by both groups of respondents. The negative response of respondents to the adequacy of training under the previous discussion supports these problems of implementing the system of ROAPP.

Negative attitude of the appraisers to the system, unrealistic purpose of ROAPP, and negative attitude of appraisees towards the system were the least three implementation problems of ROAPP rated as intermediate problems with weighted mean scores of 2.91, 2.79, and 2.68 respectively from the given options.

In general, one can deduce from the rating of respondents that, most of the problems indicated as very serious and serious are problems related to the design and operation of the system followed by knowledge, technical and conceptual skills of appraisees and appraisers.

These are in agreement with the problem of implementing ROPA explained in various literatures: ROPA fails in many organizations perhaps because of misapplications raised from inadequate preparation in terms of resources, design and operation of the system (Henry, 1982:125).

Significant number of appraisees and appraisers suggested the detachment of appraisal result with actions of promotion or demotion as a big problem on the space provided to write problems other than listed in questionnaire. Interview made with the woreda education officials confirms as there were no measures taken related to appraisal result mainly with regard to career structures. The reason behind this according to the officials was short, that is; no development has been registered parallel to the appraisal result. This, however, contradicts the announcement by regional education bureau that dictates a change or improvement registered in educational sectors, mainly in primary schools to which one of the contributors could be school principals.

However failure to link the appraisal result with actions mainly to promotion might have negative consequences to the appraisal system. Unless appraisal results are valued, employees lack interest and become insensitive to appraisal process (Artley, 2001:18), and hence, creation of problem of implementation of the system would be predictable.

Table 18: Proposed interventions for the problems of ROAPP

No	Items	Response in Percentage and frequency						D=r ₁ -r ₂	D ²
		Appraisees (N=92)			Appraisers (N= 24)				
		f	%	r ₁	f	%	r ₂		
a	Making supervisors work place at school	92	100.00	1	20	83.34	4	-3	9
b	Increasing number of appraisers	92	100.00	1	24	100.00	1	0	0
c	Training appraisers	92	100.00	1	23	95.84	2	-1	1
d	Training of appraisees	90	97.78	4	23	95.84	2	2	4
e	Linking appraisal result with action	87	94.56	5	20	83.34	4	1	1
f	Change of appraiser	41	44.56	6	12	50.00	6	0	0
g	Changing the appraisal system by other	27	29.34	7	7	29.17	7	0	0
								$\Sigma D^2 = 15$	

It is clearly revealed that all the options appeared in Table 18; with the exception of the change of appraiser and the system, have secured support from more than half of appraisees and appraisers. Making supervisors workplace at schools, increasing the number of appraisers, and training appraisers were equally rated by appraisees as the first priority (100%). While training of

appraisees, linking appraisal result with action, change of appraisers, and change of the appraisal system were rated as 97.78%, 94.56%, 44.56% and 29.34% respectively by the appraisees.

The appraisers on their part, ranked the solution to the problem of implementing ROAPP as; increasing number for appraisers (100%), training of appraisees and appraisers (95.84), making supervisors place of work at school and linking appraisal result to actions equally (83.84), change of appraisers (50%), and change of the appraisal system by itself (29.17%) as the least interventions from the given options. Appraisers favored the change in their workplace less than the appraisees did. This might have happened due to fear or dislike of appraisers to go to rural.

The interview response confirmed the first four items indicated in the table to be interventions made to reduce the problem of implementing ROAPP. Whether the ranking as to what must be done to reduce the problem differs significantly or not, the Spearman rank order correlation was employed.

The computation for Spearman rank order correlation has yielded ρ_{obt} to be 0.732; while the critical value (ρ_{crit}) at $N=7$ and $\alpha = .05$ is 0.786. Hence, there exist significant differences between appraisees and appraisers in ranking interventions need to be made to improve the problems of implementing ROAPP.

CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final section of the thesis deals with the summary of the major findings of the study, conclusions reached at and the recommendations forwarded.

4.1 Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the practices of ROAPP in primary schools of Guji zone and determining its effectiveness. To this end, basic questions addressing the issues related to ROAPP, such as purposes, process and criteria of ROAPP, competence of designated appraiser, problems of implementation of ROAPP were raised.

Descriptive survey method was employed as appropriate methodology. And the study was conducted on seven woredas of the zone selected on the basis of purposive sampling technique. Simple random sampling technique was employed to select schools from each of sampled woredas. All available supervisors, WECBO heads of each sampled woreda and the concerned zonal education expert were included. Hence, school principals, supervisors, WECBO head and a zonal expert were the subject of this study. Further relevant national and regional documents were used as cornerstone of references of information for the study.

The required information was gathered through questionnaire from principals and supervisors which were field tested in woredas of the zone not included in the sample to avoid irrelevant terms and ambiguity before distribution. Moreover, interviews were held with WECBO officials and zonal education expert.

The collected data through questionnaire were presented in tables, and analyzed using statistical tools such as chi-square, spearman rank order correlation coefficient, standard deviation, mean, and percentage. The qualitative data were used to supplement and explain quantitative data wherever necessary by summarizing the opinion of respondents. These were followed by relevant discussion to reach at certain findings.

In brief, the following findings have been documented in response to the five basic research questions formulated under the statement of the problem.

A. Purposes of ROAPP

As revealed by results of the descriptive statistics and the chi-square test, appraisees and appraisers had better perception concerning the intended purposes of ROAPP. The formative (developmental) purposes of ROAPP have been perceived as the primary function of the system than the summative (administrative) purposes by both groups of respondents. The average weighted means score values; 4.23 for formative, and 3.59 for the summative purposes verify the situation.

In identifying the purposes that the current system of ROAPP is serving in primary schools in the zone under study, both the study groups approved the summative purposes being better achieved than the formative purposes in contrary to what they have expected the primary purpose of the system to be. The average weighted mean scores 2.84 and 2.34 for summative and formative purposes respectively confirm the priority of the summative purpose over the formative one. The rating of appraisees and appraisers to the overall achievements of the purposes of ROAPP was found to be a little above average, with a weighted mean score 2.54.

B. The Process of ROAPP

The practices of accomplishing necessary activities of the process of ROAPP as per the system inquires were considered to be inadequate, and hence rated below the average with the overall weighted mean score 2.35. Limitations in developing appropriate appraisal criteria by mutual involvement of appraisees and appraisers, little or no monitoring and feedback to principals on work based on planned objectives, weakness to examine results by comparing actual performance with the planned one, and failure to attach the rating to values are among major defects evidenced by participants.

C. The Appraisal Criteria

It was revealed that, the way performance appraisal criteria for principals developed in zone under study varies; of which principals themselves prepare their own appraisal criteria and present it to supervisors for approval has been a common practice. Appraisees and appraisers rated the appropriateness of this non-uniformly developed appraisal criteria to measure the performance of principals' slightly above the average with weighted mean score of 2.52. That is,

the extent to which the basic features of appraisal criteria are integrated in the appraisal criteria is not satisfactory. Technical and conceptual difficulties to develop appropriate appraisal criteria by appraisees and appraisers, and the inherent limitation of the system by itself to measure some aspects of tasks; which can not be easily quantified were cited as major factors behind the defects of the appraisal criteria of ROAPP.

D. Appraisers of principals

It was found out that a great majority of appraisees (80.4%), including the appraisers (54.2%) themselves asserted that, they have no trust and confidence to the competence of the designated appraiser of primary school principals. Location of appraisers' work place being at WECBO which is far from most of the schools, overload of appraisers by many subordinates and other office works, and lack of necessary knowledge and experience on the part of appraisers are the major leading reasons reported by respondents for the incompetence.

It was however, indicated that a majority of appraisees and appraisers chose supervisors, teachers/department heads, parent-teacher association (PTA) and multiple appraisers to be a pertinent appraiser of their performance. Moreover, significant number of appraisees and appraisers plus most of the woreda education officials recommended supervisors jointly with PTA to be appropriate appraisers of principals' performance.

Most of appraisees and appraisers confirmed that, as they had exposure to short-term training related to ROAPP. However, no one from both groups responded training they had to be adequate enough to know about ROAPP. Besides, about 62.5% of appraisers and 49% of appraisees reported as they had no necessary certificate to their post.

E Problems and Interventions

Among eight assumed problems of implementing ROAPP, 37.5% were identified as very serious difficulties with weighted mean scores ranging from 3.56-3.98. These were: less contact and communication between appraisees and appraisers, difficulty related to performance criteria, poor administration of the appraisal process. Serious difficulties were lack of necessary knowledge, experience and information of participants about the system, unrealistic purpose of the system, and negative attitude of appraisees and appraisers towards the system which add up together 62.5 %.

To make supervisors place of work at school, increasing number of supervisors, linking appraisal result with the actions, provision of training to appraisees and appraisers were recommendations in their rank order forwarded by respondents

The study disclosed that the majority of appraisees (53.3%) and appraisers (62.5%) perceived the effectiveness of ROAPP currently operating in primary schools of the zone under consideration below the average.

4.2 Conclusions

In light of the above findings the following conclusions are drawn regarding ROAPP in primary schools of Guji zone.

1. The system of ROAPP was poorly employed for the purposes it was intended to serve, though the perception of appraisees and appraisers had to what should be the purposes of the appraisal seems good and in agreement. Hence, lack of clarity on the purposes ROAPP ought to serve by appraisees and appraisers could not be the major factor for the system not achieving its intended purposes effectively as expected. It was also indicated by the result of the study that, the summative purposes of the ROAPP exhibited relatively better achievement than the summative one in contrary to what appraisees and appraisers expected the primary purposes of the system to be. This might happened as a result that, summative purposes demand continuous follow up and support of principals on work less than the formative purposes in the appraisal process.
2. The logical steps through which the process of ROAAPP should pass through had not been followed and administered to the extent and the way required by the system to come up with achievement of the intended purposes. It would rather, simply made to happen in unplanned and uncoordinated manner without following and doing logical activities that could realize the purposes. In short, the way the process of ROAPP ought to be implemented and its actual practice differ significantly.
3. It is the incompetence of the designated appraisers to carry out their responsibilities properly as needed by the system that result in poor administration of the ROAPP process, which in turn make the system ineffective to achieve the purposes for which it was designed. Hence, it can be said, that necessary preparations in terms of the adequacy of supervisors both in number and qualification to carry out the appraisal effectively, where to be the place of work of the appraiser, and how many principals has to be

appraised by a single appraiser, and the like were not intensively searched out before operation of the system. However, it was the preference of many principals to be appraised by supervisors, if problems for their incompetence have to be improved or eliminated.

4. The extent to which the basic features of the appraisal criteria integrated in the appraisal criteria employed to appraise the performance of primary school principals in the zone under study were found to be inadequate. Hence, its contribution to the success of the overall purposes of the system would be insignificant. Besides, any decisions made depending on the on the information obtained through the use of such defective appraisal criteria would be unfair, and consequently make participants, mainly the principals develop negative attitude towards the system as a whole.
5. Most of appraisees and appraisers reported as they had no adequate short term training and a certificate to their post hence they would have been susceptible to commit appraisal errors of any kind since they would not have necessary background about the system to administer ROAPP process effectively. The ultimate consequence would, therefore, be failure of system to achieve its purposes effectively.
6. The major problems of implementing the appraisal system of ROAPP such as problems related to appraisal process, appraisal criteria, problems related to designated appraisers and lack of technical and conceptual skills by participants all directly and indirectly imply existence of weakness in the design of the system before its operation. Stated differently, necessary preconditions such as; who could be an appropriate appraiser, what to appraise, training needed, and the like were not deeply dealt with.

Generally, much attention was not paid to ROAPP system by education officials and all other concerned individuals before and after its implementation. The appraisal has been made to happen simply for formality to fulfill the requirements that, every principal has to be evaluated per semester. The system has been considered as having little contribution to the improvement of the teaching learning process, as well as for professional competence of principals. As a result, it fails to get full acceptance and commitment from appraisees and appraisers. It would, therefore, be concluded that, it is unwise to expect positive outcome from the system, and relative failure would be inevitable unless meaningful amendments are to be made.

4.3 Recommendations

In order to improve the current deficient practices of ROAPP and achieve the intended objectives; the following measures should be taken in primary schools of Guji zone

1. The appraisal system is believed to be effective when there exists consensus regarding the purpose of appraisal scheme, and when the perceived purposes coincide with the actual practices. However, the current appraisal system of principals (ROAPP) was found almost not serving the said purposes, though the perception of principals and supervisors had to what should be the purposes of ROAPP seems fair and in agreement. Poor administration of the appraisal process is among the major factors that make the system not to achieve its intended purposes.

Hence, it would be better for authorities at woreda level in collaboration with zonal and regional levels to work toward the achievements of these purposes, by creating environment that enable the process administered successfully. To these the following are recommended to be under taken:

- to assign supervisors on schools possibly at clusters (groups of schools; usually 3-5 that are geographically close and accessible to each other), where they can better contact with reasonable number of principals to carryout the appraisal process as required
- to increases numbers of supervisors so as to reduce overload by many subordinates or principals
- to make supervisors free from other office works
- to provide educational supervision courses for supervisors, possibly before assigning them as appraisers, if not facilitating on job trainings in addition to short term training and workshops given in between.

In parallel to this appraisal results need to valued; performance related pays should be given to principals according to their performance results as per the directive entails. It would be better to let the continuation of the terminated career structure based on the appraisal result of ROAPP.

2. The appraisal criteria for ROAPP have to be 'SMART' as much as possible and should be developed by mutual participation of appraisees and appraisers. However, the current practice of developing criteria in the zone under study has deviation from this. The way it developed

is not participatory. Moreover it is found to be inadequate to measure principals' performance fairly and objectively. And hence lack full acceptance from appraisees and appraisers. Thus, practical measures should be taken to make the appraisal criteria appropriate and acceptable among the participants.

- One way of doing this is to make the trend of developing the performance criteria uniform through out the zone as per the system of ROAPP inquire i.e. mutual participation of appraisees and appraisers. To this, Orientation should be provided to WECBO officials and other concerned bodies facilitated by ZECBO to create uniformity.
 - Secondly, a thorough training is recommended to principals and supervisors on how to develop performance criteria i.e., from where and how tasks need to be performed by principals can be derived, and how measures or standards of performance set for each task.
3. Factors for incompetence of designated appraisers such as, overload by many subordinates and office works distance from schools, and inadequate knowledge and skill problems have to be reduced, if not eliminated at all, for supervisors to continue as appraiser of principals' performance. If not, other appropriate appraisers which were preferred by principals next to supervisors, and claimed to have close contact with the day to day activities of principals and know well the complexities of the job, such as PTA in joint with supervisors ,only PTA and multiple appraisers are to be assigned in place as the second, third and fourth options.
 4. Generally, ROAPP has been made to happen simply for the sake of formality in which its process was not emphasized, and the result of the appraisal has not been valued. It is not surprising then for appraisees and appraisers to rate the effectiveness of the system almost below the average. Therefore the researcher strongly recommends that systematic assessment and adjustment need to be made on the design of system under use. Moreover, efforts has to made in under taking a serious of orientation and workshops for participants. Other wise better to look for other methods of performance appraisal which are in line with the existing situation; suitable and economical compared to ROAPP.

Finally, the writer recommends a more comprehensive study in the same area so as to strengthen the findings of this study and come-up with new and better findings. Because the main task in this small survey is not to conclude rather it is a mere attempt to explore.

REFERENCES

- Allen, G. (1998), *Supervision*. Retrieved (January 17, 2007):<http://www.bmpcoe.org/bestpractices/external/mash/mash18.html>
- Altman, S. (1997). Performance Monitoring Systems for Public Managers. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 39, No.1
- Artley, W. (2001). *Performance Appraisal Handbook: A Guide for Managers/ Supervisors and employees*. California: U.S. Department of the Interior.
- Attwood, M and Stuart D. (1996). *Personnel Management*. Houndmills: Macmillan Publisher.
- Ayalew Shibeshi (2000). Approaches to Educational Organization Management. AAU (Unpublished)
- Berhanu Moyata (2006). A Study on Implementation of the Current Result- Oriented Performance Appraisal in High School of Guji zone of Oromia Regional State from View of Appraisees and Appraisers. AAU (Unpublished MA Thesis)
- Bratton and Gold (1994). *Human Resource Management: Theory and Practices*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Caron, M.L. (2007). *Managing Partner*. Retrieved (March 01, 2007):<http://www.managepartner.hrm/org.html>
- Champion, V. (1992). "Cambria's Experience: 'Not out of the Woods'; Dilemmas in the Statutory Appraisal of Head Teachers". *Staff Appraisal and Staff Management in Schools and Colleges: A Guide to Implementation*. Essex: Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Chandan, J. S. (1999). *Management Concepts and Strategies*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing Company.
- Chaube, S. P. and Chaube, A. (1996). *School Organization*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, Pvt. Ltd.
- Clayton Jones, L. et al (1993). New Ways to Assess the Performance of School Principals. *Peabody Journal of Education*, Vol. 68, No.2
- Dattner, B. (2002). Performance Appraisal. (Retrieved March, 2007):<http://www.dattnerconsulting.com/presentation/perforamnceappraisal.pdf>

- Dessler, G. (1991). *Personnel /Human Resource Management*. New York: Prentice- Hall, Inc.
- FCSC (1996 E.C.). Result-Oriented Performance Plan of Employees. Addis Ababa (Unpublished).
- _____(1997 E.C). Result-Oriented performance Appraisal in Result-Oriented Performance Management. Addis Ababa (Unpublished).
- _____(1999). Policy Paper on Performance Appraisal and Time Management. Addis Ababa (Unpublished)
- Fidler, B. (1992). "Experience from Pilot Schemes of the Appraisal of Head Teachers" *Staff Appraisal and Staff Management in Schools and Colleges: A Guide to Implementation*. Essex: Longman Industry and Public Service Management.
- Fidler, B. and R. Copper (1992). *Staff Appraisal and Staff Management in Schools and Colleges: A Guide to Implementation*. Essex: Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Fletcher, C.V. (2003). *Appraisal: Routes to Improved Performance* (2nded). London: short Run Press, Exeter.
- Getnet Eshete and Maru Shete (2005). Performance of Staff of Ethiopia Telecommunication: 'A Comparative Analysis between Conventional and Distance Mode Accounting. In St. Mary University (ed.), *Proceedings of the 3rd National Conference on Private Higher Education in Ethiopia*, Addis Ababa, 20 August 2005.
- Gold, R. (2000). *Running a School*. London: Jordan University Press.
- Good, V.C. (1973). *Dictionary of Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Goss, D (1994). *Principles of Human Resource Management*. London: Routledge.
- Habtamu Gezahegn (2006). Instructors' Perception of performance Appraisal in Government Teacher Training Colleges of Amhara Region. AAU (Unpublished Master Thesis)
- Haccett, D. (1992)."Salford's Experience". *Staff Appraisal and Staff Management in Schools and Colleges: A Guide to Implementation*. Essex: Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Hansen, D. (2005). *Performance Appraisal Tips Page*. Retrieved (March 10, 2007):[http:// 1509 kl.hom.att.net/per/performanceappraisal.html](http://1509.kl.hom.att.net/per/performanceappraisal.html)
- Hattersley, M. (ed.) (1992). *The Appraisal of Head Teacher*. London: Cassell.

- Healy, M (1994). *The Experience of Head Teacher Appraisal*. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Heck, R.H. and Marcoulides, G.A. (1992). Principal Assessment: Conceptual Problem, Methodological Problem, or Both? *Peabody Journal of Education*, Vol.68, No.1
- Hellawell (1992). "Who Should Appraise the Head Teachers?" *The Appraisal Head Teacher*. London: Cassell.
- Heneman, et al. (1996). *Personnel/ Human Resource Management* (4th ed.). New Delhi: Universal Book Stall.
- Henry, T.P. (1982). *A Manager's Guide to Performance Appraisal*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Hewton, E. and West, N. (1992). *Appraisal of Primary Head Teachers: Challenge, Confidence and Clarity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Hume, D. A. (2000). *Improving Employee Performance, Motivation and Pay*. Shivan Tower: Maya Publisher.
- Kasaye Tuji and Kokeb Demeke (2004). The Concept of Strategic Planning and MBO. Oromia Management Institute (Unpublished)
- Koontz, H. and Weihrich (1993). *Management: A Global Perspective* (10th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Company.
- Levacic (1989). *Financial Management in Education*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Locke, E.A. et al. (1981). Goal Setting and Task Performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 90, P.125
- Lockheed, marlaine and Verspoor, M.A. (1994). *Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries*. New York :Oxford University press.
- Lunenberg, F. C. and Ornstein, A. C. (1991). *Educational Administration: Concepts and Practices*. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Martin, M. and Trica, J. (2000). *Personnel Practice*. London: Cromwell Press.
- Mathis, R. L and John, H. (1997). *Human Resource Management*. New York: West Publishing Company
- Melaku Mekonen (1985). Introduction to Educational Administration. AAU (Unpublished)

- Melaku Yimam (1992). Appraiser-Appraisee Perception of Teachers' Performance Appraisal. AAU (Unpublished Master Thesis).
- MOE (1994 E.C.). *Educational Leadership and Organization, Community Participation and Financial Administration*. Addis Ababa: MOE.
- Mondey, et al. (1999). *Human Resource Management* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Backon.
- OCSC (2004). Result-Oriented Performance Appraisal of Employees. Addis Ababa (Unpublished document for Training).
- OECBB (2004). Result-Oriented Performance Appraisal of Teachers' and Principals'. Addis Ababa (Unpublished).
- Philp, T. (1990). *Appraising Performance for Results* Maidenhead: McGraw Hill Book Company (UK) Ltd.
- Qajeelfama Madaallii Raawwii Karoora Barsiisota fi Dura Bu'oootaa Bu'aarratti Xiyeeffatee Finfinee: BBIDO.
- Reddy, Y. (1991). *Strategic Approach to Human Resource Management*. New Delhi: Wiley Eastern Ltd.
- Robbins, S. P. (1997). *Essentials of Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Roome, C. (1994). "The Resident Inspector: The Head Teacher's Role in Monitoring Quality". *Primary Schools Management and Leadership Toward 2000*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Rue, L. W and Byars, L. (1990). *Supervision Key to Productivity* (3rd ed.). Homewood: IRWIN, Inc.
- Schermerhorn, J. R. et al. (1996). *Management and Organizational Behavior*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Scott, D.R. (2001). *Evaluating Your Most Important Asset: The Employee Performance Appraisal*. Retrieved (January 27, 2007):[http://www. performance appraisal.com/methods.html](http://www.performanceappraisal.com/methods.html).
- Seevers, J. S (1979). *Management By Objective and Appraisal*. Retrieved (March 10, 2007): <http://www.maxwell.atmil/aureview1997/Sep.Oct/severs.html>

- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *The Principal ship: A Practice Perspective* (4th ed.). Boston: A Pearson Education Company.
- Stress, M. and Black, J.S. (1994). *Organizational Behavior* (5th ed.). New York: Harper Collins College Publisher.
- Terry, G.R. and Stephen, G. F. (1999). *Principles of Management*. Delhi: Regd Publisher
- Torrington, D., Hall, L., and Taylor, S. (2000). *Human Resource Management*. Rotolito Lombarda.
- Towers, B. (1998). *Human Resource Management*. New Delhi: Beacon Books
- Tyson, S, and Alfared, Y. (2002). *Essentials of Human Resource Management*. Oxford: Butterworth- Heinemann Ltd.
- Week, J (1992). "Head Teacher Appraisal and School Review." *The Appraisal of Head Teacher*. London: Cassell.
- Wills, M (1992). "Head Teachers Appraisal and the Local Education Authority". *The Appraisal of Head Teacher*. London: Cassell.
- Winston and Creamer (1997). *Performance Appraisal is an organizational System, Comprising Deliberate Process for Determining Staff Accomplishment to Improve Staff Effectiveness*. Retrieved (Feb.13, 2007): [http://www. Performance-appraisal.com/intro.html](http://www.Performance-appraisal.com/intro.html)
- Wossenu Yimam (1997). A Study on the System of Appraising Principals' Performance in the Technical/Vocational Schools of Ethiopia. AAU (Unpublished Master Thesis)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX – A
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

A Questionnaire to Be Filled by Principals and Their Appraisers

This questionnaire is designed to collect information about the current result-oriented appraisal of principals' performance in primary schools of Guji zone of Oromia regional state. The success of the study above all depends on your genuine, frankly and timely responses.

The study is purely academic and in no way negatively affects you personally or organizationally. Therefore, I kindly request your contribution in filling the questionnaire honestly and responsibly.

In responding the questions please note the following.

1. ROAPP: is an abbreviation for Result-Oriented Appraisal of Principals' Performance
2. You are not required to write your name
3. Read and follow the specific instruction at the beginning of each section before attempting to complete it
4. Make a check mark (✓) or write brief answers whenever necessary
5. After completing the questionnaire, you are requested to return it to the concerned individual.

Thank you for your cooperation

PART ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. a) Name of your office /school _____

b) School location Rural, Urban

c) School level 1st cycle 2nd cycle

d) Woreda _____

2. Your sex Male Female

3. Your age (in years)

a) 20 and below e) 36-40

b) 21-25 f) 41-45

c) 26-30 g) 46-50

d) 31-35 h) 51 and above

4. Your present post a) Principal b) Supervisor c) Expert

d) Other (please specify) _____

5. Academic qualification

a) 10th or 12th complete b) TTI

c) Diploma d) BA

e) MA and above

6. Do you have a necessary training or certificate to your present post?

a) Yes b) No

7. Years of service

	Below 5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26 and above
a) at present post	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) in teaching only	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) in others	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please specify _____

d) Total

PART TWO: PURPOSES OF ROAPP

DIRECTION: please read each item separately and indicate your degree of agreement or Disagreement by putting a check mark (✓) in one of the boxes for each item by rating them as: SA for Strongly Agree, A for Agree, UD for Undecided, D for Disagree and SD for Strongly Disagree.

8. In your opinion, which of the following do you think *should be* the main purpose of ROAPP?

No	Purposes	SA	A	UD	D	SD
a	To improve the quality of education					
b	To improve professional competence of principals					
c	To motivate principals' to their work					
d	To decide on principals' salary increment					
e	To decide on principals' transfer					
f	To reward competent principals					
g	To take disciplinary actions on principals					
h	To identify principals' training needs					
i	To select principals for higher education					
j	To provide feedback to principals					

9. As you see it in practice, which of these purposes are in use currently in ROAPP?

No	Purposes	SA	A	UD	D	SD
a	To improve the quality of education					
b	To improve professional competence of principals					
c	To motivate principals to their work					
d	To decide on principals' salary increment					
e	To decide on principals' transfer					
f	To reward competent principals					
g	To take disciplinary actions on principals					
h	To identify principals' training needs					
i	To select principals for higher education					
j	To provide feedback to principals					

10. Generally, what is your degree of agreement on current ROAPP in meeting the overall purpose for which it is intended to serve?

1. Strongly Agree

2. Agree

3. Undecided

4. Disagree

5. Strongly Disagree

PART THREE: PROCESS OF ROAPP

DIRECTION: The following is a process of ROAPP. The attempts made to fulfill each activity of the process favor the success of the system. Please rate these items as being practiced currently. (1= Poor, 2= Fair, 3= good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent)

No	Process	Rating scale				
		1	2	3	4	5
11	Planning of tasks & setting expectations					
	• The extent to which principals and supervisors:					
	a) make discussion on school plan and objectives					
	b) identify principals' major areas of work responsibility					
	c) classify tasks of principals' in their critical priority into key, major and minor tasks					
	d) develop standard of performance for each tasks					
	e) design method of follow-up and feedback mechanisms					
	f) agree on developed performance criteria					
12	Monitoring performance					
	a) Supervisor continuous follow-up of principal's actual performance at school.					
	b) Supervisor use of follow-up format to monitor principals performance					
	c) Timely feedback given to principals related to their performance					
	d) Continuous record of evidences about actual performance					
	e) Modification of performance criteria when necessary					
	f) On-job training given to principals with performance difficulty					
	g) Work-shop or meeting provision related to the system					
	h) Preparation of action plan per two weeks					

13	Examine result					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which supervisors and principals: 					
	a) review principal's actual performance over the past appraisal period					
	b) compare principal's actual performance with planned standard					
	c) identify areas that stand above or below agreed standard.					
	d) identify the most likely causes for the difference					
	e) discuss on the rating					
	f) agree on rating					
14	Taking action Based on Performance Results					
	a) Discussion about deficiencies in past performance					
	b) Rewarding principals with best performance					
	c) Salary increment for good performers					
	d) Training or counseling action for 'poor' performers					
	e) Negative action on 'poor' performers					
	f) Promoting, principals with 'very high' and 'high' rate level.					

PART FOUR: THE CRITERIA FOR ROAPP

DIRECTION: Please put a check mark (✓) in the column which most closely match your response against a rating scale: 1= Very Minimally, 2= Minimally, 3= Moderately, 4= Highly, 5= Very Highly

No	Items	Rating scale				
		1	2	3	4	5
15.	To what extent the developed criteria:					
	a) related to the purpose of the appraisal system?					
	b) related to the duties and responsibilities of primary school principals?					
	c) realistic to be performed by primary School principals?					
	d) specific and measurable?					
	e) measure the principals' competence in instructional leadership?					
	f) measure the principals' competence in administrative leadership ?					
	g) measure principals' competence in teaching ?					
	h) enable to take fair administrative decisions on principals?					
	i) enable to identify competent principals from incompetent ?					
	j) enable to identify principals' training needs?					
	k) focus on school plan and objectives?					
16	In general, to what extent are you satisfied with the criteria used for appraising principals' performance currently?					

17. Who develop(s) the appraisal criteria for ROAPP currently employed at your school/woreda ?

- a) principal b) supervisor c) principal in joint with supervisor

PART FIVE: APPRAISERS OF PRINCIPALS

DIRECTION: Please indicate your response by a check mark (✓) or by writing where it is necessary in the space provided

18. Do you have trust and confidence in competence of currently designated appraiser of the performance of school principals?

1. Yes 2. No

19. If your answer to item number 21 is "No" what is the reason? (Please check as many reasons as you think is appropriate)

- a) They lack the required skill and knowledge
- b) They lack willingness to appraise
- c) They are over burden by many subordinates
- d) They are far located from school
- e) They are overburdened by other office works
- f) They tend to maintain bias and favoritism
- g) They do not recognize the value the appraisal
- h) Others,(if any please specify) _____

20. In your opinion who *should* appraise principals? (Please check as many options as your think is appropriate)

- a) Supervisors
- b) Teachers/ Department heads
- c) Principals of other similar schools/ peers
- d) Kebele Education and Training Board
- e) Parent-Teachers Association
- f) Principals' themselves/ self appraisal
- g) Students
- h) The combination of the above (multiple appraisers)
- i) Others (specify) _____

21. Do you have any training concerning the current ROAPP?

- a) Yes b) No

22. Do you think that the training given was sufficient to know about ROAPP?

- a) Yes b) No c) Not sure

PART SIX: PROBLEMS OF ROAPP

23. Problems of implementing the result- oriented appraisal of principals' performance are given below. In your opinion judge the potential seriousness of each of these problems by checking the appropriate space after each of them.

No	Problems	Extremely Serious	Very serious	Some what serious	Observed but not serious	Not observed
a	Lack of necessary knowledge, skill and experience on the part of appraisers					
b	Difficulty of developing appropriate performance criteria					
c	Poor administration of the performance appraisal process					
d	Lack of necessary knowledge and information about the system by appraisees					
e	Less contact and communication between appraisees and appraisers					
f	Unrealistic purposes of the appraisal system					
g	Negative attitude of appraisees towards the system					
h	Negative attitude of appraisers towards the system					

m) Please, list down if any, major problems that are left out

- a) _____
b) _____
c) _____
d) _____

24. What interventions need to be made to reduce problems pertaining to ROAPP? Please, indicate your choice by putting '✓', more than one choice is possible.

- a) Providing training to appraisers
- b) Providing training to appraisees
- c) Change of appraiser
- d) Making supervisors workplace at schools
- e) Replacing the current system by the other
- f) Increasing number of supervisors
- g) Linking appraisal result with action
- h) Please list down others, if any

25. In general, how well do you rate the contribution of current system of appraising principals' performance in improving the competence of principals' as well as the quality of teaching learning process?

- a) very high
- b) high
- c) medium
- d) low

APPENDIX – B
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interview Guide Questions for Woreda Education and Capacity Building Office Heads, and the Zonal Education Expert.

1. What were the purposes of introducing ROAPP, and to what extent would these purposes being achieved?
2. To what extent the process of ROAPP. Such as mutual planning, monitoring the actual performance, examining and rating administered as required by the system?
3. Do you have trust and confidence to the competence of currently designated appraiser in wining their responsibilities, if no, why?
4. What necessary preconditions were made before implementation the ROAPP system?
5. What major problems encountered in courses of implementing the system, and what interventions were made so far?
6. How do you perceive the over all effectiveness of appraising principal performance operating currently in your zone/ woreda?

Thank you

APPENDIX – C

A Sample Plan of Performance

No	Tasks	Type of Tasks	Weight out of 25	Indicators	Specific indicator description	Satisfactory (2)	High (3)	Very high (4)	Follow-up mechanism
1									
1.1				Quality					
				Quantity					
				Time					
				Cost					

Adapted from (OCSC, 200: 62)

DECLARATION

I, the under signed, declare that this thesis is my original work and that all sources of material used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Dereje Abebe

Signature: 

Place and Date of Submission AAU, July 2007

SUBMISSION APPROVAL

This Thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as a university advisor.

Name: Wossenu Yimam (Ph.D)

Signature:  _____

Date of Submission 20/07/07