



**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND
MANAGEMENT**

**PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS' TOWARDS TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL
SYSTEM IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF HALABA SPECIAL WOREDA**

BY

KEDIR AYMELLO SALYA

JUNE, 2017

**PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS' TOWARDS TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE
APPRAISAL SYSTEM IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF HALABA SPECIAL
WOREDA**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Educational Planning and
Management of Addis Ababa University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Masters of Arts in Educational Leadership and
Management**

By

Kedir Aymelo

June, 2017

Addis Ababa

Addis Ababa University
College of Education and Behavioral Studies
Department of Educational Planning and Management

**PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS' TOWARDS TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE
APPRAISAL SYSTEM IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF HALABA SPECIAL
WOREDA**

By

Kedir Aymelo

Approved by the Examination Board

Chairman, Department of
Graduate Studies

Signature

Date

Advisor

Signature

Date

Internal Examiner

Signature

Date

External Examiner

Signature

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I acknowledge the invaluable and significant support and contribution from my advisor, Ass. Prof. Befekadu Zeleke. You are among the very few individuals I will forever owe my intellectual development to. I have not just completed a research project but you spent your time. Thank you so much for making me learn this much. I sincerely appreciate and thank Dr. Kenenisa Dabi for his genuine help and compassion and support throughout my study period.

I want to take this opportunity to thank my elder brother Ato Abdulbasit Aymelo and the Halaba TVET College for their financial and stationery materials support during my whole thesis period. I want to express my deepest appreciation and thanks to Abdulquadir Ahmed (lecturer at Arbaminch teachers training college) for the priceless contribution he has made in going through my draft and correcting the language imperfections.

My special thanks also go to my friends especially Ato Mohammed kemale Nurye who helped me in how to make use of the statistical tools particularly SPSS, without which the analysis part of my study may not be successfully complete. Moreover, it is with great pleasure that I acknowledge my indebtedness to Ato Abduselam Hassen, for the contribution he has made during data collection.

Table of Contents

Title	Page
Acknowledgements	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Table.....	iv
List of Acronyms	v
Abstract.....	vi
Chapter One	
Introduction	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	4
1.3. Objective of the Study	7
1.4. Significances of the Study	7
1.5. Delimitation of the Study	8
1.6. Limitations of the Study	8
1.7. Operational Definitions of Key Terms	9
1.8. Organization of the Study.....	10
Chapter Two	
Review of Related Literature.....	11
2.1. Definitions and Concepts of Performance Appraisal	11
2.2. Purposes/Aims of Performance Appraisal Systems.....	13
2.3 Approaches of Performance Evaluation.....	20
2.4. Performance Appraisal Process	21
2.5. Methods of Performance Appraisal	28
2.6. Principles of Performance Appraisal Systems.....	33
2.7. Employee perception toward PA system	37
2.8. Challenges/Problems of PA.....	38
2.9. Teachers' Performance Appraisal in Ethiopia	40
2.10. Unit Summary.....	41

Chapter Three

The Research Design and Methodology	42
3.1. Research Design.....	42
3. 2. Source of Data.....	42
3.3. Sample size and Sampling Technique	42
3.4. Instruments and Procedures for Data Collection	44
3.5 Instrument Validity and Reliability Test	46
3.6. Method of Data Analysis	47
3.7. Ethical Consideration.....	48

Chapter Four

Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of Data	49
4.1. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents	49
4.2. Analysis and Interpretations of Data.....	51

Chapter Five

5. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations	96
5.1 Summary of Major Findings	96
5.2 Conclusion	99
5.3 Recommendation.....	100

References

Appendices

LIST OF TABLES

Title	Page
1. Population Distribution and Sample Size of respondents.....	44
2. Cronbach's Alpha Value of Survey Pilot Testing.....	47
3. Respondent's Demographic Information.....	50
4. T-test for Mean Differences across sex of respondents' perception about the Major purposes of the current System of TPA	53
5. Mean Distribution of Responses and One-Way ANOVA Results on the Purposes of TPA across qualifications of respondents	55
6. Mean Distribution of Responses and One-Way ANOVA Results on the Purposes of TPA across experiences categories of respondents.....	67
7. Mean distribution of responses and T-test results on the perception of PA process by sex of respondents.....	61
8. One Way ANOVA, Mean and Standard Deviation of PA Process in relation to respondents Qualifications	63
9. One Way ANOVA, Mean and Standard Deviation of teachers' perception on PA Process in terms of teaching Experiences.....	65
10. Mean Distribution of Responses and t-test Results for Criteria related issues across sex of respondents.....	70
11. Mean Distribution of Responses and One Way ANOVA results for perception toward Criteria across qualifications of respondents	71
12. Mean Distribution of Responses and One Way ANOVA results for perception about PA Criteria across respondents' years of experience in teaching ..	73
13. Methods and Procedures of Teachers' Performance Appraisal	77
14. Perception of teachers toward the overall PA practice across sex of respondents	81
15. Mean Distribution of Responses and ANOVA-test Results on the perception of Teachers Performance Appraisal.....	83
16. Mean Distribution of Responses and ANOVA test Results on perception of Teachers Performance Appraisal.....	85
17. Problems of TPA.....	94

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
BARS	Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scale
BSC	Balanced Scored Card
E.C	Ethiopian Calendar
FCSC	Federal Civil Service Commission
GSS	Governmental Secondary Schools
HRM	Human Recourse Management
HSD	Honestly Significant Difference
MBO	Management by Objectives
MoE	Ministry of Education
PA	Performance Appraisal
PAS	Performance Appraisal System
ROTPA	Result-oriented Teachers Performance Appraisal
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
SNNP	South Nations, Nationalities & Peoples.
TPA	Teachers Performance Appraisal
TPAS	Teachers Performance Appraisal System
US/OPM	United States Office of Personnel Management
WEO	Woreda Education Office

Abstract

The ultimate purpose of the study was to assess the practice of current teachers' performance appraisal system by making use of survey conducted at government secondary schools located in Halaba special Woreda, Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Region. All the seven government secondary schools were selected for the study by using census sampling technique. The population of the research comprises teachers, vice directors, directors and supervisors of government secondary schools in Halaba special Woreda. The researcher used a sample size of one hundred and ten teachers out of the possible two hundred and ten and nine school leaders out of the nineteen at government secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda. The respondents were selected for the study by using stratified sampling technique for teachers and purposive sampling technique for school directors. Open and close ended questions, structured interview and document review were used to collect data. The data gathered through questionnaires were analyzed using percentages, mean, standard deviation, weighted mean, independent sample t-test, One Way ANOVA and Tukey HSD test. The data gathered from open ended questions and documents review were analyzed logically. Based on the analysis the study revealed that teachers were not happy with overall PA practice in their schools. Moreover, there were no many of the vital elements that are needed in an effective performance appraisal. Thus, this needs a serious attention and there should be some work to be done in improving the system and making it more successful and rewarding. The study recommends that teachers be involved in designing the rating and measurement scales to ensure development of reliable, valid, fair and useful performance standards. The study also recommends regular training of appraisers on performance appraisal as well as redesigning of the appraisal tool for effectiveness in measuring different dimensions of performance.

Keywords: Performance appraisal, performance management, teachers' appraisal

References

- Armstrong, M. (2009). *A handbook of personnel management practice*. 11th Ed. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Armstrong, M. (2000). *A handbook of personnel management practice*. 7th Ed. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Armstrong, M. and Baron, A. (2005). *Managing Performance: performance management in action*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development
- Armstrong, M. and Baron, A. 2002. *Performance Management. The new realities*, Institute of Personnel and Development, London, U.K
- Berhanu Moyata (2006). *Implementation of Result-oriented teachers' performance Appraisal, as perceived by principals and teachers* (unpublished master's thesis), Addis Ababa University.
- Beer, M. (1987), "Performance appraisal", in Lorch, J. (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, pp. 286-99.
- Bollington, R., Hopkins, D. and West, M. 1990. *An introduction to teacher appraisal*. London: Cassel
- Boswell, W.R., & Boudreau, J.W. (2000). *Employee Satisfaction with Performance Appraisals and Appraisers*: *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11 (3), 283-299.
- Cawley, B, Keeping, L. & Levy, P (1998). 'Participation in the Performance Appraisal Process and Employee Reactions: A Meta-Analytic Review of Field Investigations', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(4), 615-63
- Chandan, J.S. (1995). *Management: Theory and practice*. New Delhi: Vikas publishing House Pvt. Ltd
- Y.K. Singh. (2006). *New Age: Fundamental of Research Methodology and Statistics*. New International Publishers.
- Creswell, W. (2012). *Educational research, planning, conducting, and evaluating: Quantitative and qualitative research 4th ed.*, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

- DelPo, A., 2007. *The Performance Appraisal Handbook*, USA consolidated Printers, Inc. Philadelphia: Open University
- Dessler, Gary, (2000), *Human Resource Management*, 8th Ed. New York. Prentice Hall International,
- Dessler, G. 2008. *Management: Leading people and organization in 21st century*. Harlow: Prentice hall.
- Dipboye, R. L. and Pont Briand, R. (1981) 'Correlates of employee reactions to performance appraisals and appraisal systems', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 66,248-251
- Donnelly, et.al. (1992). *Fundamentals of management*. Homewood: Richard Irwin, Inc.
- Dorcah, A. 2014. Teachers' Perceptions of Performance Appraisal Practices in Public Secondary Schools in Limuru district. PhD Dissertation, University of Nairobi: Nairobi, Kenya.
- Duke, D.L. (1995). *Teacher's Evaluation Policy from Accountability to Professional development*. New York: state university of New York press, Albany
- Endale Berhanu Demise (2015). "An assessment of teachers' performance appraisal in secondary schools of Wolaita Zone" *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)* Volume 23, No.2, pp. 286-306
- Ethiopian Federal Democratic Republic Ministry of Education. (2008). General Education Quality Improvement Package. Addis Ababa: EMPDA
- Fletcher, C (2004) *Appraisal and Feedback, Making Performance Review Work*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Gar Gbeja, O.O (2000). *Performance Appraisal and Management in the public Service*. A Paper delivered at the First Annual Conference of South African Association of Public Administration and Management, November 22nd – 24th,
- Gary, D. (2003). *Human Resource Management* (9th Ed.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India
- Grote, R. C. (2011). *How to be good at performance appraisals: Simple, effective, done*.

- Hailesilassie Waldagerima.1999. *Human Resource Management*. A Teaching Material: Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Henderson, R. (1984). *Practical Guide to Performance Appraisal*. London: Reston Publishing.
- Heneman et al. (1996).*Personal Management* (4th Ed) New Delhi: RICHARD, Irwin, Inc.
- Iraki M.W (2013).Teachers' perceptions of the role of performance appraisal in enhancing teaching and learning: a case of Kiambu County (MA thesis), Kenyatta university, Kenya.
- Ivancevich, J.M. (2004). Human Resource Management. 9th edition, McGraw- *Journal of Management History*, 4(3), 233-249.
- Kaynak, Tuğray et al., İnsanKaynakları Yönetimi, İstanbul: İ.Ü.İşletmeFakültesi, Yayın No: 7, 2000
- Longenecker, C. A., 1999. *Creative Effective Performance Appraisals*. Ind. Manag. 18-23.
- Long. (1987) .Performance Appraisal Revisited (2nded.). London: Duteous Printers Ltd.
- Marguerite G. Lodico, Dean T. Spaulding, Katherine H. and Voegtle (2006).*Methods in educational research from theory to practice*. Published by Jossey-Bass. Retrieved from <http://www.josseybass.com>
- Mathias, J. and J. Jones. (1989). *Appraisal of performance: Teachers' Guide*. Berkshire: The NFER-NELSON publishing Company Ltd
- Mathis, R.L. & Jackson, J.H. (1997). *Human Resource Management*. (8th Ed.). USA: West publishing company.
- McCrea, Thomas. L. (1984). *Successful teacher evaluation*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- McGregor, D, (1987). *The Human Side of Enterprise*, New York, McGraw-Hill.

- Melaku Yimam (1992) Appraiser-Appraisee perception of teachers performance in senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa, AAU
- Melaku Y. "Educational Leadership and Management: Human Resource Management in Educational Organizations of Ethiopia". *Performance Management*, 2000, pp. 55-79.
- Millman, J., & Linda D.H. (Eds.). (1990). *Teacher Evaluation*. Newbury Park: SAGE publication.
- Monyatsi, P. Steyn, T. and Kamper, G. (2006). Teacher Perceptions of the effectiveness of teacher appraisal in Botswana. *South African Journal of Education*, 26 (3), 427-441.
- Moorhead, G.J. and Griffin, R.N. 1992. *Organizations Behavior*, 3rd Edition. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, USA
- Muhammad, F. (2013). "Role of performance appraisal system on employee motivation", *Journal of Business and Management*, 8:4, pp. 66-83
- Pay, C.U & Waltham, G.P (2012). Effects of Training and Rating Scales of Rating Errors. *Personnel Psychology*. Spring, PP. 105-116.
- "Performance Appraisal", Available on site: <http://www.performanceappraisal.com/basic.htm> (10.09.2006)
- Piggot-Irvine, E. (2003) Key features of appraisal effectiveness. *The International Journal of Educational Management*. Vol. 17, Iss. 4/5, pp. 170-17
- Rankin, G. & Kleiner, B. (1988) 'Effective Performance Appraisal', *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, Vol. 88(1/2)
- Rasheed, M.I., Sarwar, S., Aslam, H.D. 2013. A Critical Analysis of Performance Appraisal System for Teachers in Public Sector Universities of Pakistan: A Case Study of Islamia University of Bahawalpur. *African Journal of Business Management* 5(9):335-34.
- Roberts, G (2003) 'Employee Performance Appraisal System Participation: A Technique that Works', *Public Personnel Management*, 32(1), 89.

- Robert N. Lussier and John R. Hendem (2012). *Human Resource Management*. London. SAGE publication, Inc.
- Shaw, J. D., Delery, J. E., Jenkins, G. D., & Gupta, N. (2008). An organization-level analysis of voluntary and involuntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 511–525
- Stronge, J. H. (2006). *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Stronge, J.H. (2010). O que funciona, de facto, na avaliação de professores: breves considerações. In M.A. Flores (ed.) *A Avaliação de Professores numa Perspectiva Internacional: Sentidos e Implicações*. Porto: Areal Editores.
- Stronge, J.H. & Tucker, P.D. (1999). The politics of teacher evaluation: A case study of new system design and implementation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 13(4), 339-360.
- Stronge, J. H., & Tucker, P. D. (2003). *Handbook on teacher evaluation: Assessing and improving performance*. Larchmont, NY. Eye on Education Publications.
- Tatek Abera. 2012. Performance Appraisal and Teachers Reaction in Secondary Schools of West Hararghe Zone. MEd Thesis, Haramaya University: Haramaya, Ethiopia.
- Tracey, W. R., *the Human Resources Glossary*, Washington DC St. Lucie Press, 1998.
- United States Office of Personnel Management (1980). Annual Report. USA
- Webb, L.D and Norton, MS (1992). *Human Resources Administration. Personnel Issues and Needs in Education*
- Yamoah, E.E. 2013. Exploratory Study on Rewards and Job Performance of Teachers of Public Schools in Ghana. Doctoral Dissertation, Valley View University: Adenta Accra, Ghana.

Yilma (2007). Practices of Teachers' Performance Appraisal the case of SNNPRS (unpublished master's thesis) Addis Ababa University

Yong. F. (1996). Inflation of subordinates' performance ratings: Main and interactive effects of Rater Negative Affectivity, Documentation of Work Behavior, and Appraisal visibility. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, Vol.20, No.4. (Jul., 1999), pp.431-444

ትምህርት ሚኒስቴር (1988). የመምህራን የደረጃ ዕድገት ሥርዓት አፈጻጸም መመሪያ. ቁጥር 2. ትምህርት ሚኒስቴር: አዲስ አበባ

Annex-1

A Questionnaire to be filled by Teachers

I am a student of the Addis Ababa University and am currently studying a Masters in Educational Leadership and Management. I am writing my thesis on **the Assessment of Teachers' Performance Appraisal**. I have designed this survey on issues related to this topic.

I would really appreciate if you could spend a few minutes of your time filling in this survey. Your answers are very important for the proper analysis of the research. Your answers will be treated confidentially and anonymously. All information obtained from this survey will be treated in the strictest confidence, and will only be available to the researcher and his thesis advisor.

I kindly request for you to complete this questionnaire honestly.

Thank you in advance!

General Instructions

You are not required to write your name

- Use thick (√) mark to your response of closed-ended questionnaire from the given rating scales.
- Write briefly your response for open-ended questionnaire. .
- Please, give appropriate response based on your school experience/context

Section One: Background Information

1. Your School _____
2. Sex : Male Female
3. Age: 25 yrs. and below 26-34 yrs. 35-44 yrs. 45 yrs. and above
4. Educational Background: Diploma B.A/B.SC MA/MSC and above
5. Your experience in teaching: 0 to 5 Years 6 to 10 years 11 to 15 Years
16 to 20 years 21 years and above

Section Two: The following questions are presented on a five point. If the item strongly matches with your response choose **5(Strongly Agree)**, if you moderately agree on the idea choose **4(Agree)**, if you do not have any idea or information on the point choose **3(Undecided)**, if you moderately disagree with the point choose **2(Disagree)** and if you completely disagree with the point choose **1(Strongly disagree)**.

6. The Primary Objectives of PAS in schools as perceived by Teachers

No	Objectives	5	4	3	2	1
1	To improve the quality of the teaching-learning process.					
2	To support teachers' professional development					
3	To motivate and promote work interest of teachers					
4	To determine rewards and benefits for competent teachers					
5	To select teachers for higher education					
6	To identify teachers training needs					
7	To decide on teachers' rank in the career ladder					
8	To decide on teachers' transfer					
9	To weed out incompetent teachers					
10	For the sake of fulfilling administrative formalities.					

7. The Process of Performance Appraisal System in schools as perceived by teachers

No	Process	5	4	3	2	1
1	Prior to the appraisal process, adequate training and information about the appraisal is given for both the appraisees and appraisers.					
2	Prior to any action both the appraisers and the appraisees meet and establish agreed up on objectives.					
3	The performance appraisal is conducted against the previously established objectives and criteria.					
4	There is post appraisal discussion between appraisers and appraises					
5	I get timely and accurate feedback on my performance					

Comments:

8. Teachers' Performance Appraisal Criteria used in schools as perceived by Teachers

No	Criteria of Performance Appraisal	5	4	3	2	1
1	Criteria are clearly defined and objective-oriented					
2	Criteria are exhaustive to appraise performance.					
3	The criteria employed are relevant to the purposes of TPAS					
4	The Performance Appraisal form is capable of distinguishing effective from ineffective performers.					
5	The overall current appraisal criteria fulfilled the required quality to appraise teachers.					

9. Teachers response on the Methods and Procedures of PA used in schools

No	Practices	5	4	3	2	1
1	The school conducts performance appraisal regularly					
2	My achievement at school are kept in my portfolio for future use					
3	I am provided with facilities for accomplishing my tasks before performance appraisal					
4	Substantial time is allotted for performance appraisal practices					
5	Students participate on performance appraisal practices					
6	Before rating the performance supervisors gather information from peers					
7	There is a chance to assess own performance (self-appraisal method)					
8	Department heads participate on performance appraisal practices					
9	I am happy with the overall practice of performance appraisal system.					

Comments _____

10. Teachers' satisfaction toward overall practice of PAS implementing in schools

No	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	The appraisal system is effective in encouraging me to work hard.					
2	The appraisal system of the school is motivating to the teachers					
3	Those who got the highest rank are given appropriate rewards					
4	I take part in the formulation of the performance appraisal system					
5	I am satisfied with the way I am being evaluated and ranked					
6	I take greater understanding of the results expected of me from appraisal.					
7	Performance goals are clearly defined in the appraisal process					
8	I am satisfied with the feedback aspect of Performance appraisal					
9	The performance appraisal system improves the relationship with my supervisor.					
10	All the information obtained from performance appraisal is confidential					
11	The appraisal system in my school is fair for all teachers.					

11. Major Challenges of Performance Appraisal on the Process of Implementation

No	Indicator	5	4	3	2	1
1	There is poor administration of the overall appraisal process in my school.					
2	Teachers' misperception towards appraisal					
3	The inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria to appraise the teachers of secondary schools					
4	Appraisers lack the necessary knowledge, skill and experience to appraise teacher's performance objectively.					
5	Outstanding performers/teachers did not provide with necessary rewards.					
6	The purposes of the appraisal system is unrealistic					

Others _____

7. Does information generated through performance evaluation used to motivate and promote work interest of teachers?
Yes No
8. Do you think information from TPA is being to weed out incompetent teachers?
Yes No
9. Do you think PA is used to decide on transfer teachers?
Yes No
10. Is TPA results are being used to identify training needs teachers?
Yes No

Section Three: Perception of teachers toward the criteria of teachers' performance evaluation

1. Are the criteria used in TPA clearly defined and objective?
Yes No
If no/yes, why _____
2. Does the criteria used in the school is capable of distinguishing effective performers from ineffective performers?
Yes No
If no/yes, why _____
3. Are the criteria employed relevant to the purpose of PAS?
Yes No
If no/yes, why _____
4. Are the criteria used in your school exhaustive appraise performance?
Yes No
If no/yes, why _____
5. Did the overall current appraisal criteria fulfilled the required quality to appraise teachers?
Yes No
If no/yes, why _____

Section four: Perception of Teachers toward the Process of TPAS

1. In your school do appraisers and teachers discuss, identify and formalize the personal objectives in TPA process?
Yes No
If no/yes, why _____
2. Do you provide adequate training and information about the appraisal is given for both the appraisees and appraisers before appraisal process?
Yes No
If no/yes, why _____
3. In your school, do appraisal of performance is made against the previously established objectives?
Yes No
If no/yes, why _____
4. Are there a feedback process and an appeal procedure in your school?
Yes No
If no/yes, why _____
5. Is there a post appraisal discussion with between appraisers and appraises?
Yes No
If no/yes, why _____

Section Five: Teachers Perception toward Principles TPAS being implemented

1. Is teachers' performance appraisal system practicing in your school is fair?
Yes No
If no/yes, why _____
2. Do you think the system TPA improves the relationship teachers with the appraiser?
Yes No
If no/yes, why _____
3. Do appraisal results are linked with rewards system?
Yes No
If No, why _____
4. Do you think that feedback given for teachers is specific and accurate?
Yes No

If No, why _____

5. Are all the information obtained from PA is confidential?

Yes [] No []

If No what is the reason _____

6. Is there any participation opportunity in the process of appraisals provided to teachers?

Yes, how _____

No, why, _____

Section Six: Major Challenges/problems of Teachers' Performance Appraisal

1. Do you think appraisers lack the necessary knowledge, skill and experience to evaluating teachers' performance?

Yes [] No []

If No what is the reason _____

2. Do you think that there is a misperception of teachers toward appraisal system in your school?

Yes [] No []

If No what is the reason _____

3. Are there inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria to appraise the teachers of secondary schools?

Yes [] No []

If No, what is the reason _____?

3. Is there poor administration of the overall appraisal process in schools?

Yes [] No []

If no, what is the reason _____?

4. Do you believe that the purposes of the appraisal system are unrealistic?

Yes [] No []

If No, what is the reason _____?

5. Do you think that there lack of rewards for outstanding performers/teachers?

Yes [] No []

If No what is the reason _____

Thank You!

Annex-3

ANOVA

Independent variable= educational background of respondents

Dependent variable=To decide on teachers' transfer

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.650	2	2.825	3.790	.026
Within Groups	72.310	97	.745		
Total	77.960	99			

-----One Way ANOVA-----

Multiple Comparisons

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Qualification=Educational Background of respondents	(J) Qualification=Educational Background of respondents	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
To decide on teachers' transfer	Diploma	BA/BSC	-.40805	.61749	.787	-1.8778	1.0617
		MA/MSC	-1.13636	.66370	.206	-2.7161	.4434
	BA/BSC	Diploma	.40805	.61749	.787	-1.0617	1.8778
		MA/MSC	-.72832	.27629	.026	-1.3860	-.0707
	MA/MSC	Diploma	1.13636	.66370	.206	-.4434	2.7161
		BA/BSC	.72832	.27629	.026	.0707	1.3860

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Annex-4

ANOVA

Independent variable= educational background of respondents

Dependent variable=To weed out incompetent teachers

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.177	2	2.088	3.331	.040
Within Groups	60.813	97	.627		
Total	64.990	99			

-----One Way ANOVA-----

Multiple Comparisons

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Qualification=Educational Background of respondents	(J) Qualification=Educational Background of respondents	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
To weed out incompetent teachers	Diploma	BA/BSC	.56897	.56628	.576	-.7789	1.9168
		MA/MSC	-.04545	.60866	.997	-1.4942	1.4033
	BA/BSC	Diploma	-.56897	.56628	.576	-1.9168	.7789
		MA/MSC	-.61442	.25338	.045	-1.2175	-.0113
	MA/MSC	Diploma	.04545	.60866	.997	-1.4033	1.4942
		BA/BSC	.61442	.25338	.045	.0113	1.2175

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Annex-5

ANOVA

Independent variable=experience years of respondents

Dependent variable=To support teachers' professional development

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	9.872	4	2.468	4.413	.003
Within Groups	53.128	95	.559		
Total	63.000	99			

-----ANOVA-----

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: To support teachers' professional development

Tukey HSD

(I) Service=Experience of respondents in teaching	(J) Service=Experience of respondents in teaching	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Below five years	6-10 years	.35897	.23949	.566	-.3070	1.0250
	11-15 years	.36302	.20922	.418	-.2188	.9448
	16-20 years	.20513	.27654	.946	-.5639	.9742
	21 years and above	.85513*	.20567	.001	.2832	1.4271
6-10 years	Below five years	-.35897	.23949	.566	-1.0250	.3070
	11-15 years	.00405	.26917	1.000	-.7445	.7526
	16-20 years	-.15385	.32428	.989	-1.0556	.7479
	21 years and above	.49615	.26642	.345	-.2447	1.2370
11-15 years	Below five years	-.36302	.20922	.418	-.9448	.2188
	6-10 years	-.00405	.26917	1.000	-.7526	.7445
	16-20 years	-.15789	.30261	.985	-.9994	.6836
	21 years and above	.49211	.23957	.249	-.1741	1.1583
16-20 years	Below five years	-.20513	.27654	.946	-.9742	.5639
	6-10 years	.15385	.32428	.989	-.7479	1.0556
	11-15 years	.15789	.30261	.985	-.6836	.9994
	21 years and above	.65000	.30017	.202	-.1847	1.4847
21 years and above	Below five years	-.85513*	.20567	.001	-1.4271	-.2832
	6-10 years	-.49615	.26642	.345	-1.2370	.2447
	11-15 years	-.49211	.23957	.249	-1.1583	.1741
	16-20 years	-.65000	.30017	.202	-1.4847	.1847

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Annex-6

ANOVA

Independent variable=experience years of respondents

Dependent variable=To decide on teachers' transfer

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7.993	4	1.998	2.868	.027
Within Groups	66.197	95	.697		
Total	74.190	99			

-----ANOVA-----

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: To decide on teachers' transfer

Tukey HSD

(I) Service=Experience of respondents in teaching	(J) Service=Experience of respondents in teaching	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Below five years	6-10 years	-.61538	.26733	.153	-1.3588	.1280
	11-15 years	-.15385	.23354	.965	-.8033	.4956
	16-20 years	-.26496	.30869	.911	-1.1234	.5935
	21 years and above	.34615	.22958	.560	-.2923	.9846
6-10 years	Below five years	.61538	.26733	.153	-.1280	1.3588
	11-15 years	.46154	.30046	.542	-.3740	1.2971
	16-20 years	.35043	.36197	.869	-.6562	1.3570
	21 years and above	.96154*	.29739	.014	.1345	1.7885
11-15 years	Below five years	.15385	.23354	.965	-.4956	.8033
	6-10 years	-.46154	.30046	.542	-1.2971	.3740
	16-20 years	-.11111	.33778	.997	-1.0504	.8282
	21 years and above	.50000	.26742	.341	-.2437	1.2437
16-20 years	Below five years	.26496	.30869	.911	-.5935	1.1234
	6-10 years	-.35043	.36197	.869	-1.3570	.6562
	11-15 years	.11111	.33778	.997	-.8282	1.0504
	21 years and above	.61111	.33506	.366	-.3206	1.5429
21 years and above	Below five years	-.34615	.22958	.560	-.9846	.2923
	6-10 years	-.96154*	.29739	.014	-1.7885	-.1345
	11-15 years	-.50000	.26742	.341	-1.2437	.2437
	16-20 years	-.61111	.33506	.366	-1.5429	.3206

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Annex-7

ANOVA

Independent variable=educational background of respondents

Dependent variable=Prior to any action both appraisers and appraises jointly meet and establish agreed up on objectives

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7.128	2	3.564	4.166	.018
Within Groups	82.982	97	.855		
Total	90.110	99			

-----ANOVA-----

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Prior to any action both appraisers and appraises jointly meet and establish agreed up on objectives

Tukey HSD

(I) Qualification=Education al Background of respondents	(J) Qualification=Education al Background of respondents	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
College Diploma	BA/BSC	1.74713*	.66150	.026	.1726	3.3216
	MA/MSc and above	1.36364	.71100	.139	-.3287	3.0560
BA/BSC	College Diploma	-1.74713*	.66150	.026	-3.3216	-.1726
	MA/MSc and above	-.38349	.29598	.401	-1.0880	.3210
MA/MSc and above	College Diploma	-1.36364	.71100	.139	-3.0560	.3287
	BA/BSC	.38349	.29598	.401	-.3210	1.0880

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Annex-8

ANOVA

Independent variable= experiences years of respondents

Dependent variable=I get timely and accurate feedback on my performance

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12.196	4	3.049	2.749	.033
Within Groups	105.364	95	1.109		
Total	117.560	99			

-----ANOVA-----

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: I get timely and accurate feedback on my performance

Tukey HSD

(I) Service=Experience of respondents in teaching	(J) Service=Experience of respondents in teaching	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Below five years	6-10 years	-.56410	.33727	.456	-1.5020	.3738
	11-15 years	-.84750*	.29464	.039	-1.6669	-.0282
	16-20 years	-.79487	.38945	.255	-1.8779	.2881
	21 years and above	-.54487	.28964	.335	-1.3503	.2606
6-10 years	Below five years	.56410	.33727	.456	-.3738	1.5020
	11-15 years	-.28340	.37906	.945	-1.3375	.7707
	16-20 years	-.23077	.45667	.987	-1.5007	1.0392
	21 years and above	.01923	.37519	1.000	-1.0241	1.0626
11-15 years	Below five years	.84750*	.29464	.039	.0282	1.6669
	6-10 years	.28340	.37906	.945	-.7707	1.3375
	16-20 years	.05263	.42615	1.000	-1.1324	1.2377
	21 years and above	.30263	.33738	.897	-.6356	1.2409
16-20 years	Below five years	.79487	.38945	.255	-.2881	1.8779
	6-10 years	.23077	.45667	.987	-1.0392	1.5007
	11-15 years	-.05263	.42615	1.000	-1.2377	1.1324
	21 years and above	.25000	.42271	.976	-.9255	1.4255
21 years and above	Below five years	.54487	.28964	.335	-.2606	1.3503
	6-10 years	-.01923	.37519	1.000	-1.0626	1.0241
	11-15 years	-.30263	.33738	.897	-1.2409	.6356
	16-20 years	-.25000	.42271	.976	-1.4255	.9255

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Annex-9

ANOVA

Independent variable=educational backgrounds of respondents

Dependent variable=Those who got the highest rank are given appropriate rewards

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	10.549	2	5.275	4.329	.016
Within Groups	118.201	97	1.219		
Total	128.750	99			

-----ANOVA-----

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Those who got the highest rank are given appropriate rewards

Tukey HSD

(I) Qualification=Education al Background of respondents	(J) Qualification=Education al Background of respondents	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Diploma	BA/BSC	-.34483	.78949	.900	-2.2240	1.5343
	MA/MSC	-1.36364	.84856	.248	-3.3834	.6561
BA/BSC	Diploma	.34483	.78949	.900	-1.5343	2.2240
	MA/MSC	-1.01881*	.35325	.013	-1.8596	-.1780
MA/MSC	Diploma	1.36364	.84856	.248	-.6561	3.3834
	BA/BSC	1.01881*	.35325	.013	.1780	1.8596

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Annex-10

ANOVA

Independent variable= experiences of respondents by

Dependent variable=I take greater understanding of the results expected of me from performance appraisal

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	20.037	4	5.009	4.829	.001
Within Groups	98.553	95	1.037		
Total	118.590	99			

----- One Way ANOVA -----

Tukey HSD: Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: I take greater understanding of the results expected of me from appraisal.

(I) Service=Experience of respondents in teaching	(J) Service=Experience of respondents in teaching	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Below five years	6-10 years	-.35897	.32619	.806	-1.2661	.5481
	11-15 years	-.48043	.28496	.447	-1.2729	.3120
	16-20 years	-.96581	.37665	.085	-2.0132	.0816
	21 years and above	-1.14359*	.28012	.001	-1.9226	-.3646
6-10 years	Below five years	.35897	.32619	.806	-.5481	1.2661
	11-15 years	-.12146	.36661	.997	-1.1409	.8980
	16-20 years	-.60684	.44166	.646	-1.8350	.6214
	21 years and above	-.78462	.36286	.203	-1.7937	.2245
11-15 years	Below five years	.48043	.28496	.447	-.3120	1.2729
	6-10 years	.12146	.36661	.997	-.8980	1.1409
	16-20 years	-.48538	.41215	.764	-1.6315	.6607
	21 years and above	-.66316	.32630	.259	-1.5705	.2442
16-20 years	Below five years	.96581	.37665	.085	-.0816	2.0132
	6-10 years	.60684	.44166	.646	-.6214	1.8350
	11-15 years	.48538	.41215	.764	-.6607	1.6315
	21 years and above	-.17778	.40882	.992	-1.3147	.9591
21 years and above	Below five years	1.14359*	.28012	.001	.3646	1.9226
	6-10 years	.78462	.36286	.203	-.2245	1.7937
	11-15 years	.66316	.32630	.259	-.2442	1.5705
	16-20 years	.17778	.40882	.992	-.9591	1.3147

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Annex-11

ANOVA

Independent variable= experiences of respondents by

Dependent variable=All the information obtained from performance appraisal is confidential

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	13.677	4	3.419	2.537	.045
Within Groups	128.033	95	1.348		
Total	141.710	99			

----- One Way ANOVA-----

Tukey HSD: Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: All the information obtained from performance appraisal is confidential

(I) Service=Experience of respondents in teaching	(J) Service=Experience of respondents in teaching	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Below five years	6-10 years	-.43590	.37179	.767	-1.4698	.5980
	11-15 years	-.27395	.32479	.916	-1.1772	.6292
	16-20 years	-.58974	.42931	.646	-1.7836	.6041
	21 years and above	-.98974*	.31929	.021	-1.8776	-.1019
6-10 years	Below five years	.43590	.37179	.767	-.5980	1.4698
	11-15 years	.16194	.41786	.995	-1.0001	1.3239
	16-20 years	-.15385	.50341	.998	-1.5537	1.2461
	21 years and above	-.55385	.41359	.668	-1.7040	.5963
11-15 years	Below five years	.27395	.32479	.916	-.6292	1.1772
	6-10 years	-.16194	.41786	.995	-1.3239	1.0001
	16-20 years	-.31579	.46977	.962	-1.6221	.9906
	21 years and above	-.71579	.37191	.312	-1.7500	.3184
16-20 years	Below five years	.58974	.42931	.646	-.6041	1.7836
	6-10 years	.15385	.50341	.998	-1.2461	1.5537
	11-15 years	.31579	.46977	.962	-.9906	1.6221
	21 years and above	-.40000	.46598	.911	-1.6958	.8958
21 years and above	Below five years	.98974*	.31929	.021	.1019	1.8776
	6-10 years	.55385	.41359	.668	-.5963	1.7040
	11-15 years	.71579	.37191	.312	-.3184	1.7500
	16-20 years	.40000	.46598	.911	-.8958	1.6958

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Annex-12

ANOVA

Independent variable= experiences of respondents

Dependent Variable: Performance appraisal in my school is fair.

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	49.126	4	12.282	10.091	.000
Within Groups	115.624	95	1.217		
Total	164.750	99			

-----ANOVA-----

Tukey HSD: Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Performance appraisal in my school is fair.

(I) Service=Experience of respondents in teaching	(J) Service=Experience of respondents in teaching	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Below five years	6-10 years	-1.05128*	.35331	.030	-2.0338	-.0688
	11-15 years	-1.13225*	.30865	.004	-1.9906	-.2739
	16-20 years	-1.30769*	.40797	.015	-2.4422	-.1732
	21 years and above	-1.77436*	.30342	.000	-2.6181	-.9306
6-10 years	Below five years	1.05128*	.35331	.030	.0688	2.0338
	11-15 years	-.08097	.39709	1.000	-1.1852	1.0233
	16-20 years	-.25641	.47839	.983	-1.5867	1.0739
	21 years and above	-.72308	.39304	.357	-1.8161	.3699
11-15 years	Below five years	1.13225*	.30865	.004	.2739	1.9906
	6-10 years	.08097	.39709	1.000	-1.0233	1.1852
	16-20 years	-.17544	.44642	.995	-1.4169	1.0660
	21 years and above	-.64211	.35343	.370	-1.6249	.3407
16-20 years	Below five years	1.30769*	.40797	.015	.1732	2.4422
	6-10 years	.25641	.47839	.983	-1.0739	1.5867
	11-15 years	.17544	.44642	.995	-1.0660	1.4169
	21 years and above	-.46667	.44282	.829	-1.6981	.7647
21 years and above	Below five years	1.77436*	.30342	.000	.9306	2.6181
	6-10 years	.72308	.39304	.357	-.3699	1.8161
	11-15 years	.64211	.35343	.370	-.3407	1.6249
	16-20 years	.46667	.44282	.829	-.7647	1.6981

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this is my original work and has not been submitted to any other college, institution or university other than Addis Ababa University for academic credit.

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Kedir Aymelo (GSR / 2312 / 08)

This thesis has been presented for examination with my approval as the appointed supervisor.

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Associate Professor Befekadu Zeleke (PhD)

Chapter One

Introduction

This part deals with a brief background explanation of the study and states the problem. It also contains objectives, significance of the study, delimitations of the study, limitations of the study, and operational definitions key terms and organization of the study.

1.1. Background of the Study

Schools are social organizations established to facilitate the teaching learning process. The goals of the teaching learning process are to change and mold the behavior of students. Hence, the accomplishment of this goal depends mainly on the performance of teachers. In this regard Stronge & Tucker, (2003) reported that evaluation of teachers is important because without capable, high quality teachers' classrooms, no educational reform effort can possibly succeed. They further reported that the core of education is teaching and learning, which can be achieved by having effective teachers. So effective teachers can only be seen when there are high quality evaluation systems, (Stronge & Tucker, 2003, p. 3). Therefore, teachers have to be continuously motivated and upgraded so as to achieve the goals and objective of education effectively and to improve the quality of teaching.

Performance Appraisal can be defined as a system that involves setting employee standards, looking at employees' actual job performance, assessing that performance against the standards, giving feedback to the employee on the performance, how to improve it in the future and setting new goals and expectations for another period (Dessler, 2008). Employee appraisal has been one of the most widely studied areas within Human Resource Management literature. It's an essential component of HRM in most organizations and one of the most vital responsibilities for human resource and line managers.

In this regard performance management provide the information in schools about: the purpose of performance appraisal in school is to ensure that effective teachers continue in the classrooms, to foster professional growth of new and continuing teachers, to promote school

improvement and the enhancement of student learning and to ensure that best qualified teachers are hired (Millman and Linda, 1990).

Having decided the purpose of evaluation, the school must design an evaluation plan to achieve these purposes. According to Webb and Norton (1999:381),” Evaluation plan has three major elements which, in effect, involve answers to three questions: what will be evaluated? (The criteria (what level of performance is expected? (The standard), and how well evidence be collected? (Media and data collected)”

According to (Moorhead & Griffin, 1992), performance appraisal was introduced in the United States of America in the 1940s during the Second World War as a method of justifying employees’ wages. It was then known as merit rating. Whereas, in Ethiopia teacher’s performance evaluation was introduced along with the beginning of inspection in 1934 for the first time as a method to control and inspect the institutional process (Hailesselassie, 1996:12). Berhanu (2006:7) reported that, since 1995, in addition to administrative evaluation, students’ and parents’ evaluation of teachers’ performance had been in effect at elementary and secondary government schools. Recently, since 2004 result-oriented teachers performance appraisal was introduced in line with Federal Civil Service Commission (FCSC). However, there have been problems in the implementation, thereby, many teachers complain and do not have a positive attitude toward result-oriented teacher performance appraisal (Yilma 2007).

Performance appraisal as one of the essential tool of Human Resource Management, it can have many purposes in organizations. According to Mathis and Jackson (1997: p. 344), “performance appraisal (PA) has two roles in organizations: to measure performance and development of individual potential”. Consequently, PA can be an important tool for supporting and improving the quality of teaching. Unfortunately, teacher evaluation too frequently has been viewed not as vehicle for growth and improvement, but rather as a formality that must be endured (Stronge & Tucker, 1999). However, teacher performance evaluation and professional development should be viewed as the inseparable pair. According to Thomas (1984), “The main purpose of evaluation should be to provide information to help teachers improve their teaching performance. Accordingly, a good evaluation system should reflect respect for individual worth and dignity by encouraging teachers to set personal and organizational objectives”. (p.2). Further, a crucial

element in teacher evaluation systems is its link to teacher professional development and school improvement. As Wheeler & Scriven in 2006 stated, the existence of clear criteria and standards of performance are seen as a key factor for quality teacher evaluation systems. (As Iraki (2013) cited).

Performance appraisal is about documenting the quality of teachers' performance, helping them improve and hold them accountable for their work (Stronge, 2006). To this effect the importance of a quality teacher evaluation system is paramount. However, the obsolete evaluation system, exclusion of students' feedback, untrained evaluators and decreased motivation for the process are the potential hindering factors for performance appraisal systems (Rasheed, 2011). Moreover Stronge (2010) identified that performance appraisal is collaboration, cooperation, communication and commitment in disguise. All these factors contribute towards quality of teachers. In other words, if a quality system is to be developed, it is important to look at the ways in which both appraisers and appraisees see the appraisal process and the relationship between them.

Performance appraisal is a process that involves determining and communicating to an employee how he/she performing the job and ideally establishing a plan of improvement. According to Gorton (1983) cited in Tatek (2012) recommends the principals, the assistance principals, unit leaders, and department heads jointly appraise teachers. For effective Teachers' Performance Appraisal System (TPAS) to happen, school principals must ensure that these stallholders are well trained in appraisal procedures and their active participation in the process of implementation. In support of this Stronge & Toker (1999) asserted that teachers and other stakeholders should be educated on the role, purpose and importance of evaluation as a part of their regular professional life. Hence, performance appraisal affective and clearly explained to employees, there is a high chance that it could be implemented with a high degree of importance and tolerability. According to Melaku (2010:41) multiple appraisal approach such as peer appraisal, student appraisal and self-appraisal are also vital to reduce appraisal errors and create trust and confidence in the school organization.

Given these vital roles of the teacher's performance appraisal to the development of teachers and the students' achievements, the researcher initiated to conduct this study.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

In educational institutions as in the other organizations, the teachers' performance appraisal has become equally an integral part of the management activities. To this line, in schools teachers' performance appraisal is continuously undertaken to assist in identification, measurement and development of the teachers work so that the aims and objectives of the school are more effectively realized while along benefiting the teachers in terms of recognition of performance, professional advancement and career support (Schuler et al 1992; as cited by Tatek, 2014:25).

However, PA of teachers in high school is affected by some challenges. According to the Ontario Report on Teachers Performance Appraisal Systems (2006), the current teacher PA system requires experienced teachers to be appraised every 3 years, with two appraisals in their evaluation year. The Report notes that teachers receive an overall rating of exemplary good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. If unsatisfactory rating, the principal and teacher need to prepare an improvement plan outlining the steps that the teacher should take to improve his or her performance and the support that would be provided in order to carry them out.

According to Yamoah (2013), if teachers' performance appraisal is practiced properly with additional motivation teachers could perform excellently. In addition, the proper development and implementation of performance appraisal can result in sustainable improvement in school organizations performance. However, "teachers' performance evaluation has not proved to be an easy task to successfully accomplish in many school systems. The task of teachers' performance evaluation has been troublesome to both teachers and their evaluators" (Melaku, 1992: 90). Whereas, according to Armstrong and Baron (2002) if the performance appraisal system of development and practice are misguided, then all efforts will remain futile exercises, which could lead to wastage of resources.

The findings of different research conducted on the practice of teachers performance appraisal in primary and secondary schools of different Regions and Zones of our country have shown that, there was a number of problems in TPA process that prevent it from serving the purpose for which it is established. Endale (2015) assessed the practice and problems of teachers' performance appraisal in the secondary schools of Wolaita Zone, SNNPR. His mixed methods study, involving

six interviews and surveys of 10 principals and 120 teachers concluded that the implementation of TPA in their schools is characterized by; lack of validity and reliability of performance appraisal criteria, inadequate classroom observation for performance appraisal, less participation of school supervisors in performance appraisal process, the absence of pre and post-appraisal meeting and lack of training on the TPA.

In addition, Tatek in 2012 also examined the Oromiya's Region practice of performance appraisal and teachers reaction in secondary schools of west Hararghe zone. His mixed methods study, involving interviews with 14 principals and supervisors and a survey of 145 teachers and appraisers (i.e. unit leaders, department heads, vice principal) concluded that majority of teachers are not motivated by the current practice, not satisfied with the feedback, they didn't believe the essentiality to conduct performance evaluation in their school, this results in conflict. Moreover, there is a trend of giving more emphasis on the administrative purpose than developmental, which is for career structure of teachers. Hence, the current TPA didn't distinguish effective performers from ineffective and its process is not implemented on time and didn't follow the process of appraisal.

Further vice principals routinely complete the required forms which are then filed and the subject not mentioned again until the next review period, usually a year. Hence schools TPAS do not have clearly established corporate objectives for undertaking performance review and don't apply appropriate procedures. A survey study conducted in Amhara and Oromiya Regions on 130 and 64 Secondary school teachers respectively reported that, teachers and principals had negative attitude towards TPA criteria (Birhanu, 2006 and Kibre, 2005).(as cited by Yilma, 2007)

Furthermore, Yilma in 2007 examined the practice and problems of TPA in primary schools of Halaba special Woreda. He employed mixed methods of the study, involving interviews with 13 teachers, principals and officials of education and survey of 110 teachers and principals concluded that majority of teachers and school principals didn't have favorable attitude towards TPA criteria. Moreover, teachers were not fully involved in developing the appraisal criteria. Teachers also complained that the principals were not knowledgeable in appraising their performance. The research also revealed the following as major problems of TPA; in adequate training was given to teachers and principals, TPA criteria neglected teachers' behavior, teachers were appraised by the

principal alone, no grievance committee was formed at school level and there was no any support given to the school from officials of education.

Based on above evidences one can clearly understand that there are various flaws of performance appraisal in Ethiopian schools. Some research has been previously done on this area, but it has seemed to focus more on the practice and challenges of performance appraisal and not so much on the perception of teachers about PAS. However, these studies did not answer many questions regarding the root problems in the implementation of the current TPA that still caused teachers and principals to have negative attitude towards its implementation.

Although, Yilma in 2007 conducted survey study on practice of TPA in primary schools in my study area; there is no research based evidence concerning teacher's perception towards teachers' performance appraisal system in secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda. It is therefore vital to conduct a study on the perception of teachers, in government secondary schools. Furthermore, perceptions keep changing with time, a gap that this study seeks to address.

To this effect, the study was intended to answer the following basic

1. What is the perception of teachers toward the purposes of their performance appraisal in the Government Secondary Schools of Halaba special Woreda?
2. What is the perception of teachers toward the process of their performance appraisal in secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda?
3. What is the perception of teachers toward the criteria used in their performance appraisal in secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda?
4. What elements of effective performance appraisal are present in the secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda?
5. What are the major challenges encountered in the implementation of teachers' performance appraisal in secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda?
6. Is there difference of perception between male and female teachers?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective

The overall aim of this study is to look at the performance appraisal system from teachers' point of view and to give recommendations based on the principles and concepts in the literature review, and the empirical findings of the study.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study were:

1. To assess to the perception of teachers toward the purposes of TPA.
2. To describe the perception of teachers toward the process of their PA.
3. To elaborate the perception of teachers toward the criteria used in their PA.
4. To examine whether the elements of an effective performance appraisal are present in the schools.
5. To identify the challenges in implementation of TPA in GSS of Halaba special Woreda.
6. To examine statistical differences between male and female teachers and their perception on PAS.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study attempted to investigate how TPA system has been practiced in Halaba special Woreda and the problems from perspective of teachers. The information gathered may help the teachers and school leaders in the training of teachers on the importance of performance appraisal. The school leaders may be able to identify whether the performance appraisal is effective or not and take the necessary action. The teachers can also make the necessary suggestions on how the performance appraisals systems can be improved and structured to motivate teachers to perform effectively thus improve the quality of education in government secondary schools.

The study is significant in that the findings may benefit the Ministry of Education (MoE), Regional Education Bureau, Woreda Education Office, teachers and teacher educators in various ways. The

MoE, Regional Education Bureau, and Woreda Education Office are hard pressed to improve the quality of teaching and learning in our schools. This can only happen through effectiveness of teachers, which relies on effective performance appraisal. The study findings may help the Ministry and other concerned bureaus by pointing to the weaknesses of the current approach to teacher appraisal in the country, and suggesting possible remedies. The study could advise the schools on areas that need improvement in evaluation process.

Teachers, like all other employees, need to appreciate the role of appraisal as positive tool towards job improvement and career advancement. The study findings may point this to teachers thereby changing any negative perceptions about the exercise. For teacher trainers such as teacher-training colleges and Universities, the findings could point to the areas of weakness in the teacher appraisal system and thereby suggest ways through which future educational leaders out to be trained in relation to performance appraisal. The study may also add to the existing body of research on teachers' performance appraisals.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

This study was delimited to assess teachers' performance appraisal system in secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda. Halaba special Woreda is found in Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Region. The investigator focused on his study to assess of the issues related to the teachers' performance appraisal system, perceived purpose of TPA, perceived criteria and perceived process of TPA and challenges affecting its implementation and other related issues involved in the study. In addition to this presence of principles and effective characteristics of PA in GSS of Halaba special Woreda was also examined. The study delimited to all the seven government secondary (9-10) schools, teachers, principals, vice principals, and supervisors in secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

Absence of well-organized records and documents at government secondary schools and Halaba special Woreda has contributed for some of the limitations of the research. The other limitation of the research occurred on collecting distributed questionnaires. Some respondents

failed to return questionnaires; and because of this, data analysis was made only on the collected questionnaires.

In addition, the reluctance of some respondents to fill and return the questionnaires has limited the study. 10 (9%) of the sample respondents did so. Some school leaders showed reluctance to give adequate time for interview and a few of them were limited not to give adequate information when interviewed. However, regardless of those minor limitations the research was completed successfully.

The findings of the study were not affected due to above challenges. This is because the researcher solved those problems by re-distributing questionnaires for teachers with the help of Woreda supervisors and school principals. Besides, to enhance the accuracy of the findings interview and document reviews were incorporated in data collection and data analysis was done only on the successfully collected questionnaires.

1.7 Operational Definitions of Key Terms

The following definitions are used for terms in the thesis.

Appraisal: is a systematic evaluation of teachers' job performance in the teaching and learning process by principals, head teachers and unit leaders, (Tatek, 2014).

Perception: is the attitude towards policies concerned with pay, recognition, promotion and quality of working life, and the influence of the group with whom they identify (Armstrong, 2006).

Performance Appraisal: The process of evaluating how well employees do their job to a set of standards and the communication of that information to the employees (Mathis and Jackson, 1997)

Secondary Education: Grades 9-10 (secondary first cycle) provide general secondary education and, upon completion, students are streamed either into grades 11-12 (secondary second cycle) as preparation for university, or into technical and vocational education and training (TVET), based on performance in the secondary education completion certificate examination. (Gen. Edu. Quality Improvement Package, 2008).

Teacher performance appraisal: The process of determining how well a teacher has fulfilled his/her teaching responsibilities by using a variety of methods of data collection. (Iraki, 2013)

1.8 Organization of the Study

The study is organized in to five chapters. The first chapter deals with introduction, the second chapter presents review of related literature, the third chapter is concerned with research design and methodology, the fourth chapter deals with data presentation, analysis and interpretation and finally the fifth chapter presents the summary of major findings, conclusion and recommendations.

Chapter Two

2. Review of Related Literature

This chapter is devoted to treating some important topics which are related to the system of appraising the performance of employees in general and that of school teachers in particular. The topics to be dealt with are: the notion of performance appraisal; the purposes of performance appraisal; approaches of performance appraisal; the process of performance appraisal, the criteria of performance appraisal; the methods and practices of performance appraisal; principles of effective characteristics of performance appraisal system and problems in performance appraisal. Finally an overview of practices of system of appraising school teachers in Ethiopia is presented.

2.1. Definitions and Concepts of Performance Appraisal

Performance means “a basic instructional method in which the trainee is required to perform, under controlled conditions, the operation, skills, or movement being taught” (Tracey, 1998: 391). Performance appraisal is defined as evaluating employees how well do their jobs according to performance standards (Dessler, 2000; 321). After an employee has been selected for a job, has been trained for it, and has worked for a period of time, her or his performance should be reviewed. So, performance appraisal is one of the most significant topics in Human Resource Management.

Traditional performance appraisal relies on economic reward and the threat of punishment to motivate employees to reach desired performance. But this concept does not hold true anymore. Today, performance appraisal is used for developmental and motivational purposes in the organizations.

Performance appraisal system has a value of a back bone of every organization. The performance appraisal processes vital part of the HRM in the organization. Performance appraisal (PA) defines and measures the performance of the employees. It is a tool for assessing the performance of the employees and in turn the organization. Decision Support System which acts as a performance Appraisal System to monitor the performance of employees in any organization (Iraki, 2013).

Performance appraisal is not a still evaluation activity, but a dynamic process, which should be viewed as follows: planning the employees’ performance, evaluation, and improving the

performance of the employees'. This process brings the new concept: performance management (Kaynak et al., 2000: 205). This concept is essential for today's organization to integrate the management goals and employee performance. Performance management is concerned with: aligning individual objectives to organizational objectives and encouraging individuals to uphold corporate core values; enabling expectations to be defined and agreed in terms of role responsibilities and accountabilities (expected to do), skills (expected to have) and behaviors (expected to be); providing opportunities for individuals to identify their own goals and develop their skills and competencies. (Armstrong, 2009)

Performance Appraisal is defined by different scholars of human resource management in different time. Therefore, some theories of those scholars have been discussed as follows:

Performance appraisal may be defined as the process by which superiors evaluate the performance of subordinates, typically on an annual or semiannual basis for the purpose of determining raises, promotions, or training needs (Grote, 2011). Moreover, according to Beer, as cited in Lorch, (1987) performance appraisal is defined as: "...a system of papers and procedures designed by the organization for use by its managers and an interpersonal process in which manager and subordinate communicate and attempt to influence each other"(P.291).

According to the author, performance appraisal has two major components: The appraisal system and the appraisal process. The performance appraisal system is the specified mechanism (e.g. objectives, participants, procedures, criteria, rating scales etc.) that is used to guide and regulate the process of performance evaluation. The appraisal process refers to the interpersonal process in which the supervisor and the subordinate communicate and attempt to influence each other through the feedback interview. It is concerned with how performance appraisal is actually implemented and carried out in an organization. Further, Performance appraisal is defined as: "an evaluation and grading exercise undertaken by an organization on all its employees either periodically or annually, on the outcomes of performance based on the job content, job requirement and personal behavior in the position" (Yong, 1996:436).

Therefore, HR development, begins with the orientation of new employees, HR training and development, and also includes the necessary information to accommodate technological changes.

Encouraging development of all employees including supervisors and managers is necessary to prepare organizations for future challenges.

Finally, “performance evaluation”, according to the United States Office of Personnel Management, means “all periodic written assessment of job performance measured against responsibilities, goals and/or tasks, specific duties assigned and agreed to as well as identification of strengths and weaknesses demonstrated by employee’s potential and training or development needs” (US/OPM, 1980). The merit of this definition is that it sees performance evaluation as a regular and continuous process by which the quality, quantity and levels of performance and the various factors that influence performance are assessed and evaluated. It also involves an appraisal of the growth potential of an employee, with a view to providing the organization with information that not only leads to positive actions but also ensures that individuals are provided with necessary feedback for performance improvements, personal growth and job satisfaction.

Different scholars give different names to performance appraisal: it is also known as a performance assessment, merit rating, efficiency rating, performance review, performance evaluation, and (career) development discussion or employee appraisal (Ivancevich, 2004). As most scholars agree performance appraisal is a method by which the job performance of an employee is documented and evaluated. Performance appraisal is one of the three core functions of a performance management system. In education, performance evaluation of teachers mainly focuses on improving instruction as well as it emphasize up on discovering strong and weak points in the teacher performance as a means of contributing and improving the teacher's service and continues professional growth.

2.2. Purposes/Aims of Performance Appraisal Systems

Performance appraisal is one element of the performance management process which involves different measurements throughout the organizations but it is the element which is important if organization is to take advantage of their most important asset employees and gain human capital advantage. There are other processes within the organizations such as technology and design but it is the human factor which is the most difficult to replicate and therefore the most valuable (Armstrong & Baron 2005) strategy implementation and delivery of the organizational strategic

target is the best accomplished through high performance people (Thomas, 1984) and it is the development of these people which performance appraisal seek to advance. This is not the only identified purpose for performance appraisal.

In order to develop a performance appraisal system /process it is important to understand what purpose appraisal serve. Even so often, the senior management of company come together and outlines the goal and for the company over a specified time frame. The performance appraisal helps employers and employees understand how well those goals are being met. The employer already knows whether a goal has been achieved. But, may not understand how or why the results are the way they are, just as important individual employees need to understand how they have performance in regard to the company's goal, and the goals set for them personally (Dessler, 2008).

The appraisal process also gives the employees and superior on opportunity to work on carrier planning. Once supervisor understands the employee's personal long term goals, he/she can help design a plan to help further the employee's goals (Dessler, 2008). This may induce recommending training options or even letting the employees in functional area outside their normal responsibilities. There are several reasons to appraise performance. An accurately conducted performance appraisal produces data useful for a variety of organization and individual purpose. Many authors list it in different ways.

There are three key reasons why every organization should give performance reviews: (Performance Appraisal, 2006).

- Performance appraisals help employees become better employees by providing feedback about their weaknesses and strengths
- Performance appraisal measurement can help determine employee compensation, training needs and promotion.
- Performance appraisals can protect organizations against legal cases when countering to claims of illegal activities.

According to Dick Grote (2002), an effective performance appraisal system will help you achieve all the ends- and –more by providing a solid foundation for all aspects of the employer/employee relationship. Such a system can help manager:

- Providing feedback to employees about their performance
- Determining who gets promoted
- Facilitating layoff or downsizing decision
- Encouraging performance improvement
- Motivating superior performance
- Setting and measuring goals
- Counseling poor performers
- Determining compensation changes
- Encouraging coaching and mentoring
- Supporting man power planning or succession planning
- Determining individual training and developmental needs
- Providing legal defensibility for personnel decisions
- Improving overall organizational performance

As it has been described by Armstrong (2000), a performance appraisal function is not a one shot activity; it rather follows evolutionary and continuous processes on measuring employees' performance. The performance appraisal process lets supervisors and employees to sit and discuss on general feedbacks gained through the appraisal system.

The purpose of performance appraisals can be classified in a number of ways. McGregor (1987) groups the objectives in three categories; first, they are used for administrative reasons to provide an orderly way of determining promotions, transfers and salary increases. Second, they are used for informative purposes, i.e., they supply data to management on the performance of employees and to individual employees on each person's particular performance. Third, these appraisal are used to motivate staff so that they can develop themselves and improve their performance through experiential learning (McGregor 1987).

Heneman et al (1996, pp. 340) have also categorized the general uses of performance appraisal into three:

Administration Decisions: This aspect of performance appraisal provides decision makers with tangible source of information to carry out promotion, layoff, termination, transfer and salary increment assignments. The results of performance appraisal can also be used to examine the proper positions that should be assumed by employees to exert their maximum effort on meeting organizational objectives.

Mathis and Jackson (1997, pp.334) moreover state the administrative aspect of PA as follows: PA system is often the link between the reward employees hope to receive and their productivity. Decisions on promotion, termination layoff, and transfer assignments are some of the administrative use of PA that are very important to employees. When organizations terminate, promote or pay people differently, PAs are necessary as they are a crucial defense if employees sue over such decisions.

Employee feedback and development: the other use of performance appraisal lies on providing reflection of employees' position against performance objectives and organizational expectations. Performance appraisal can be major source of information and feedback for employees, which is the key for their future development. As long as managers are provided with improvement areas on employees' performance, they can easily come up with appropriate intervention mechanisms to alleviate employees' performance gaps.

The performance appraisal system creates conducive environment for continuous discussions made with immediate supervisors on areas of improvements. The development aspect of performance appraisal mostly focuses on performance improvements on individual basis; but at times, it can embrace teams that work assignments together.

Evaluation of policies and programs implemented: Performance appraisal data are potentially useful for use in every human resource function areas such as in every human resource planning and development of employee potential. Apart from the purposes of performance appraisal on individual basis, it can give substantial information for revising organizational policies and programs.

Although lists of purposes vary in content and length. Millman and Linda (1990:159) listed four purposes for which teachers' evaluation can be used. These are:

1. **Accountability:** to ensure that effective teachers continue in the classrooms
2. **Professional growth:** to foster professional growth of new and continuing teachers.
3. **School improvement:** to promote school improvement and the enhancement of student learning.
4. **Selection:** to ensure that best qualified teachers are hired.

Hence, the purpose of PA comprises both the improvement of the performance of the individuals and that of the institution. That is by enhancing and maximizing educational opportunities of students through teachers' professional development, both institutional and individual growth can be brought about.

In a more comprehensive way, Michael Beer (1987) described the two major goals of performance appraisal as follows: Organization and individual employees. He argued that both individual and organizational goals are not always compatible and results in conflict of interest in performance appraisals. As a result it brought up a mixed blessing to both the supervisor and the subordinates.

From the perspectives of the organization, Performance appraisals serve two basic goals:

- a) **Evaluation goals:** the evaluation goals are primarily designed to give feedback to subordinates so they know where they stand, to develop valid data for pay (salary and bonus) and promotion decisions and to provide a means of communicating these decisions, and to help the manager in making discharge and retention decisions and to provide a means of warning subordinates about unsatisfactory performance.
- b) **coaching and development goals:** the coaching and development goals are to be used to counsel and coach subordinates so that they will improve their performance and develop future potential, to develop commitment to the larger organizations through discussion of career opportunities and career planning, to motivate subordinates through recognition and support, to strengthen supervisor-subordinate relations, and to diagnose individual and organizational problems.

This is a fundamental division and one on which appraisal of teaching can founder. Equally, the custody and use of appraisal information is both sensitive and critical to the success of teaching appraisal, and it is important that information is gathered with great candour and clarity of the purposes to which it will be put.

Nevertheless, despite the dichotomy of purposes, strategies which will meet many goals of both groups are possible. For example, the effectiveness of staff is a major determinant of institutional effectiveness. This can be monitored by an institutional appraisal scheme. Equally, the institution can work towards the creation of a working environment where academic staff obtains intrinsic and socially derived satisfactions. This, in turn, will raise motivation and performance of academic staff. Overall, the end is the same, but the means are very different.

Properly designed and implemented teachers' performance appraisal results in the professional development of teachers, teachers' job satisfaction, and ultimately the academic performance of the learner. If performance appraisal is conducted in unplanned manner, teachers' performance appraisal becomes haphazard, unsystematic, a source of conflict between appraisers and appraisees, and a source of inaccurate performance data that lead to subjective personnel decisions (West and Bollington, 1990). Due to this, teachers become less confident on accepting performance results as true reflections of their achievements.

The more teachers perceive evaluations of their performance to be sound, the more legitimate they will deem the evaluation system and the more effort they will devote to tasks upon which they are evaluated (Millman and Linda 1990:40). In line with this, to let teachers adore their profession and get motivated through their daily activities, performance appraisal should be carried out objectively in a way that clearly identifies their strong and weak sides.

While teacher appraisals can have various purposes, nearly all are intended to improve teaching performance and/or strengthen accountability.

Teacher appraisal for improvement also referred to as developmental appraisal or formative appraisal provides feedback that aims to help improve teaching practices, largely through professional development. It is usually conducted by the individual school and may not always be regulated nationally. By identifying individual teachers' strengths and weaknesses, teachers and

school leaders can make more informed choices about the specific professional-development activities that best meet teachers' needs in the context of the school's priorities.

Teacher appraisal for accountability, also referred to as summative appraisal, focuses on holding teachers accountable for their performance. As such, this type of appraisal can have a range of consequences for teachers' careers. The appraisal aims to provide summary information about a teacher's past practices and performance, gathered at various points during his or her career, relative to what is considered "good" teaching, and to establish incentives for teachers to perform at their best. This type of appraisal may involve external evaluators, and it usually entails consequences for the teacher, such as career advancement, bonus pay, or the possibility of sanctions for underperformance.

In general, these are the purposes of performance appraisal which apply to personnel in education as well as in other sectors. It should be noted that the purposes of the appraisal scheme determine the nature and content of the appraisal criteria and the appraisal process as well. Thus from the very beginning in the design of the system, the purpose of the performance appraisal program should be clearly defined and known both by appraisers and appraisees.

2.3 Approaches of Performance Evaluation

Performance appraisal is conducted in organizations at different intervals based on their stated internal policies. Performance appraisal process can be conducted either by waiting for some specific time intervals of the year; or it can be used regularly without waiting for specific intervals. The two approaches are mostly taken as complementary; they are made into use interchangeably. According to Webb and Norton (1992) and Duke (1995), these two common approaches are termed as formative and summative evaluations.

2.3.1. Formative Evaluation

Formative evaluation is mainly focused on providing teachers with feedbacks which are meant to improve their day-to-day performance in their profession. Formative evaluation focuses on tracking their progress towards meeting organizational goals.

According to Duke (1995:46): “the formative aspect of the evaluation cycle occurs when judgment in the form of narratives was reported to teachers during the course of conference scheduled with a few days of class room observations.”

Formative evaluation is a continuous evaluation process which is aimed at providing constructive feedbacks to the employee assuming self-improvement as a core purpose. Formative evaluation maintains regular and uninterrupted communication between evaluators and evaluatees so that timely remedial actions can be taken at times when there are performance deviations. This type of evaluation creates opportunities to address issues related to employees’ continual professional development rather than administrative decisions.

2.3.2. Summative Evaluation

As the word implies, summative evaluation is geared towards making major decisions on teachers’ performance at the end of a semester or academic year. In summative evaluation, teachers’ overall performance is measured against their job descriptions and job standards. Duke (1995:45) stated that: “the summative evaluation system was intended to allow organizational decision such as promotion, tenure, contract renewal, and staff development programs to be made on the basis of observed conditions of practice.”

Summative evaluation is conducted on periodical basis, mostly once and twice a year, with a purpose of taking administrative decisions. Its objectives is not to improve or take remedial action to the short comings seen during ongoing performance, rather it is more used for managerial decision on employee promotion or layoff. In similar way, Webb and Norton (1992:379) stated that “summative evaluation is designed to assess the terminal behavior or overall performance.”

2.4 Performance Appraisal Process

Performance appraisal for teachers is an ongoing process. It consists of two complementary types of evaluation: formative and summative. The former is the process of gathering performance data, analyzing it, and using the results to provide feedback for the purpose of improving teaching. The latter is the process of using performance data to judge the quality of teaching in the light of the county’s established criteria for teacher performance. Thus, performance appraisal is a key to

check whether employees are performing their job effectively or not. So organizations should plan carefully appraisal system and its sequence of steps. According to Muhammad (2013) performance appraisal process involves five steps.

2.4.1 Identifying key Performance Criteria

The most challenging aspect when setting performance appraisal is what to assess. The main dimensions of performance to be assessed by performance appraisal are competencies, behaviors, results or outcomes and organizational citizenship behaviors' (Muhammad, 2013).

Criteria are defined as, "The job related behaviors expected of the teacher, administrator, or other staff member" (Valentine 1992) as cited by (Web and Norton, 1999:381). Accordingly, they described three types of criteria for evaluation plans:

1. **Trait or attribute criteria:** - the assumption using this criterion is that, there are definable traits that are necessary for good performance. That is trait criteria describe what the employee is, rather than what the employees does. Performance trait such as aggressiveness, tolerance of the stress, creativity, self-confidence, adaptability, leadership, personal integrity, emotional balance and enthusiasm can offer the teaching-learning process in positive or negative ways. There are also other personal qualities which affect the teaching learning process. For example, personality, appearance, sociability, comments, cooperation and etc. Ginsberg and berry 1990 as cited by Web and Norton (1999:383) wrote that, "Although most schools don't rely heavily on trait criteria today. Some trait criteria such as dependability and personal appearance are still found in many evaluation systems.
2. **Result based criteria:** - the rationale for this approach is that, teachers and administration should achieve certain objectives and that their performance can be meaningfully assessed by examining the extent to which those objectives have been accomplished.
3. **Performance-based criteria:**-according to this criterion, teacher's and administration's behavior to do specific tasks should be evaluated or assessed.

Regarding to the above discussion the criteria for appraising employees' performance should focus on such job related areas of work as quality of work performed, quantity of work done and how well the employee gets along with others at work. to put this in to effect, the PA criteria are

required to be clearly identified and well developed. Donnely et.al. (1992:42) write “an important and necessary step in developing PA system is the development of criteria that indicate successful performance.” However, this does not mean that we avoid subjective factors such as initiative, enthusiasm, loyalty, and cooperation. Unless such factors can be clearly shown to be job related, they should not be used in formal evaluation (Donnely et.al, 1992). Thus, criteria of PA must be valid and reliable.

Similarly, teacher’s performance criteria are statements of standards against which a teacher’s competency in accomplishing specified teaching activities is measured (Melaku 1992:19). He further elaborates that “effective performance criteria to measure teacher’s competence are expected to possess three major characteristics: Validity, Reliability and Utility. That is, for an appraisal criterion to be valid, it should be relevant and related to the appraisee’s specific performance. For it to be reliable, it must be consistent in producing the same result over time and for different appraisers. Utility of appraisal criteria, on the other hand, refers to the balance between the time and effort spent in administering the criteria, and the possibility of getting accurate and reliable information on the performance of the appraisee.

To make performance appraisal criteria relevant to the work place, practice and acceptable to appraiser and employee:

- Performance criteria should be based on an up to date job description and
- Performance criteria should be developed by consultation with appraiser and employee.

The participation of employees in the development of appraisal criteria and measures makes the employee to accept and being satisfied with the appraisal system. Some of the strategies to participate employees are:

- Making formal and informal meeting and discussions with supervisor.
- Including self-appraisals in the appraisal process.
- Give opportunities for employees to contribute to the performance appraisal of coworkers and managers/ supervisors.
- Creating good employees perception about the equitability and fairness of the appraisal system.

In brief, performance criteria are statements of standards against which accomplishing specified a teacher's competence in teaching and learning activities is assessed. Thus, the criteria for appraising teachers' performance must be carefully identified, clearly understood, and mutually agreed - upon by both the appraisers and the appraisees.

2.4.2 Develop Appraisal Measures

The second step on the performance appraisal is how to assess the employee performance. It should be made on structured and systematic way or approach. Unstructured approach will cause problems like, increase chance of appraiser's error, knowledge, skill and abilities critical to job performance may be overlooked, and reduced consistency between appraisal and perception of subjectivity in evaluations may occur (Muhammad 2013).

According to Muhammad (2013) there are three important considerations in the design of appraisal measures:

- i. Generic versus individually tailored measures

Many workplaces use a generic or uniform rating format for all employees irrespective of their role or position within the organization. "The one size fit all" approach of generic measures may overlook important performance criteria that are relevant to particular job, and may also include criteria that are irrelevant to others. Although it saves time and cost, but it affects the accuracy and relevance of appraisal negatively. When time and other resource permits, it is more appropriate to construct appraisal formats tailored to specific jobs or families of jobs.

- i. Objective versus subjective Assessment

Objective measures of job performance involve counts of various work-related behaviors. Some common objective performance measures include, number of absenteeism, number of incidents at work and lateness. Objective measures can be relatively quick and easy to obtain, however, an exclusive focus on results or outcomes may mask factors that impact on employee's performance that are beyond their control. Subjective measures rely on the judgment of an appraiser (self, coworker or supervisor). Subjective assessments are commonly used in performance appraisals and often involve the use of rating scales.

ii. Assessing the Impact of the Work Environment on Performance

The goal of performance appraisal is to support and improve employee's performance and effectiveness. Therefore work environment factors that help or hinder employee's capacity to perform effectively should be included to be assessed by appraisal.

2.4.3 Collect Performance Information from Different Sources

After the appraisal measures are developed, the next step is collection of accurate performance information (Muhammad, 2013). Observation of employees just before conducting appraisal will give an in accurate picture of employee's performance. Ideally, employee's performance should be observed in a systematic way through time. But high workload of managers or supervisors may limit opportunities to conduct regular observation of employee's performance. In addition perception of ongoing monitoring may increase sense of surveillance, which can damage staff morale.

Sources of performance appraisal information:

I. Managers/ Supervisor Appraisals

According to Robert and John (2012) managers/ supervisors play a central role in the appraisal process, and should always be included as one of the main appraiser. They play two roles, judge (assessing performance) and coach (providing constructive feedback and identifying areas of improvement).

II. Self-Appraisals/ Report

Self-rating is a process in which individuals review their own performance, using a structured approach, as the basis for discussions with their supervisors in review meetings (Armstrong, 2006, p.95). Further, Muhammad (2013) stated it as the process of evaluating one's own performance and it increases employees' effort to appraisal process, positive perception to fairness of appraisal and satisfaction with the appraisal process. In addition it helps to know areas for development, but it usually biased towards leniency (Muhammad, 2013).

III. Coworker/peer Appraisals

Particularly where teamwork occurs, coworkers can provide important feedback on performance. Most of the time coworkers are more aware about employee's performance than managers and supervisors (Robert & John, 2012). More over as there is more than one coworker who rate an employee's performance, it increases its reliability. However, coworker evaluation may be exposed to friendship bias in the organization and also if it is used to compare employees for incentive and reward it may result a negative impact on teamwork and cooperation. So it is recommended that coworker appraisals be used for professional development rather than administrative decisions.

IV. Subordinate Appraisal

Regarding different aspects of supervisors or leaders' performance, subordinates are valuable source of information (Robert & John, 2012). By making them to provide feedback and comment on managerial performance they can develop their managerial skill. This source of appraisal may only appropriate in larger organizations where there are sufficient subordinates to allow anonymity.

VI. Customer Appraisal

Customers also have given the chance to evaluate workers within the organization. Customers can be people outside the organization, who use the product or service of the organization and suppliers. Customers can also be people within the organization, who are working in other departments. When the worker has frequent and routine contact with internal and external customers of the organization, we involve customers in the evaluation process. This enables us to know how customers feel about employee's interaction. Especially external customers should be given more attention because if they are upset about the interaction with the organization employee, they have the capability to go to our neighbor with their business. Internal customers also create paramount problem on the organization due to conflict between departments. So customer evaluation is important to check those reactions (Robert & John, 2012).

VII. 360 degree evaluations

In this method, all parties who have either direct or indirect say on employees performance will be invited to involve during the evaluation process. Immediate supervisors, team members, customers, peers, subordinates and self-participate in the evaluation process with different weights to each group of raters. This method has been found to be useful in many instances to diagnose some traits like inter-personal skills, customer satisfaction and team building skills. One of the biggest advantages of this system is that assessors cannot afford to neglect any constituency and has to show all round performance. However, on the negative side, receiving feedback from multiple sources can be intimidating, threatening, and expensive and time consuming (Shaw *et al.*, 2008).

In school contexts, 360 degree appraisal encourages participation of other teachers (peers), students, parents and self to participate on the appraisal process. This method assures the addition of different perspectives on the appraisal process so that decisions made by immediate supervisors can be supported by all major stakeholders who are directly or indirectly involved in the education system. On implementing the 360 degree appraisal, it is very important to make sure that all appraisers who participate in the process have good knowledge about appraisal system; they should have substantial knowledge and understanding about job expectations of teachers.

How judgments are made is critically important. Too much weight can be given to a narrow range of evidence, for example students' examination performance. Triangulating evidence from a number of sources, systematically incorporating classroom observations and using more than one evaluator will help ensure judgments are.

So far an attempt has been made to treat the various methods of performance appraisal. Other components of appraisal are essential in the process of appraising teachers' performance. Among these, the appraisal discussion is considered to be central to the success of the whole process. Hence, the task of the next section would be to deal with this important issue.

2.4.4 Conduct an Appraisal Interview/discussion

The fourth step in performance appraisal is to conduct the appraisal interview/appraisal discussion. The appraisal discussion lies at the heart of the performance appraisal process and is crucial to the success of the whole process. It is aimed at creating mutual understanding and agreement between appraisers and appraisees about what will happen in the appraisal process. According to Muhammad (2013) it has two central purposes, it helps to identify past achievements areas that needs further development and barriers/ facilitators to effective performance and helps to identify goals and strategies for work practice (Muhammad, 2013).

Managers and supervisors should use the following strategies to make the appraisal interview positive, constructive as well as to increase employees effectiveness:

Before the interview

- Assist employees to become familiar and comfortable with discussions about their performance potential obstacles and possible solutions.
- Encourage employees to review their performance ahead.
- Plan ahead a list of issues that you want to address with the employees.
- Encourage employee's participation and make a two-way discussion.
- Begin with positive feedback to put the employee at ease.
- Set goals mutually and ensure to clear agreement on performance objective and evaluation criteria for the next year.

After the interview

- Keep written records of the appraisal interview signed off on both parties.
- Coach employees regularly by providing frequent feedback.
- Make periodic review of progress towards goals.
- Link appraisal results to employment decisions such as, promotion and salaries.

2.4.5 Evaluate the Appraisal Process

The performance appraisal process should undergo with regular review and improvement. It can be evaluated by conducting focus group discussion or survey with employees to gauge their satisfaction with the appraisal process and suggestion for improvement. A successful performance appraisal process should demonstrate a change in both the rating of employee's performance and the work environment (Muhammad, 2013).

2.5. Methods of Performance Appraisal

Evaluation performance of staff is a lot easier that evaluating organizational performance. Although the former dovetails into the latter, there is difference with regard to the criteria evaluated as well as the instrument used. Because of the problems and difficulties that have plagued the issue of how best to appraise the performance of staff, management scholars have recently been taking a hard look at the question, what exactly is being appraised? The focus of known schemes could be categorized into four definable orientations (Gbeja, 2000).

These are:

1. Appraisals that focus on Behavior and Personality;
2. Appraisals that focus on Work Activities;
3. Appraisals that focus on Comparisons; and
4. Appraisals that focuses on Results.

In the category of appraisal that emphasize behavior and personality are:

a. Trait appraisal/Graphic Rating Scales:

According to Gary (2003), graphic rating scales method usually comprises a list of personality traits. A rater will be required to indicate on a numerical scale the degree to which the individual being appraised possesses these traits. This is the simplest and most commonly used method of performance appraisal. It lists personality traits and a range of performance values (on a scale of unsatisfactory to outstanding) for each trait. The supervisor rates each employee by checking or circling each score, which best describes the employees' trait. It is to be done numerically on the

scale of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5; where 1 was the strongest and 5 the weakest; or alphabetical A, B, C, D, and E where A is the strongest and E is the weakest. However, since they lack specific job-related definitions, trait- rating scales are extremely vulnerable to errors such as halo, strictness, leniency and central tendency that severely affect the validity and reliability of the ratings.

b. Global Essays and Ratings/Narrative Forms

The essay appraisal is one where the appraiser writes one or more paragraphs about the employee's strengths, weaknesses, and behavior on the job, without making distinctions among performance dimensions. In an essay format the rater is asked to respond narratively to a question such as "What is your overall evaluation of this individual's performance for the past year?" Without specific performance criteria derived from a job analysis procedure, neither the global rating nor the general narrative can be considered job-related. Therefore, both of these techniques have serious limitations.

c. Critical Incident

Critical incident method requires the supervisor to regularly write down desirable or undesirable incidents of each employee's work-related behavior. The supervisor and the employee then meet at regular intervals to discuss the incidents. This method has the following advantages: it provides the supervisor with hard examples of good or poor performance, which support in explaining how the employee was appraised and ensures the supervisor thinks and monitors the employee's performance throughout the year; not just the most recent ones. It also provides a list of specific incidents or areas, which the employee should have addressed to improve his performance and could be adapted to specific job expectations laid out for the subordinate at the beginning of the year.

Long (1987:23-24), further noted that since this method is based on specific example of observed behavior, it is convenient for conducting post-appraisal conferences. Emphasizing its limitations, he has the following to say: "The method is very demanding in terms of developmental effect and the recording of incidents is time-consuming and burdensome.

d. Behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales/behaviorally based Scales (BARS)

According to Gary (2003), a behaviorally Anchored Rating Scale (BARS) combines the benefits of narratives, critical incidents and quantifies (graphic rating type) scales by anchoring a rating scale with specific behavioral examples of good or poor performance. Its proponents argue that it provides better, more equitable appraisals than do the other tool as discussed above. Henderson (1984) says that behaviorally Anchored Rating Scales (BARS) implies replacement of such words as “Excellent”, “Good”, “Average” with short descriptions of actual job behavior, e.g. under “Relations with colleagues”, instead of “Poor”, the anchor may be “fights with colleagues often”, or instead of “Excellent” the behavior anchor may be “inspires team spirit are descriptions of various degrees of behavior with regard to a specific performance dimension. The behaviors, specifically defined, provide the anchors for rating scales. Although these scales represent job-relevant dimensions of performance, they still pose problems in determining which actually absent behaviors match with specifically anchored performance scales. Despite this difficulty, BARS are a significant improvement, since they require less inference on the part of a rater than traditional trait-rating approaches.

As for the category that emphasizes work activities we have the followings:

a. Ranking Appraisals:

The method involves an employee ranking technique in which supervisors are asked to choose the “most valuable” and “lowest valuable”. Paired comparison ranking or normal distribution ranks are two popular methods for this procedure. Whilst this permits overall ranking of staff it has no standard form. Minor impression may take strong priority in the evaluation, and it may not focus on important job.

b. Multi person comparison: Compare one individual’s performance to those of one or more others it is a relative, not an absolute, measuring device. The three most popular uses of this method are group order ranking, individual ranking, and paired comparisons

Group order ranking: A performance appraisal approach that group employees in to ordered classification by the evaluator.

Paired comparison: This method is a modified version of ranking method. It involves comparing two employees at a time on each trait. For each trait, an employee has a plus (+) or a minus (-) depending on whether he/she ranks better than the others on the trait. The number of time an employee is ranked better is counted and added up. Paired comparison method helps to make the ranking method more precise. For every trait for example quantity of work, an employee is paired and compared, with every other subordinate

Individual ranking: A performance appraisal approach that ranks employees in order from highest to lowest based on their performance accumulated. The evaluator ranks all individual employees in relation to their performance task.

c. Forced Distribution Method/ Forced-Choice Appraisal:

This is similar to grading on a curve. This method places predetermined percentages of rates in categories. For example, it decides to distribute employees as follows: 15% high performers, 20% high-average performers, 30% average performers, 20% low-average performers and 15% low performers. The employee is rated relative to his peers. It involves writing each employee's name on a separate card for each category of trait being appraised such as leadership, judgment or initiative. The employee's card is then placed in one of the appropriate performance categories. One will therefore fall in any of the rate categories and that will be their appropriate performance appraisal rate. The advantage is that the rated does not know what value is assigned to each statement (which usually incorporates an element required for the job); it tends to be more objective. But the method tends to be expensive, unilateral, and susceptible to "halo" effect and the assessor is forced to select one or another statement with no choice between.

d. Alternation Ranking Method

Gary (2003) describes this as the method of ranking employees from best to worst on a trait. Since it is easier to distinguish between the worst and best employees, an alternation ranking method is most popular. First, the rater lists all subordinates to be rated then cross out the names of any not known well enough to rank. Then on a specifically designed form, the rater indicates the employee who is the highest on the characteristic being measured, at the same time shows the lowest employee, then chooses the next highest and the next lowest, alternating between highest and lowest until all employees have been ranked.

e. Training Stimulation Appraisal:

This is recent technique for rating performance under a job situation. The assessee is given, under stimulated conditions, the task he or she is expected to accomplish in real situation. The appraisee is compared with others who do the same work. It affords opportunity for a whole evaluation and permit counseling. If video-taped, the assessee can see points of corrections. The disadvantage is however the “distance factor” of the real world. That is, reality is different from simulations, no matter how close.

Management by Objectives (MBO): focuses on the product of one’s efforts. It is the most common format for the results approach. Also, it contains different methods during application. (Heneman et al. 1996) More recently, there has been a swing towards the result-oriented approach and to participation by the job holder, both in setting the objectives or targets and in appraising its own performance against these. The results-oriented approach is generally considered to be more effective because:

- ✚ It relates directly to the requirements of the job and standards of performance required to achieve the organization’s target.
- ✚ It is more objective because it is based on actual result achieved not on personality traits which may or may not result in the desired performance.
- ✚ It measures performance against yardsticks which are clearly realistic, understood and accepted.
- ✚ It involves more effective communication between the supervisor and the subordinate officer. It should result in a clear, agreed plan of action for improving performance.
- ✚ It helps to motivate the subordinate officer to improve his performance; etc. (Pay & Waltham, 2012). The other approaches can be similarly assessed, especially in terms of how objective they are and what their effects are likely to be on improving performance.

From this we conclude that there are many methods that are used for performance appraisal. It is very difficult to say which technique is better than the other because it depends upon the type and size of organization.

2.6. Principles of Performance Appraisal Systems

There are some key guiding principles, which have emerged from research and experience, and proved relevant to any PA. Understanding these key principles can be useful to learn how a successful employee PA program can be designed and operated in the interest of enhancing the development of an individual employee and the organization in which he works.

Piggot-Irvine (2003), found from her studies that for performance appraisal to be effective the system should be confidential, informative, have clear guidelines and be educative. In order to have effective appraisal, the process must be embedded completely throughout the organization where the values shape part of the fabric of the everyday life of the workplace.

Moreover, Amy Delpo (2005), identifies some of the specific qualities that all effective performance evaluation systems share, paying particular attention to those that you as a manager can control.

A. Fair and Communicative Environment

The most effective performance appraisal systems place concern for the employee at their core. The reality is that you cannot control your employees' behavior- only they control how they perform their jobs. Research has shown, however, that the majority of employees want to perform well; the key is to provide them with the right environment in which to do so. Such an environment includes support, communication, collaboration and fair treatment- the very qualities created by effective performance appraisal systems.

B. Respect for the Employee

Respecting employees respect its foundation for any effective performance evaluation system. Employees who feel respected are more likely to buy into the appraisal system- to participate fully and sincerely in setting goals and to strive hard to perform to the standards you set. On the other hand, employees who do not feel respected will show that some lack of respect for you and your efforts to improve their performance.

C. Focus on the Future

If, at its heart, a performance appraisal process is designed to improve employee performance, then a manager should emphasize what the employee can do going forward, not how the employee did in the past. The past can inform your ideas about the future, but it should not be the sole focus of the appraisal process.

This means that one should spend the bulk of the appraisal meeting on identifying goals for the next year and talking about how the employee can achieve them. It also means that your feedback throughout the year should not punish or shame employees for bad performance, but help employees see when their performance is slipping and strategize with them on how to improve.

This doesn't mean that looking to the past performance has no place in the process; indeed, at each evaluation and discuss how the employee met the goals set at the previous evaluation. But you should look to the past with goal of learning from it, so that the look backward is developmental and helpful to the employee, rather than punitive.

D. Employee Participation

Another element common to successful performance evaluation systems is employee participation. Employees must play a key role, participating in everything from writing job descriptions, to identifying their own goals and standards, to assessing how well they have performed. You can increase employee's job satisfaction and engender their trust in the appraisal system by bringing them into the loop and giving them power and responsibility for directing and assessing their own performance. This satisfaction and trust leads employees to accept the company's appraisal process and make a commitment to their own development.

In addition, you need the information that your employees can bring to the table. Your employees are often in the best position to answer the questions posed during the appraisal process, at the very least; they can provide some crucial insights.

These questions include:

- ✍ How can they help the company achieve its goals?

- ✍ How much can be expected from someone in a given job?
- ✍ Are there any organizational impediments to their performance?
- ✍ Is there anything you can provide to help them perform better?
- ✍ How well they have achieved their own goals?

Having both the manager carrying out the appraisal and the employee setting goals mutually is crucial for the effectiveness of the performance appraisal. This can ensure that the employee will work harder to reach these goals as they participated in setting them initially. The degree of involvement of subordinates in the appraisal has been seen to be of benefit to the success of the system. Cawley et al (1998) proved that subordinate participation in the appraisal procedure is related to employee satisfaction and their acceptance of the performance appraisal system. Employee Participation is a key element of intrinsic motivational strategies that facilitate worker growth and development (Roberts, 2003). Research has shown that when employees are involved in goal setting, the goals they set are higher and more demanding than goals that managers set alone. Employees will push the envelope, often demanding more of themselves than you might demand of them.

Employee participation promotes team work. It gives the two of you the sense of working together rather than being opposite sides of the fence. It also reduces the chances that you will miss out on important or insights you could share with each other.

E. Ongoing Feedback

Giving employee's feedback-both positive and negative –as circumstances warrant is another important feature of an effective performance evaluation system. If you tell employees what you think of their performance only once a year, you have wasted a lot of opportunities throughout the year to encourage good performance and to help employees who are struggling get back on track.

Feedback also helps employees adjust as circumstances change throughout the year. The importance of certain goals may shift; obstacles may appear; employees may lose motivation or focus. Your feedback will tell employees what is still important, what is no longer important, and what they can do to achieve their goals in the face of these changes.

Studies show that without feedback, a performance appraisal system alone will not improve employee performance. Positive feedback, often particularly neglected, is important: providing positive feedback whenever appropriate gives employees a sense of accomplishment and appreciation, while highlighting standards for how they should continue to perform.

F. Document

Ongoing and accurate documentation is the crux of a good performance appraisal system. Documentation spanning the entire appraisal period ensures that your review will be fair and accurate and gives you rock –solid support in case of a lawsuit. Without good documentation of an employee’s performance throughout the year, all you will have are memories and gut feelings, neither of which is reliable or legally safe.

Therefore, this paper stressed a number of key principles which must be clarified before a teaching evaluation scheme can be put in place. In particular, there is a need to understand why evaluation is necessary; there is a need for a clear institutional position on appraisal of teaching, preferably a developmental stance; and there is a need to be clear about what information will be gathered, how and from whom it will be sought, to what use(s) it will be put and what its strengths/limitations might be.

2.7 Employee Perception

According to Armstrong (2009), perception is the intuitive understanding, recognition and interpretation of things and events. Behavior will be influenced by the perceptions of individuals about the situation they are in. Therefore, the perception of employee about their performance appraisal depends upon their understanding of themselves and interpretation of their own.

Moreover, ‘the success of any HR intervention in organization is heavily dependent on employees’ perception of that intervention’ (Dipboye and Pont Briand, 1981). For performance appraisal to be effective and useful, it is vital that those taking part, the appraiser and the appraisee, are both benefiting from it and find the procedure a productive tool, as without this, it would be impossible for the system to work.

Employees' thoughts of performance appraisal systems could be as important to the continuing success of the system as reliability and validity (Dipboye and Pont Briand, 1981). Employee perceptions of the fairness of their performance appraisals are useful in determining the success of performance appraisal systems (Erdogan, Kraimer & Liden, 2001) (as cited by Dorcah, 2014). A vast amount of literature looks at whether performance appraisal is successful based on rating accuracy and qualitative aspects of the appraisal, but it is reasonable to suppose that employees' reactions to the appraisal system could have just as much influence on the success of an appraisal system (Cawley, Keeping & Levy, 1998). An organization might develop the most precise and sophisticated appraisal system, but if the system is not recognized by the staff, its effectiveness will be limited.

Flecher, (2004) listed the three things that employees being appraised looked for in a performance appraisal, these are: perceiving the assessment as accurate and fair, the quality of the existing relationship with the appraiser and the impact of the assessment on their rewards and well-being.

According to Cawley et al (1998) subordinates reactions to performance appraisal can be a way of measuring their outlook towards the system. The main reactions that can be assessed are their satisfaction from the appraisal, the utility, whether they felt they were fairly appraised, how motivated they were from the appraisal and the accuracy of the system.

Perception of Teachers on System of TPA

Monyatsi, *et al.* (2006), pointed out that perceptions of teachers about performance appraisal has a significant influence on the outcomes of the exercise. One of the main factors that have been found to influence the outcomes of performance appraisal is the perception that teachers have about the appraisal system (Monyatsi *at al.*, 2006).

Performance appraisal can only have the desired outcomes if teachers have a positive attitude towards the appraisal system. If the perceptions of the purpose of the appraisal system implemented in the school are very unclear, the consequences may be found in how teachers went about implementing it. As research has found out, teacher appraisal process often faces problems associated with lack of agreement on appropriate appraisal criteria, concerns over the validity and

reliability of evaluation methods, and the negative perceptions of teachers towards the appraisal system (Dorcah, 2014).

Understanding employee attitudes about the PAS in organizations is important as they can determine its effectiveness (Fletcher, 2004). In appraisal process, teacher's attitudes toward the system are strongly linked to satisfaction with the system. According to Boswell and Boudreau (2000), if the performance appraisal is seen and believed to be biased, irrelevant or political, that may be a source of dissatisfaction with the system. Teacher's reaction to the TPAS is a critical aspect of the acceptance and effectiveness of the system.

2.8. Challenges/Problems of PA

There are a number of obstacles which hamper the success of performance appraisal schemes. Chandan (1995:195-197), categorizes these problems into two as: (1) problems related to the appraiser, and (2) problems related to management support and the appraisal format. He further elaborated these problems as follows:

1. Problems Related to the Appraiser

Since performance appraisal is carried out by human beings, it is subject to a number of errors, biases, weaknesses, and pitfalls. Some of these drawbacks are: the halo effect, constant error recency of events, central tendency, and errors of variable standards.

2. Problems related to the system of PA

According to Beer many of the problems in PA stem from the appraisal system itself: the objectives it is intended to serve, the administrative system in which it is embedded, and the forms and procedures that make up the system. In addition, the performance system can be blamed if the criterion for evaluation is poor, the technique used is burdensome, or the system is more form than substance. If the criteria used focus solely on activities rather than output (results), or on personality traits rather than performance, the evaluation may not be well received. Furthermore, raters' evaluations are often subjectively biased by their cognitive and motivational states, and supervisors often apply different standards with different employees, which results in inconsistent,

unreliable, and invalid evaluations. Concentration on goal attainment contributes to the fairness of the system by lending an air of rational objectivity to performance appraisal.

Goal-setting theory suggests that appraisal criteria and performance goals should be clear and understandable so as to motivate the appraisee, otherwise the appraisee would not know what to work towards. This knowledge may well decrease job ambiguity, a source of stress for some individuals. On the other hand, appraisal based primarily on ends may produce overwhelming pressure on subordinates to attain the objectives. The lack of clarity and objectivity of the criteria used to measure the performance of the employees creates role ambiguity, confusion and frustration among the workers to undertake their job.

According to Deborah and Kleiner (1997) organizations need to have a systematic framework to ensure that performance appraisal is “fair” and “consistent”. In their study of “designing effective performance appraisal system”, they conclude that that designing an effective appraisal system requires a strong commitment from top management. The system should provide a link between employee performance and organizational goals through individualized objectives and performance criteria.

Deborah and Kleiner (1997) further argued that the system should help to create a motivated and committed workforce. The system should have a framework to provide appropriate training for supervisors, raters, and employees, a system for frequent review of performance, accurate record keeping, a clearly defined measurement system, and a multiple rater group to perform the appraisal.

2.9. Teachers’ Performance Appraisal in Ethiopia

In Ethiopia, teacher’s performance evaluation was introduced along with the beginning of inspection in 1934 for the first time as a method to control and inspect the institutional process (Hailesselassie, 1996:12). Later on, it continued to operate by changing its name to supervision and teachers were evaluated by administrators and the purpose seems largely the same. Berhanu (2006) stated that result-oriented performance appraisal (ROTPA) was introduced in Ethiopia since 2004 in line with Federal Civil Service Commission (FCSC). Berhanu also explain that the overall objectives of the appraisal system was to enable civil service

institutions to objectively measure and provide feedback on the result of employees' performance using openness, transparent and result-based criteria that promote performance effectiveness and efficiency in the civil service institutions.

In Ethiopia, the present system of performance appraisal of teachers is result oriented and, delineates among four performance categories: poor (25-49%), acceptable (50-74%), very good (75-94%) and excellent (95-100%) based on teachers result on key, major, and minor tasks. Depending on the results of performance evaluation and year of teaching service, secondary school (which is the focus of the present study) teachers have the opportunity of going up nine stages in the career ladder structure (MoE, 1998 E.C.). As stated above, to move to the next ladder on their profession, teachers are expected to score accepted results on performance appraisal. At times when the appraisal system open doors for subjective measurements, it leads educational leaders to pass unreliable decisions on teachers' career development.

Because of its complexity and lack of implementation effectiveness, a number of problems have been created in relation to teacher dissatisfaction. Even though result- oriented teacher performance was introduced by the ministry of education in 2004, however teachers and principals had negative attitude towards result- oriented teacher performance appraisal criteria (Yilma, 2007). The performance appraisal which is the 2004 appraisal criteria system in one hand and the newly introduced BSC system in the other hand are both working side by side as result - oriented teacher performance appraisal but both created problems in their authentic and genuine implementation. Because of lack of clear criteria set up and complex nature of the evaluation system, both teachers principals and vice principals have faced problems in practicing it.

2.10 Chapter Summary

In this chapter attempts have been made to show how performance appraisal developed from trait (individual) appraisal to comprehensive Performance appraisal system. Different scholars at different times forwarded different definitions; but PA is recognized as a systematic, strategic, and integrated approach. The performance appraisal of employee is planned to be performed in two ways. First the performance of employees assessed weekly and monthly this called formative

assessment. Second, summative assessment, all employee performance is assessed twice a year and yearly in line with the formative assessment result. Effective communication, participatory in nature, reward and pay for performance, accuracy of performance ratings and the relationship of appraiser and appraisee, confidentiality and fairness are basic principles of the system. Its purpose, in general is developmental and administrative while purposes of measurement is to see achievements of objectives and take remedial actions on deviations. As regards to model development it must be tailored to specific conditions of organizations, because there is no one best way of doing PA. Contributing factors for its success are frequency of the appraisal, training of the appraisers, accurate record keeping system, use of multiple data sources, the system as teachers' motivator, involvement, development and fulfillment of resources etc.

Chapter Three

The Research Design and Methodology

3.1. Research Design

The major goal of the study was to assess teachers' perception towards performance appraisal system in the available seven government secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda. To attain this purpose a descriptive survey design was employed. A descriptive survey describes and interprets what is there currently. In this study, it allows for investigating the opinions of respondents concerning their views on the dimensions of system of teachers' performance appraisal practice in secondary schools. Surveys are especially important in educational research to describe attitudes, beliefs, and opinions. So descriptive survey research design was chosen with a mix of both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

Quantitative method approach was used for the investigation in which data were gathered from teachers in government secondary school teachers of Halaba special Woreda through questionnaire. Further qualitative approach was incorporated in the study to validate and triangulate the quantitative data from school leaders in study area through interview.

3.2. Source of Data

In this study both primary and secondary source of data were used. The primary sources of data was collected from teachers, school directors, vice directors and supervisors at Government Secondary Schools of Halaba special Woreda. Secondary data source were collected through assessing performance appraisal document, monitoring and evaluation report. These documents were used largely for the purpose of triangulation.

3.3. Sample size and Sampling Technique

In Halaba special Woreda until 2017, there were seven government secondary schools. All of the schools were selected using census sampling. These were Halaba, Guba, Hansha, Alemtena, Kulito and Wanja, Abokicho and Besheno secondary schools. The subjects of the study were teachers, vice directors, directors and supervisors.

According to Singh (2007, p.6) "descriptive survey research typically uses larger samples:

it is suggested that the sample size should not be less than 30 percent of accessible population for the sample”. Accordingly, out of 210, one Hundred ten teachers were selected through proportionate stratified random sampling technique. In this regard, this study utilized is 52.4% of the population size. Therefore, the study’s sample size of 110 is fair enough to represent the population. The researcher applied stratified sampling technique so as to allocate the sample size in to groups based on their schools and to keep proportionally the representative sample of the teachers.

Random sampling is a technique or tool that produces essentially a mini-version of the initial population. Random sampling is conducted in such a way that every person in the population has an equal and independent chance of being selected (Marguerite et al., 2006).

Simple random sampling were employed to select appropriate teachers from each stratum (school), to fill the questionnaires as they have equal chance for all to be selected in order to avoid sampling bias. At school level, the researcher obtained the list of teachers from the head teacher. The names were written on pieces of papers and placed in a box. Then, the researcher picked randomly required pieces of paper. Teachers whose names were picked randomly were selected for the study.

On selecting educational leaders (directors and vice directors) for conducting structured interview, purposive sampling technique was employed to select seven educational leaders. The purposive sampling technique has been chosen by the researcher to select educational leaders based on their experience. Accordingly, out of 19 educational leaders (directors, vice directors and supervisors), a total of nine (9) were selected for responding interview questions whose working experience is greater than 2 years. It was believed that using this method enables to have in-depth knowledge from those who are the key individuals who can give the information required for the study.

Table 1. Population Distribution and Sample Size of respondents

No	School	Teachers		School leaders	
		Population	Sample	Population	Sample
1	Halaba Comprehensive Sec. School	80	41	4	2
2	Kulito Wanja Secondary School	40	21	3	1
3	Guba Secondary School	21	11	3	1
4	Hansha Secondary School	19	10	2	1
5	Alemtena Secondary School	13	7	2	1
6	Abokicho Secondary School	19	10	3	2
7	Besheno Secondary School	18	9	2	1
	Total	210	110(52.4%)	19	9 (47.37%)

3.4. Instruments and Procedures for Data Collection

3.4.1 Instruments for Data Collection

The major tools employed to collect data for the study are questionnaire, interview, and review of relevant documents.

Questionnaire

Questionnaire was used to collect data from the teachers of secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda to obtain first-hand information. One set of questionnaire was prepared for teachers. It was prepared by the researcher based on review of literature. The questionnaire has two sections. Section 1 seeks to collect background information about respondents. Second section contains 6

sub scale rated over 5 point scales ranging from 5(strongly agree to 1 strongly disagree). Subscale 1 consists of 10 items focused on identification teachers' perception about purposes of TPA while Subscale 2 has 5 items that measure perception about process of PA. Subscale 3 measures perception about appraisal criteria through 5 items. Subscale 4 contains 9 items on general information on the practice of appraisal system. Subscale 5 consists of 11 items dealt with principles of TPA system. Subscale 6 examines the major challenges on appraising teachers' performance through 6 items.

Interview: In the study, structured interview were conducted with the school directors/vice directors consisting of six parts to obtain further supplementary information which were appropriate to the study. The interviews with these groups of respondents were specifically geared towards obtaining information on major purposes, the process and criteria of PA, perception of teachers on overall practices of PA and major challenges encouraged in its implementation in schools.

The interview was conducted in working hours at their schools in one by one through face to face and conducted by the researcher. The data maintained during the interview were recorded through notebook. The interview took approximately 25-30 minutes for each interviewee. To ensure effective communication between interviewer and respondents, questions were organized in Amharic for school directors and then translated back to English for analysis.

Document Review:- In addition to the primary data, in order to find facts in the study area, the researcher analyzed different documents as a file containing a yearly record of TPA, semi-annual and yearly reports from the sample schools, individual teachers' portfolios, minutes, and reports at GSS of Halaba special Woreda. The related documents were analyzed and recorded on notebook.

3.4.2 Data Collection Procedures

After reading the available related literature on the issues of performance appraisal system, the basic questions of the study were established. Based on these basic questions and the review of the literature of the study, questionnaires and interview questions were designed.

3.5. Instrument Validity and Reliability Test

A pilot test of a questionnaire or interview survey is a procedure in which a researcher makes changes in an instrument based on feedback from a small number of individuals who complete and evaluate the instrument. The participants in the pilot test provided written comments directly on the survey.

After good questions have been developed using principles of question construction, the researcher made pilot tests on the questions. This helped to determine whether the individuals in the sample were capable of completing the survey or not. It also measured how much they can understand the questions (Creswel, 2012).

Before distribution of questionnaires was conducted to the sample group, pilot questionnaires were prepared and administered to 10 respondents in Halaba Comprehensive secondary school to ensure the objectivity and clarity of the items. The questionnaires were pre-tested; and any suggestions for improvements encountered during the piloting process were incorporated in the final questionnaire. Based on the feedbacks collected from the pilot test, the researcher modified or changed the survey to reflect those concerns (e.g. early questions on general information on the practice of appraisal system and principles of TPA system).

Because the pilot group provided feedback on the questionnaire, they have been excluded from the final sample for the study.

The reliability of instruments used during data gathering has been maintained by using question items which are not ambiguous and unclear. Therefore, in order to minimize the threats to validity and reliability, the questionnaires were prepared by consulting advisor and other experts with experience in the area of study to incorporate their feedback and ensure that the final instrument appropriate to measure what it was supposed to measure.

It has also been managed to follow data gathering procedures of test administration that do not vary. To assure reliability, it has also been tried to have standardized procedures of data administration. In addition to the above mentioned points, arrangements and facilitations were used so that participants could give responses without being fatigued or being nervous. During all

procedures of data administration, it has been tried to avoid misinterpretations on the part of respondents.

As far as validity of a measurement tool is considered to be the degree to which the tool measures what it claims to measure, the validity of open and close ended questionnaires and interview questions have been checked before they were administered. Besides, for measuring internal consistency and its associated reliability of the instruments used in the study, Cronbach alpha was calculated and the results in each category of scales were higher than 0.7, indicating high reliability of the scale items in the instruments. It is one of the most commonly used indicators of internal consistence. Ideally, Cronbach alpha coefficient of a scale should be above 0.7 (Creswell, 2008:109).

Table 2: Cronbach’s Alpha Value of Survey Pilot Testing

No	Variables	Cronbach’s Alpha	Number of Items
1	Purposes of teachers performance appraisal	0.749	10
2	Process of performance appraisal	0.815	5
3	Appraisal criteria.	0.735	5
4	General information on the practice of appraisal system	0.925	9
5	Principles of teachers’ performance appraisal system	0.804	11
6	Major problems of teachers’ performance appraisal system.	0.762	6
Total		0.798	46

3.6. Method of Data Analysis

Both qualitative and quantitative methods were adopted for the data analysis. Data analysis begins with a report on the number of returns and non-returns of the questionnaire instrument. After capturing this information about questionnaire response, the data gathered through questionnaire has two parts, the first part is questionnaire related to background information that is about the demographic characteristics of the informants. The second part of the questionnaire is related to

the basic research question. The data gathered from questionnaire was summarized and analyzed by using descriptive statistics like percentages and mean. Then the data was described using tables for more clarification and the data were coded using scientific statistical data analysis software such as SPSS version 20.

In order to know whether male and female teachers (respondents) differ in their perceptions about the main purposes, process, criteria and principles of PA system, the mean scores of the two groups were calculated for each item. Then, the differences of the mean scores were examined through independent sample T-test.

One-way ANOVA and Tukey-HSD test were employed to determine the significant differences between and among the respondents across their educational qualifications groups and work experiences groups based upon their views concerning the purposes, process, criteria and principles of PA system.

In all the above cases, the existing differences were tested for statistical significance at .05 level. In addition, weighted mean value were used to assess practices and procedures of TPA and to identify the major problems of appraising the teachers of secondary schools. The data gained from interview, open ended questions and document review are analyzed contextually as per the research basic questions.

3.7. Ethical Consideration

The study was conducted in such a way that it considered ethical responsibility that is being honest about what exactly the study is all about and what it intended to measure. The respondents were assured that the information that they provided will be confidential and only be used for the intended purpose.

Chapter Four

Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation of data

This chapter presents presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered through primary and secondary sources on teachers' appraisal system.

The questionnaires were distributed to a total of 110 teachers in the secondary schools in Halaba special Woreda. Among the distributed questionnaires 100 (90.9%) were completed and returned. The responses given to each of the questions were analyzed and interpreted in line with major research questions.

T-test, mean, standard deviations, One Way ANOVA and percentages were some of the statistics that used to analyze perception of teachers toward PA dimensions and treated in relation to independent variables such as sex, qualification and teaching experience of the respondent teachers.

4.1. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

This part summarizes the demographic information needed to examine the respondents' (teachers') personal profile. The identities of respondents were grouped by characteristics of sex, age, educational background and year of service in teaching for the sake of analysis. The demographic profile of respondents is set out in Table 2 as follows.

Table 3: Respondent's Demographic Information

No	Variables		Frequency	Percent
1	Sex	Male	78	78.0
		Female	22	22.0
		Total	100	100.0
2	Age	≤ 25 years	25	25.0
		26-34 Years	42	42.0
		35-44 Years	17	17.0
		≥ 45 years	16	16.0
		Total	100	100.0
3	Educational back ground	Diploma	2	2.0
		First Degree	87	87.0
		Master's Degree	11	11.0
		Total	100	100.0
4	Service Years in teaching	≤ 5 years	39	39.0
		6-10 years	13	13.0
		11-15 years	19	19.0
		16-20 years	9	9.0
		≥ 21 years	20	20.0
		Total	100	100.0

From the table 3 above, the majority of 78% respondents were male and the remaining 22% were female. This shows that the secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda were dominated by men teachers. This depicts that even if the number of female teachers is low; their participation towards implementing appraisal process is also low.

With regard to the age of respondent, the largest group of the respondents, 67% were in the age range of less than 35 years. This implies that the majority of the teachers were young and they may have strong perception for the practice teachers performance appraisal system in their school. This

in turn may help to provide adequate information for the study. In this connection, this period is considered adequate to equip one with necessary competencies in performance appraisal especially if trained on how to do it (Dorcah, 2014).

In relation to qualification of respondents, the majorities 87% are bachelor's degree holders, 11% are master's degree and above and 2% are diploma holders in government secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda . Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the information obtained from them can be considered as a reliable and reasonable due to their academic background.

Of the total 100 respondents, 39% of those, the largest section of teachers in the secondary schools are under a five year while 32% of respondents are working in the schools between 6-15 years and the smallest category with 29% teachers surveyed are in the schools over 16 years.

A teacher's experience in teaching can have a forceful influence on understanding about performance appraisal system and on how they perceive PA in their schools. If a teacher is with little experience and service in teaching and has only few appraisal meeting then they may have a different view on it that someone who is with teaching many years. It was assumed that this differences in teaching service helps in providing adequate information for the study in order to compare the perception of teachers toward PAS.

4.2. Analysis and Interpretations of Data

This is the second part of this chapter that deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data on the assessment of teachers' performance appraisal in the secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda. To this end, responses on the perception of teachers toward purposes of teachers' performance appraisal, process, criteria of teachers' performance appraisal, methods and procedures of TPA, perception of teachers on overall practices and challenges of in implementation of teachers' performance appraisal are analyzed accordingly.

Moreover, the indicators of each factor were selected and presented to the respondents to be rated on a five point Likert scale from very high or strongly agree= 5 to very low or strongly disagree=1 were used. The response were scaled from 5 to 1, where 5 indicated strongly agree, 4 indicated somewhat agree, 3 indicated neutral/undecided, 2 indicated somewhat disagree and 1 indicated

strongly disagree. For analysis purpose, the mean values were interpreted as: 1-1.49 is strongly disagree; 1.50-2.49 is disagree; 2.50-3.49 is moderate (undecided); 3.50-4.49 is agree and > 4.50 is strongly agree

4.2.1. Perception of teachers toward primary objectives of TPA System

The focus of this part of analysis is to assess the perception of teachers toward purpose of teachers' performance appraisal in secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda. To do so some 10 major indicators have been identified in the study and the responses of teachers were presented, analyzed and interpreted below.

4.2.1.1. Perception toward the primary objectives of PAS across gender of respondents

Table 4: T-test for Mean Differences across sex of respondents' perception about the major Purposes of the current System of TPA

NO	Item	Sex	N	M	SD	T	P-value
1	To improve the quality of the teaching-learning process.	Male	78	2.83	1.13	.221	.826
		Female	22	2.77	1.15		
2	To support teachers' professional development	Male	78	2.00	.939	-1.546	.125
		Female	22	2.36	1.09		
3	To motivate and promote work interest of teachers	Male	78	2.30	1.17	.513	.609
		Female	22	2.45	1.22		
4	To determine rewards and benefits for competent teachers	Male	78	1.78	.657	1.38	.177
		Female	22	2.00	.690		
5	To select teachers for higher education	Male	78	3.10	1.53	1.202	.232
		Female	22	2.68	1.08		
6	To identify teachers training needs.	Male	78	3.35	1.06	.579	.564
		Female	22	2.86	.990		
7	To decide on teachers' rank in the career ladder	Male	78	4.46	.527	.705	.483
		Female	22	4.36	.727		
8	To decide on teachers' transfer	Male	78	1.87	.858	-.830	.409
		Female	22	2.04	.898		
9	To weed out incompetent teachers	Male	78	2.06	.811	1.26	.210
		Female	22	1.81	.795		
10	For the sake of fulfilling administrative formalities	Male	78	3.88	.953	-.692	.491
		Female	22	4.04	.998		

Key: M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, N=Number of respondents, df= degree of freedom=98, *= Significant, P= Sig. (2-tailed), (M) [1-1.49] =strongly disagree, [1.5-2.49] =disagree, [2.5-3.49] = Moderate/Undecided, [3.5-4.49] = agree, and [4-.5-5] = strongly agree

As shown in items 6, 7 and 10 of table 4- the purpose of teachers' performance appraisal was to decide on teachers' rank in the career ladder and to fulfil administrative formalities were rated high with mean score above 3.5. Moreover, as items 1 ,5and 6 of the same table depicted, selecting

teachers for higher education, to identify teachers training needs and improving quality of teaching- learning process as a one of purpose of TPA were rated moderate (undecided) with mean values ranged between “2.68 and 3.35”. From this one can infer that both male and female teachers were rated less or moderate because of the less emphasis given on the stated purposes.

However, items 2, 3, 4, 8 and 9 -as responded by the teachers, the purpose for motivation and promotion of work interest of teachers, for transfer, for demotion, for determining rewards and benefits and for enhancing professional development of teachers were rated low (disagreed) with mean value ranged between “1.78 and 2.45”. This shows that, though the purpose of performance appraisal includes above stated purposes, it was hardly practicing in schools.

The statistical significance for variations in perceived primary objectives was tested by applying t-test and results of the same have been presented as per the table 3 above. Accordingly, the t-test indicated that, there is no statistically significant differences in opinions of the study groups on all items. For the items 1-10, the obtained (p) values were greater than the 0.05 level of significance.

This reveals an agreement in views between male and female respondents for the perception of teachers toward the primary purposes of TPA at GSS of Halaba special Woreda.

4.2.1.2. Perception toward the primary objectives of PAS across educational background of respondents

The statistical significance for variations across educational backgrounds in perceived purposes of TPA was tested by applying ANOVA and results of the same have been presented as per the table 5 below.

Table 5: Mean Distribution of Responses and One-Way ANOVA Results on the Purposes of Teachers Performance Appraisal across qualifications of respondents

No	Variable	Qualification	N	M	SD	F	P
1	To improve the quality of the teaching-learning process.	Diploma	2	2.50	.707	1.12	.330
		BA/BSc	87	2.88	1.15		
		MA/MSc	11	2.36	.924		
2	To support teachers' professional development	Diploma	2	2.50	.707	.495	.576
		BA/BSc	87	1.96	.920		
		MA/MSc	11	1.81	.750		
3	To motivate and promote work interest of teachers	Diploma	2	3.00	2.82	.739	.480
		BA/BSc	87	2.28	1.19		
		MA/MSc	11	2.63	.674		
4	To determine rewards and benefits for competent teachers	Diploma	2	2.00	.000	.158	.854
		BA/BSc	87	1.81	.690		
		MA/MSc	11	1.90	.539		
5	To select teachers for higher education	Diploma	2	3.00	1.41	.362	.697
		BA/BSc	87	2.96	1.42		
		MA/MSc	11	3.36	1.74		
6	To identify teachers training needs	Diploma	2	3.50	.707	.182	.834
		BA/BSc	87	3.26	1.08		
		MA/MSc	11	3.09	1.04		
7	To decide on teachers' rank in the career ladder	Diploma	2	4.50	.707	.741	.479
		BA/BSc	87	4.41	.581		
		MA/MSc	11	4.63	.504		
8	To decide on teachers' transfer	Diploma	2	1.50	.707	3.79	.026*
		BA/BSc	87	1.90	.857		
		MA/MSc	11	2.63	.924		
9	To weed out incompetent teachers	Diploma	2	2.50	2.12	3.33	.040*
		BA/BSc	87	1.93	.69		
		MA/MSc	11	2.54	1.21		
10	For the sake of fulfilling administrative formalities	Diploma	2	3.00	1.41	.960	.386
		BA/BSc	87	3.93	.912		
		MA/MSc	11	2.50	.707		

Key: *The mean difference is significant (P= Sig. (2-tailed), at the 0.05 level, df= degree of freedom=99

As can be noted from the table, majority of respondents agree that the current system of TPA in Secondary schools is primarily serving: to make administrative decisions on teachers' rank in the

career ladder and to fulfil administrative formalities with high mean values of above 3.90 each. While, the least perceived TPA objectives were enhancing teachers' professional development and determination of rewards and benefits for hard work or exceptional teachers with the lowest mean values lie below 2.0 each.

Further statistical analysis was used to test significant difference in responses. Thus, the result of one way ANOVA indicates that, there is no statistically significant difference in opinions of the three categories of respondents except on items 8 and 9. For these items the significance levels obtained was ($F = 3.79, p= 0.26$ and $F= 3.33, p=0.40$) that is less than 0.05 (full data is attached in annex -3 and 4 respectively).

Employing Tukey's multiple comparison test for item 8, it was found that there was significant mean variations between respondents with BA/BSc and MA/MSc holders. The mean value for 2nd degrees (MA/MSc) holders ($M=2.63$) is higher than that of BA/BSc holders ($M=1.90$). This result indicates that teachers with 2nd degree qualification have more perception toward the use of PA to decide on teachers' transfer than 1st degree holder teachers.

Similarly, for item 9 in the same table, it was found that there was significant mean variations between respondents with BA degree holders and Master's degree holders. The mean value of 2nd degrees (MA/MSc) holders ($M=2.54$) is higher than that of BA/BSc holders ($M=1.93$) and there is statistically significant difference at $P<0.05$ (2-tailed). The higher mean value means the higher teachers' perception/agreement on the purpose of PA to weed out incompetent teachers. Accordingly, the result of the analysis shows that teachers with 2nd degree qualification are more positively perceived toward the use of PA results as a basis to weed out incompetent teachers than 1st degree holder teachers.

4.2.1.3. Perception toward the primary objectives of PAS across teaching experience of respondents

This study was interested in examining the differences in terms of primary objectives of TPA across teaching experiences/service years groups. One-way ANOVA was run to ascertain whether there is significant differences (Table 6).

Table 6: Mean Distribution of Responses and One-Way ANOVA Results on the Purposes of Teachers Performance Appraisal across experiences categories of respondents

No	Variables	Experience (in years)	N	M	SD	Total=100		F	P
						WM	SD		
1	To improve the quality of the teaching-learning process.	≤5	39	2.71	1.12	2.82	1.13	.609	.657
		6-10	13	3.07	1.49				
		11-15	19	3.00	1.15				
		16-20	9	2.44	.726				
		≥ 21	20	2.85	1.03				
2	To support teachers' professional development	≤5	39	2.20	.832	1.90	.798	4.413	.003*
		6-10	13	1.85	.688				
		11-15	19	1.84	.602				
		16-20	9	2.00	1.00				
		≥ 21	20	1.35	.587				
3	To motivate and promote work interest of teachers	≤5	39	2.33	1.43	2.34	1.18	1.325	.266
		6-10	13	1.69	.751				
		11-15	19	2.52	1.12				
		16-20	9	2.66	.500				
		≥ 21	20	2.45	1.05				
4	To determine rewards and benefits for competent teachers	≤5	39	1.84	.844	1.83	.667	.162	.957
		6-10	13	1.69	.630				
		11-15	19	1.84	.374				
		16-20	9	1.88	.333				
		≥ 21	20	1.85	.670				
5	To select teachers for higher education	≤5	39	2.74	1.29	3.01	1.45	0.913	.460
		6-10	13	3.15	1.40				
		11-15	19	3.31	1.60				
		16-20	9	3.55	1.74				
		≥ 21	20	2.90	1.51				
6	To identify teachers training needs.	≤5	39	3.28	1.07	3.25	1.06	.472	.756
		6-10	13	3.00	1.08				
		11-15	19	3.42	1.21				
		16-20	9	3.44	1.01				
		≥ 21	20	3.10	1.07				
7	To decide on teachers' rank in the career ladder	≤5	39	4.33	.662	4.44	.057	1.239	.299
		6-10	13	4.38	.506				
		11-15	19	4.68	.477				
		16-20	9	4.44	.527				
		≥ 21	20	4.45	.510				
8	To decide on teachers' transfer	≤5	39	1.84	.874	1.91	.865	2.868	.027*
		6-10	13	2.46	.967				
		11-15	19	2.00	.745				
		16-20	9	2.11	.927				
		≥ 21	20	1.50	.688				
9	To weed out incompetent teachers	≤5	39	1.97	.742	2.40	1.05	1.603	.180
		6-10	13	1.84	.688				
		11-15	19	1.84	.501				
		16-20	9	1.88	1.05				
		≥ 21	20	2.40	1.04				
10	For the sake of fulfilling administrative formalities.	≤5	39	3.89	.911	3.92	.960	1.102	.360
		6-10	13	4.00	.816				
		11-15	19	3.94	1.02				
		16-20	9	4.44	.881				
		≥ 21	20	3.65	1.08				

Key: M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, WM=Weighted Mean, N=Number of respondents, df= degree of freedom=99, *= Significant, P= Sig. (2-tailed), (M) [1-1.49] =strongly disagree, [1.5-2.49] =disagree, [2.5-3.49] = Moderate/Undecided, [3.5-4.49] = agree, and [4.5-5] = strongly agree

Table-6 shows that majority of respondents have been found agreeing or strongly agreeing to the statement that-the information from existing performance appraisal is being used as a basis to make administrative decision on teachers' rank in the career ladder, which in turn is supported by the highest weighted mean value i.e.4.45, followed by the statement that-PA is being used to fulfill administrative formalities in the schools- in terms of weighted mean value (3.92). Wherein statements like, the use PA result as to support teachers' professional development and to determine rewards and benefits for competent teachers have secured the lowest weighted mean values 1.90 and 1.83 respectively.

As seen in table 6, the result of one way ANOVA indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the study groups on the majority of items except items 2 and 8. The significance levels obtained for item 2 was $t(99) = 4.413, p = .003$ and item 8 had $t(99) = 2.868, p = 0.027$ which is less than 0.05.

Employing Tukey's HSD test for item 2, it was found that there are significant mean variations between respondents with teaching experience of ≤ 5 years ($M = 2.20$) and that of ≥ 21 years ($M = 1.35$). This clearly explains the higher the mean value means the higher teachers' perception toward the stated objective. Thus, the analysis shows that teachers of the service years below 5 years are more positively perceived among the rest service years group of teachers. Whereas the results also indicate that teachers of service years of above 20 years are the least perceived/ were rated low (full data is attached in annex- 5).

With regard to item 8 in table 6, the Post Hoc Tukey's HSD also showed that, teachers with teaching experience of above 20 years had negative perception toward the use of PA result in decision of teachers' transfer with lower mean score (1.50) than that of service years in between 6-10 years with mean score of (2.46) (full data is attached in annex- 6).

To sum up all above findings on items 1-10, as can be noted from the tables 3-5, majority of respondents from all study groups agree that the current system of TPA in secondary schools is to decide on teachers' rank in the career ladder and to fulfill administrative decisions with weighted mean value 4.45 and 3.92 respectively meaning it seems serving to accomplish only one of among summative purposes of PA. On the other hand, identifying training needs of teachers and

improving the quality of teaching and learning process were rated as undecided with weighted mean ranged between “2.5-3.49”.

In the regard, the result of T-test and ANOVA analysis also shows there is no significant differences on perception of respondents toward summative objectives that their PA currently primarily serving in their schools.

Further the results of T-test and ANOVA depicts that there is no significant difference on perception of respondents toward the formative or developmental objectives of TPA. That is, from the teachers’ response we can observe that the secondary schools did not use PA result to support teachers’ professional development. But in principle, the appraisal exercise should be aimed at helping teachers to grow professionally by enabling them express their concerns, realize their weaknesses and helping the teachers to overcome such weakness. According to this (Performance Appraisal, 2006) dictate that: identifying areas for development, and improving overall performance of teachers are one of the Performance Appraisal purpose.

On the other hand, as can be seen above, the others purpose of PA as to determine the rewards and benefits for competent teachers is also rated low by the respondents. So it indicates that teachers are not totally benefited from the system and without this system the profession of teachers may not be well developed. In this regard, many academics believe that one of the main purposes of PA is using it as a tool to determine rewards and benefits. Moreover, Rankin & Kleiner (1988) understood that one of the key factors of performance appraisals is that the program should tie personal rewards to organizational performance. Similarly, from the teachers’ response it can also be said that the schools did not use the performance result to motivate and promote work interest of teachers.

In line with the purposes mentioned above, the interviews conducted with the school leaders revealed that they believed the purposes of TPA were to decide on teachers’ rank in the career ladder, to select teachers for higher education and to improve quality of education.

Moreover, as obtained from document review of individual teacher, currently the major credit of (20%) in competing for further education of teachers are taken from results obtained

from TPA. From this one can conclude that the result of TPA teachers was serving to some extent as a basis for selection of teachers for higher education.

In general we can infer from above reports, the system of TPA in secondary schools of *Halaba special Woreda* currently serving to make administrative decision on teachers' rank in the career ladder and to fulfill administrative formalities. Moreover, the developmental use of TPA is totally ignored in this schools' PA system. For instance PA is not tied to professional development program and its result does not bringing any benefits and rewards for exceptional performing teachers and all in all the promotion and motivational functions of TPA is missing in this *Woreda*. Besides it know that the main purpose of TPA is to improve the performance of the teachers on their teaching learning process, but this purpose was also ignored. They justified on the open ended questions that the system is just for formality purposes meaning that they have never understood what the appraisal process is purposed for.

Generally, the purposes for which teachers performance appraisal has been serving were somewhat deviated from the purpose which it ought to serve for. Many writers (Mathis and Jackson, 1997; Henenman et al, 1996; Michael Beer, 1987) contend that the two primary purposes of teachers evaluation are summative (administrative) and formative (developmental). Summative purposes are aligned more with accountability and competence, whereas formative purposes are aligned with enhancement and improvement.

4.2.2. Perception of Teachers toward Process of PA

As stated previously, appraising the performance of teachers needs certain logical steps. One of the major purposes of this study, therefore, was to know the perception of teachers towards the implementation of the process of TPA in GSS of Halaba special Woreda. Thus, a process of TPA that needs to be followed was listed in the tables 6-8 below. Then teaches were asked to respond if this has currently been working in their schools, while the results from the tables were interpreted in relation to demographic characteristics of respondents.

4.2.2.1 Perception of Teachers toward PA Process across sex of respondents

Table 7: Mean distribution of responses and T-test results on the perception of PA process by sex of respondents

No	Variable	Sex	N	M	SD	T	P
1	Prior to appraisal process, adequate training and information about the performance appraisal is given for both teachers and appraisers.	Male	78	2.63	.968	.537	.592
		Female	22	2.50	1.06		
2	Prior to any action both appraisers and appraisees jointly meet and establish agreed up on objectives.	Male	78	2.36	.896	.570	.570
		Female	22	2.23	1.15		
3	The performance appraisal is conducted against the previously established objectives and criteria.	Male	78	3.07	1.21	-1.06	.317
		Female	22	3.36	1.05		
4	There is post appraisal discussion between appraisers and appraisees	Male	78	2.42	1.07	-1.29	.199
		Female	22	2.77	1.27		
5	I get timely and accurate feedback on my performance.	Male	78	2.67	1.13	.805	.423
		Female	22	2.45	.911		

Key: M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, N=Number of respondents, df= degree of freedom=99, *= Significant, P= Sig. (2-tailed), (M) [1-1.49] =strongly disagree, [1.5-2.49] =disagree, [2.5-3.49] = Moderate/Undecided, [3.5-4.49] = agree, and [4.5-5] = strongly agree

As shown above except item 2, all items in table 7- prior to appraisal process, adequate training and information about the performance appraisal is given for both teachers and appraisers, the performance appraisal is conducted against the previously established objectives and criteria and there is post appraisal discussion between appraisers and appraisees, and I get timely and accurate feedback on my performance were rated moderate (undecided) with the mean values lie in range between 2.50 and 3.36. This results depicted that most of essential steps of PA process were not properly practiced in appraisal of teachers in the study area.

While with regard to item 2, prior to any action both appraisers and appraisees jointly meet and establish agreed up on objectives, male and female respondents rated low (disagreed) with the mean score of 2.36 and 2.23 respectively. The data revealed that teachers' participation in the design of PA form and formulation of objectives was low.

An independent sample t-test was calculated to detect differences between the responses of the two study groups. The result of the test showed that for 2 degrees of freedom at the 0.05 level of significance, the obtained ($P > 0.05$ level). Thus, conclusion would be drawn that there is no reliable evidence showing the existence of statistically significant difference between male and female teachers in their perception about the process of TPA currently implementing in their schools. That is, a higher proportion of the respondents regarded the most of the essential PA steps as being not properly implemented in GSS of Halaba special *Woreda*.

4.2.2. Perception of Teachers toward the Process of TPA across educational background of respondents

Table 8: One Way ANOVA, Mean and Standard Deviation of PA Process in relation to respondents Qualifications

No	Variable	Qualification	N	M	SD	F	P
1	Prior to the appraisal process, adequate training and information about the appraisal is given for both the appraisees and appraisers.	Diploma	2	2.50	.707	1.14	.323
		BA/BSc	87	2.65	1.02		
		MA/MSc	11	2.18	.603		
2	Prior to any action both the appraisers and the appraisees meet and establish agreed up on objectives.	Diploma	2	4.00	.000	4.16	.018*
		BA/BSc	87	2.25	.930		
		MA/MSc	11	2.63	.924		
3	The performance appraisal is conducted against the previously established objectives and criteria.	Diploma	2	3.00	1.41	.276	.759
		BA/BSc	87	3.12	1.19		
		MA/MSc	11	3.27	1.10		
4	There is post appraisal discussion between appraisers and appraisees	Diploma	2	2.00	.000	.982	.378
		BA/BSc	87	2.45	1.08		
		MA/MSc	11	2.90	1.45		
5	I get timely and accurate feedback on my performance	Diploma	2	2.50	.707	.013	.987
		BA/BSc	87	2.62	1.01		
		MA/MSc	11	2.63	1.69		

Key: M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, WM= Weighted Mean, N=Number of respondents, df= degree of freedom=99, *= Significant, P= Sig. (2-tailed), (M) [1-1.49] =strongly disagree, [1.5-2.49] =disagree, [2.5-3.49] = Moderate/Undecided, [3.5-4.49] = agree, and [4.5-5] = strongly agree

As indicated in Table 8 above, ANOVA results showed that there was a significant difference across teachers' academic qualification and the perception toward the process of TPA regarding

to item 2 ; at $p < 0.05$ level. The Post Hoc Tukey showed that, the difference existed between diploma holder and 1st degree holder groups, whereby, diploma holders perceived the presence of stated process higher (M=4.0, SD= .000) than first degree holders (M=2.25, SD=.930) were disagree on that both teachers and appraisers set PA objectives and standards mutually before any action to happen (full data is attached in annex- 7).

However, it further emerged that there was no significant differences between teachers' academic qualifications and their perception toward the process of performance appraisal on items 1, 3, 4 and 5 in table 8- prior to appraisal process, adequate training and information about the performance appraisal is given for both teachers and appraisers, the performance appraisal is conducted against the previously established objectives and criteria, there is post appraisal discussion between appraisers and appraises, and provision of accurate and timely feedback on performance appraisal practiced. As can be seen from the table 8, the majority of respondents rated the above four items regarding steps of PA at a moderate level. Thus, it shows that the essential steps in the system of TPA were not properly implemented in the GSS of Halaba special *Woreda* from perspective of teachers across their gender.

4.2.2.3. Perception of Teachers toward Process TPA and Service/Experience years of respondents in Teaching

Table 9: One Way ANOVA, Mean and Standard Deviation of teachers' perception on PA Process in terms of teaching Experiences

No	Variables	Experience (in years)	N	M	SD	Total=100		F	P
						WM	SD		
1	Prior to appraisal process, adequate training and information about the performance appraisal is given for both teachers and appraisers.	≤5	39	2.61	1.06	2.60	.985	.382	.821
		6-10	13	2.61	1.26				
		11-15	19	2.36	.760				
		16-20	9	2.66	.500				
		≥ 21	20	2.75	1.01				
2	Prior to any action both appraisers and appraisees jointly meet and establish agreed up on objectives.	≤5	39	2.43	1.23	2.33	.954	1.021	.401
		6-10	13	1.92	.493				
		11-15	19	2.26	.871				
		16-20	9	2.66	.707				
		≥ 21	20	2.30	.656				
3	The performance appraisal is conducted against the previously established objectives and criteria.	≤5	39	3.12	1.19	3.14	1.18	.132	.970
		6-10	13	3.30	1.18				
		11-15	19	3.05	1.13				
		16-20	9	3.00	.961				
		≥ 21	20	3.20	.500				
4	There is post appraisal discussion between appraisers and appraisees on the performance the performance appraisal practiced.	≤5	39	2.51	1.04	2.50	1.12	.370	.829
		6-10	13	2.53	.967				
		11-15	19	2.26	1.32				
		16-20	9	2.44	1.50				
		≥ 21	20	2.70	1.03				
5	I get timely and accurate feedback on my performance.	≤5	39	2.20	.922	2.62	1.09	2.749	.033*
		6-10	13	2.76	1.01				
		11-15	19	3.05	.848				
		16-20	9	3.00	1.58				
		≥ 21	20	2.75	1.20				

Key: M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, WM= Weighted Mean, N=Number of respondents, df= degree of freedom=99, *= Significant, P= Sig. (2-tailed), (M) [1-1.49] =strongly disagree, [1.5-2.49] =disagree, [2.5-3.49] = Moderate/Undecided, [3.5-4.49] = agree, and [4.5-5] = strongly agree

In general, when referring to table 9 teachers rated all items except 2, regarding process of TPA were perceived and rated in the range of moderate level inclined to low “M=2.5-3.49”. From this one can conclude that -concerning item 1 and 2 of the table, the schools did not give training and

orientation about the performance appraisal system prior to the appraisal process, teachers' participation in formulation of performance objectives and standards is low which means teachers did not mutually set standards/goals of performance therefore teachers were treated unfairly.

Item 3 and 5 of table above also indicate that the two steps were achieved at intermediate level in the schools. That is, evaluation of performance against the formulated objectives and presence of adequate post appraisal discussions between teachers and their appraisers were made practical moderately inclined to low, as indicated by the mean scores of respondents.

Another One-way ANOVA was conducted to investigate the difference on the perception of the process of TPA variables across the teaching experience of respondents (Table 9). The findings here also revealed that there is no a significant difference on majority of items except item 4. The significance level obtained for item 4 was ($F = 2.749$, $p = .033$) which is less than 0.05.

A Post Hoc Tukey result suggests a significant difference among study groups, specifically between group of respondents who had working for ≤ 5 years and that of 11-15 years working in teaching. The findings revealed that, respondents having 11-15 years experienced teachers have the highest positive perception on providing accurate and timely feedbacks ($M = 3.05$, $SD = .848$) than their counterparts with ≤ 5 years of experience who were disagreed with ($M = 2.20$, $SD = .922$). Whereas when we look at weighted mean value (2.62) depicted that the feedbacks were not provided accurately and timely for teachers on the performance appraisal practiced in GSS of Halaba special, Woreda (full data is attached in annex-7)

To sum up all above findings on items 1-5 of tables 7-9, regarding item 1, teachers agreed that the schools did not give training and orientation about the performance appraisal system prior to the performance appraisal process. In the regard, document review result and interviewed school directors also confirmed that there has been some orientation given to teachers about PA since the beginning of academic year but the schools did not have any planned program intended to create awareness on the part of stake holders.

Further, teachers and appraisers are the primary implementers of school and educational objectives. They are the foundation of any education system. Therefore it is extremely important that they be informed/trained on performance appraisal practices, the use and purpose. Otherwise

if appraisal instruments are used on them without much information, then they are likely to rebel and perceive not only the appraisers but also the process negatively. By so doing, the objectives of performance appraisal could not have been achieved. However, Stronge (2006) asserted that teachers and other stakeholders should be educated on the role, purpose and importance of evaluation as a part of their regular professional.

The participation of teachers in the development of appraisal criteria, methods and in the process of conducting appraisal will satisfy the teacher to accept the appraisal system. As shown in item 2, most of the teachers responded that they did not get an opportunity to discuss and to establish agreed upon PA goals before PA process in to action (WM=2.33), therefore teachers were treated unfairly.

In addition, interview with school directors also showed that teachers' participation is limited only to give comment on what was already prepared by someone else either by Woreda education officials or officials of the Regional Education Bureau. Similar result was obtained from the document review of the sampled schools. This revealed that teachers' participation in designing PA criteria, goals and measurements was low. Therefore the current practice of TPA system goes contrary with the literature.

This finding goes in harmony with study of Yilma (2007: vii), concluded that the teachers of primary were not fully involved in developing the appraisal criteria. Whereas, the participation of employees in the development of appraisal criteria and measures makes the employee to accept and being satisfied with the appraisal system (Muhammad, 2013).

With regard to analysis of item 3, the extent of conducting teachers' performance against the previously established objectives and criteria was rated moderate (WM=3.14) by the respondents that means teachers have been appraised to some extent based on pre-established criteria. In this connection, interviewed school directors have confirmed the existence of predetermined sets of objectives against which teachers' performance is measured. Accordingly, they have asserted that there are no major confusions during performance appraisal period since teachers are familiar with job expectations which are demanded from them.

In a similar way, as respondents (teachers) responded that there was no adequate post appraisal

discussions between teachers and their appraisers. From the data it could be realized that most teachers were not provided with the opportunity to exchange ideas with their appraisers on how their performance was appraised, and give suggestions about the steps needed to be taken to develop skills and competences and improve performance so as to achieve better results in the future (See item 5 of tables 7-9 above). In this regard, most of the school directors who participated during interview insisted in the existence of pre and post appraisal conferences, they failed to come up with tangible evidences especially on pre appraisal conference.

In confirmation with this finding, the study of Endale (2015:1), asserted that there were absence of pre and post-appraisal meeting and lack of training on the TPA. In addition to this (Ylma, 2007: vii), revealed that most school principals didn't conduct post appraisal conversation with all teachers being appraised. It would be, therefore, safe to say that the absence of post-appraisal discussions might have forced secondary school teachers develop negative perception toward the current system of TPA.

Finally, as to teachers' responses on item 4, most of them perceived negatively with weighted mean (WM=2.62), that the feedbacks was not provided accurately and timely in their schools. Similar responses were obtained in the interviews with school leaders. This could negatively affect teachers' perception on the performance appraisal system. As most authors agreed providing feedback is the most common justification for an organization because employees will learn how well they did the task over the period and then use the information to improve their performance in the future. Further Jensen and Reich (2011) asserted that, effectively to appraise and providing continual feedback to teachers significantly improves teachers' understanding of their teaching methods, teaching practices and student learning.

Therefore, from the above data the researcher believes that there is a significant gap between the appraisers and teachers on the way they think giving feedback regarding teachers' performance regularly.

Moreover, the overall summarized findings concerning the items mentioned in the process of performance appraisal i.e. appraisal done as per pre-established standards and feedback on progress is forwarded accurately and timely were rated moderately. However, orientation and

training was in place prior to implementation appraisal done (pre-appraisal discussion), teachers and appraisers develop PA objectives mutually together and presence of post-appraisal discussion were rated low/ negatively perceived by teachers.

In general, the implementations of the basic activities in the process of TPA in secondary schools under study was found to be moderate inclined to low. This indicates that, the TPA system in these secondary schools was not properly designed and it was simply made for the sake of appraising teachers without communicating appraisal objectives and results on time. Further, the document analysis and teachers' response on open ended questions confirms the absence of PA guideline documents like, MoE TPA guideline, annual school PA plan and policy and any related procedures and appropriately planned PA system which enable effective implementation of the system and helping to motivate teachers to develop professionally. Moreover, respondents also raised in open ended questions that there was no any mechanism taken to redesign and review PA process in order to improve its implementation. As shown in the literature, this may lead to be a source of dissatisfaction, and conflict between appraisers and teachers, and a source of incorrect performance data which leads to subjective personnel decisions (West and Billington, 19990:55)

4.2.3. Perception of Teachers toward the PA Criteria

This section looks at the analysis of perception teachers toward performance appraisal criteria as required in the secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda. To this end, respondents were asked to rate the items and the responses of teachers were presented, analyzed and interpreted below.

4.2.3.1. Perception toward the Criteria of PA across Sex of Respondents

This sub section at analysis of criteria of a system of PA perceived across sex of respondents in the study area. To do a thorough analysis of differences in perception toward criteria of PA vis a' vis teachers' gender, was analyzed using the t-test.

Table 10: Mean Distribution of Responses and t-test Results for Criteria Related Issues

No	Variables	Sex	N	M	SD	T	P
1	Criteria are clearly defined and objective-oriented.	Male	78	3.0	1.09	-.694	.489
		Female	22	3.18	1.05		
2	Criteria are exhaustive to appraise teachers' performance.	Male	78	2.71	1.28	1.037	.302
		Female	22	2.40	1.05		
3	The criteria employed are relevant to the purposes of TPA.	Male	78	2.65	1.22	-.097	.923
		Female	22	2.68	1.04		
4	The Performance Appraisal form is capable of distinguishing effective from ineffective performers.	Male	78	2.67	1.19	-.383	.703
		Female	22	2.77	.972		
5	The overall current appraisal criteria fulfilled the required quality to appraise teachers	Male	78	2.33	1.02	.240	.811
		Female	22	2.50	.913		

Key: M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, WM=Weighted Mean, N=Number of respondents, df= degree of freedom=98, *= Significant, P= Sig. (2-tailed), (M) [1-1.49] =strongly disagree, [1.5-2.49] =disagree, [2.5-3.49] = Moderate/Undecided, [3.5-4.49] = agree, and [4.5-5] = strongly agree

As shown in items 1-5 in table 10- criteria are clearly defined and objective, criteria are exhaustive to appraise teachers' performance, the criteria employed are relevant, the performance appraisal form is capable of distinguishing effective from ineffective performers and the overall current appraisal criteria fulfilled the required quality to appraise teachers were rated moderate (undecided) with the average mean values between "2.55-3.10" each. This implies that all the items regarding PA criteria were negatively perceived by majority of respondents with regard to their sex. Thus, the PA criteria should be reviewed.

Further statistical analysis was used to test significant differences in responses for each items in table 10 above. Thus, the result of independent sample t- test showed for 98 degree of freedom at 0.05 alpha level of significance, the calculated t-values are greater than the alpha level, and it implies that, there are no significant differences in perceptions between males and females for teachers' performance appraisal criteria in *Halaba special Woreda* secondary schools.

4.2.3.2 Perception toward PA Criteria across Educational Background of Respondents

Table 11: Mean Distribution of Responses and One Way ANOVA results for Criteria Related Issues

No	Variables	Qualification	N	M	SD	F	P
1	Criteria are clearly defined and objective.	Diploma	2	3.00	1.41	1.30	.275
		BA/BSC	87	3.10	1.07		
		MA/MSC	11	2.54	1.13		
2	Criteria are exhaustive to appraise performance	Diploma	2	3.50	2.12	.619	.540
		BA/BSC	87	2.60	1.14		
		MA/MSC	11	2.81	1.78		
3	The criteria employed are relevant to the purpose of TPA	Diploma	2	3.00	1.41	.084	.919
		BA/BSC	87	2.65	1.08		
		MA/MSC	11	2.63	1.91		
4	The Performance Appraisal form is capable of distinguishing effective from ineffective performers	Diploma	2	2.00	.000	.662	.518
		BA/BSC	87	2.73	1.13		
		MA/MSC	11	2.45	1.29		
5	The overall current appraisal criteria fulfilled the required quality to appraise teachers.	Diploma	2	3.00	1.41	.452	.638
		BA/BSC	87	2.37	.977		
		MA/MSC	11	2.27	1.10		

Key: M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, N=Number of respondents, df= degree of freedom=99, *= Significant, P= Sig. (2-tailed), (M) [1-1.49] =strongly disagree, [1.5-2.49] =disagree, [2.5-3.49] = Moderate/Undecided, [3.5-4.49] = agree, and [4.5-5] = strongly agree

It is clear from table 11 that the mean ratings responses of teachers across their gender on perception toward TPA criteria, ranged between “3.05-2.37”, which is a level of moderate. Item (1) (criteria are clearly defined and objective) earned the highest mean reaching (3.05), which is a level of moderate/ undecided, and the last place came item 5) The overall current appraisal criteria fulfilled the required quality to appraise teachers. It earned a mean of (2.37), which is a level of low/disagreement.

This explains that the perception of teachers toward PA criteria used to appraise teachers performance in the low level that means it’s negatively perceived by most of teachers in secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda, from the perspective of respondents (teachers) across their gender.

One Way ANOVA test was conducted in order to ascertain the differences in the perception toward PA criteria variables due to educational qualifications. The findings as presented in the table 11 above indicated that, there is no statistically significant difference on perception toward PA criteria due to (Educational Qualifications) as the result of ANOVA showed for 98 degree of freedom at 0.05 alpha level of significance, the calculated P values are more than alpha level. Criteria are clearly defined and objective ($F=.309$, $p=.275$); The PA form is capable of distinguishing effective from ineffective performers ($F=.619$, $p=.540$); Criteria are exhaustive to appraise teachers performance ($F=.084$, $p=.919$); Criteria employed are relevant ($F=.662$, $p=.518$); and the overall current appraisal criteria fulfilled the required quality to appraise teachers ($F=.320$, $p=.727$).

Thus, conclusion would be drawn that there is no reliable evidence showing the existence of statistically significant difference among study groups in their perception about the TPA criteria employed to appraise teachers’ performance. That is, a higher proportion of the respondents regarded the overall current PA criteria as did not fulfill the required quality to appraise teachers’ performance in GSS of Halaba special Woreda.

4.2.3.3 Criteria of PA and years of experiences in teaching

Table 12: Mean Distribution of Responses and One Way ANOVA results for Criteria Related Issues

No	Variables	Experience (in years)	N	M	SD	Total=100		F	P
						WM	SD		
1	The criteria are clearly defined and objective.	≤5	39	3.15	1.06	3.04	1.08	1.478	.215
		6-10	13	3.07	1.25				
		11-15	19	3.05	1.07				
		16-20	9	2.22	1.09				
		≥ 21	20	3.15	.933				
2	The criteria are exhaustive to appraise the performance of teachers	≤5	39	1.29	1.29	2.65	1.23	.334	.854
		6-10	13	1.06	1.06				
		11-15	19	1.12	1.12				
		16-20	9	1.69	1.69				
		≥ 21	20	1.16	1.16				
3	The criteria employed are relevant to the purpose of TPA.	≤5	39	1.08	1.08	2.66	1.18	.235	.918
		6-10	13	1.01	1.01				
		11-15	19	1.23	1.23				
		16-20	9	1.58	1.58				
		≥ 21	20	1.31	1.31				
4	The PA form is capable of distinguishing effective from ineffective performers.	≤5	39	1.12	1.12	2.69	1.14	1.843	.127
		6-10	13	1.44	10.44				
		11-15	19	.838	.838				
		16-20	9	1.24	1.24				
		≥ 21	20	1.09	1.09				
5	The overall current appraisal criteria fulfilled the required quality to appraise teachers' performance	≤5	39	2.41	.756	2.37	.991	.948	.440
		6-10	13	2.69	1.18				
		11-15	19	2.05	1.07				
		16-20	9	2.55	1.13				
		≥ 21	20	2.30	.801				

Key: M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, WM=Weighted Mean, N=Number of respondents, df= degree of freedom=99, *= Significant, P= Sig. (2-tailed), (M) [1-1.49] =strongly disagree, [1.5-2.49] =disagree, [2.5-3.49] = Moderate/Undecided, [3.5-4.49] = agree, and [4.5-5] = strongly agree

As shown in items 1,2,3,4, and 5 in table 12-the criteria are clearly defined and objective, the PA form is capable of distinguishing effective from ineffective performers, the criteria are exhaustive to appraise teachers' performance, the criteria employed are relevant and the overall current appraisal criteria fulfilled the required quality to appraise teachers' performance rated moderate (undecided) with the weighted mean values 3.04, 2.65, 2.66, 2.69 and 2.54 respectively.

This explains that PA criteria used to appraise teachers' performance are perceived in the low level in secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda, from the perspective of respondents (teachers) across their experiences categories.

Further one way ANOVA test was applied to identify if there is significant difference in opinions with respect to the perception toward PA criteria across experiences categories. Table 11 show that there is no statistically significant differences on all items. For the items 1,2,3,4 and 5, the obtained (p) values are greater than the 0.05 level of significance.

This reveals an agreement in views between Experiences categories for the perception teachers toward the criteria of a system of TPA in the secondary schools of *Halaba special Woreda*.

To sum up the findings on items regarding PA criteria, one can understand that the PA criteria were perceived to be moderately vague and subjective in nature (item1). This may due to the criteria/standards were not communicated and mutually established with teachers prior to any action. The school directors also disclosed in interview made with the investigator that the TPA criteria were to some extent vague and so that they were unable to defined clearly and some are subjective in nature. Hence, the lack of clarity and objectivity of the criteria used to measure the performance of the teachers creates role ambiguity, confusion and frustration among the teachers to undertake their teaching.

Therefore, majority of teachers seem to have a negative attitude toward the criteria because of the reason that they were developed by *Woreda* education office and the majority of the teachers have not been involved in their formulation. Whereas, according to Iraki (2013) the existence of clear criteria and standards of performance are seen as a key factor for quality teacher evaluation systems.

Further the study results also showed that the exhaustiveness of PA criteria to measure true performance of the teachers and the relevance of the criteria to the purposes of TPA were negatively perceived by teachers with weighted mean value of 2.65 and 2.66 respectively. This indicates that the criteria were not developed based on the purposes intended to bring about the quality of education through training and development provision for teachers.

Moreover as indicated in analysis of item 4, majority of respondents moderately agree that the form used to evaluate their performance is capable of distinguishing effective from ineffective performers. This indicates the need for the improvement of the form used in order to enhance its capability to measure the PA. In connection to this, as the analysis made by the researcher from the interview of school administrators and from the file containing a yearly record of TPA, the average PA results of three years (2006-2008 E.C) of each secondary school was also greater than 83%. Thus, the results suggested that the practice of performance appraisal in school did not distinguish effective performers from ineffective performers. Further, the analysis of schools' PA documents conducted by the researcher also confirms that there is the practice of using uniform PA format for all teachers irrespective of their role or level of experiences and qualifications with in the schools under consideration.

To this effect, the work of Tatek (2012: xiii), also revealed that PA which was practiced in secondary schools didn't distinguishing effective performers from ineffective due to absence of proper implementation of PA.

Finally, as most of the respondents agreed that the current appraisal criteria employed to appraise the performance of secondary school teachers are conceived to be deficient in fulfilling the required quality to appraise teachers. (See item 5). This may indicate that what teachers would have expected the criteria to be and the contents of the current appraisal criteria have been incompatible to a considerable degree. It would be, therefore, safe to presume that the performance of secondary teachers has been appraised by criteria which teachers considered to be inadequate and inappropriate to undertake the task of TPA. But according to different studies, among the important factors in determining effectiveness of PAS is the acceptance of its users. Flecher, (2004) emphasized that employees must have trust on the accuracy and fairness of PAS, otherwise they are tremendous waste of time and money spend on implementation and development.

From the above evidences, one can conclude that appraisal criteria being used to appraise teachers' performance in secondary schools of Halaba special *Woreda* were not clearly defined and objective, the current teacher's performance appraisal form did not discriminate good performers from poor performers, criteria were not exhaustive to measure teachers' performance and the overall PA criteria did not fulfill the required quality to appraise teachers' performance from the

perceptive of teachers. This shows that teachers have negative perception toward PA criteria used to measure their performance.

In this respect, (Swanepoel, 2003) argued that for an appraisal system to be successful and effective it must fulfill certain basic criteria or requirements, such as relevance, validity, reliability and discriminability/sensitivity. (As cited in Endale, 2015:298). In addition, this finding strengths the Yilma (2007: vii) study which concluded that teachers and school principals didn't have favorable attitude towards TPA criteria in primary schools.

4.2.4. Procedures and Methods Used to Appraise Teachers' Performance

This section of the analysis deals with an assessment of the procedures and methods used to appraise teachers' performance in the secondary schools of Halaba special *Woreda*. To do so some 9 major types of methods and procedures have been identified in the study and the response of respondents were presented, analyzed and interpreted here und

Table 13: Methods and Procedures of Teachers' Performance Appraisal

No	Practices	Value	
		Mean	St. Deviation
1	The school conducts performance appraisal regularly	2.78	1.05
2	My achievement at school are kept in my portfolio for future use	2.92	.950
3	I am provided with facilities for accomplishing my tasks before performance appraisal	3.24	.965
4	Substantial time is allotted for performance appraisal practices	2.86	.953
5	Students participate on performance appraisal practices	1.98	.942
6	Before rating the performance supervisors gather information from peers	2.21	.868
7	There is a chance to assess own performance (self-appraisal method)	2.23	.789
8	Department heads participate on performance appraisal practices	3.55	.946
9	I am happy with the overall practice of performance appraisal system.	2.42	1.016

Key: (M) [1-1.49] =strongly disagree, [1.5-2.49] =disagree, [2.5-3.49] = Moderate/Undecided, [3.5-4.49] = agree, and [4.5-5] = strongly agree

Item 1 of table 13 shows that some teachers have reflected that schools conduct appraisal regularly (M=2.78). The mean value of response claimed that the moderate practice inclined to low. This depicts that performance of teachers in secondary schools were not appraised regularly. This implies that teaching performance of teachers being appraised once or twice in a year for the sake of administrative purposes. Further, this type of appraisal do not have any impact on enhancing the development of teachers and improvement of teaching –learning process. Therefore, secondary schools under the study should give a considerable attention to teachers’ performance appraisal.

Whereas according to literatures teachers’ performance can be assessed in two ways they called as formative and summative assessment. In formative assessment teachers’ performances are assessed weekly and monthly while in summative assessment teachers’ performances are evaluated every 6 month and once at the year end. As data analysis revealed teachers were appraised in summative way.

On structured interview made with school directors and vice directors, almost all of them have confirmed that schools did not conduct regular performance appraisal most of the time it takes place twice in a year. The respondents have also witnessed that government secondary schools predominantly use rating scale (likert scale) appraisal for measuring teachers’ performance. Whereas, for PA to be effective according to Tatek (2012) it should be implemented on the time as it was planned before and appraisers should follow the process to meet its intended objectives.

According to the finding discussed under item 3 of table 13, considerable number of teachers agreed that there was not that much organized documents/files for their performance that can be used during performance appraisal practices (M=2.92). This shows that there was absence of well documented portfolio of their performance. This may imply that appraisers feels that evaluation is a onetime activity and is exposed to commit recency error i.e. to look for only recent performance. If appraisers does not keep a record on teachers’ performance, he is unable to provide the right feedback at the right time and misleads the whole hale year performance of the teacher by concentrating all the recent performance.

Participants of the study were asked about the facilities provided to them to accomplish their tasks and majority of teachers replied their moderate satisfaction with the facilities provided for properly accomplishing their tasks ($M=3.24$). This may implies the provision of necessary facilities for successful accomplishment of teaching duties is not adequate in these schools. This ultimately results in negative perception of teachers' toward the PA program implemented.

Regarding the allotted time for conducting performance appraisal which has been shown on item 4 of table 13, respondents (teachers) were rated moderate inclined to low with mean score 2.86 that substantial time is not given for the appraisal practice. This indicates that the level of adequacy of the time given for appraisals of teachers was found to be rated at medium level by respondents. This implies that the school top level management seem do not have such a commitment on PA system. Thus this area needs improvement.

Item 5 in table 13 portrays that large number teachers have responded that students do not participate in appraisal practices. The mean value of teachers response ($M=1.98$) shows that participation of students in appraising teachers is low. As long as the participation of students decreases, the reliability and trustfulness of appraisal results also decreases. In relation to this Rasheed (2011) stated as the obsolete evaluation system, exclusion of students' feedback, untrained evaluators and decreased motivation for the process are the potential hindering factors for performance appraisal systems.

With regard to item 6 most of teachers' with ($M=2.21$) respondents argue that supervisors did not ask their peer's opinion about their performance while making an assessment of teachers' performance. This explains that there is no practice of using peers' as source of information in rating teachers.

On the other hand, as item 7 of table 13, indicates majority of the respondents (teachers) replied that they did not have given a chance to assess their own performance in a self-appraisal method with mean value of ($M=2.23$) based on the agreed plan. This indicates that teachers' self-appraisal method were not practiced in schools under study. Thus this will result in, increase fears and anxieties, and increases resistance to change, and generates negative perception to the system.

On item 8 of table 13, great number of teachers agreed with mean value (M=3.55) on that using department heads as a source of data. This teacher's response revealed that the participation of department heads on performance appraisal practices to be at high level. This portrays that departments role on appraising teachers has been taken into consideration.

This shows that, as the majority of respondents confirmed, appraising teachers' performance by department heads were practiced relatively higher but not common in secondary schools. Peers and students involvement in teachers' performance appraisal was by far below that of department heads. Thus it is important to note that the all- round performance appraisal practices that measure the qualitative and quantitative aspects of teacher performance e.g. the 360⁰ feedback are not used in Halaba special Woreda. Other more democratic, participatory and inclusive performance appraisal practices like peer appraisal, self-appraisal and student/customer appraisal are either minimally used or not used at all.

In addition, the interview conducted with school directors indicated that the practice of teachers' performance appraisal was different from school to school. As school leaders said in some school vice principals, department heads and unit leaders evaluate teachers performance, while in the other schools only the principals evaluate teachers' but unit leaders and department heads participate for suggestion only. The majority of respondents indicated that teachers were appraised commonly at the end of mid-term and academic year.

Further, from the open ended questions also the respondents replied that the appraisers used only limited number of methods to collect data on performance appraisal. The appraisers mainly used checklist and peer evaluation methods in gathering information at school level. According to Melaku (2010:41) multiple appraisal approach such as peer appraisal, student appraisal and self-appraisal are also vital to reduce appraisal errors and create trust and confidence in the school organization. The data analysis revealed that teachers' to be appraised by a single appraiser than a committee form hence it seems unfair to appraise teachers by a single appraiser. The document analysis also shows that performance result were signed only by the vice principals and approved by principals. Hence seems unfair.

Finally, respondents (teachers) were asked whether they are satisfied on the overall performance appraisal system in the schools, majority of the respondents (teachers) disagreed that the current performance appraisal system satisfaction. The mean value of respondent (M=2.42) indicates that most of the teachers were not satisfied with practice of system of performance appraisal. This is due to improper procedures and unfair methods used by appraisers in the process of PA implementation in their schools. This negatively impact the effectiveness of overall practice.

Whereas employees' thoughts on the performance appraisal system are vital to the continuing success of the system (Dipboye and Pont Briand, 1981). Therefore if teachers' opinions of the system are not positive, then the system will not work as it is supposed to, as a tool to assess, motivate and develop teachers.

4.2.5. Principles of Effective Performance Appraisal Systems

This study sought to find out the extent that TPA system in GSS of Halaba special Woreda has been employing the principles and effective characteristics of performance evaluation system and teachers' attitudes toward the system. To this end, respondents were provided with eleven statements on perception/satisfaction and were required to rate them using the scale of totally agree as the highest positive remark and totally disagree as the lowest remark. The responses were subjected to descriptive statistics and means obtained. The results are discussed next

4.2.5.1 Level of perception of teachers toward the overall PA practice across sex of respondents

Table 14: t-test and mean distribution of responses on the overall PA practice across sex of respondents

No	Variable	Sex	N	M	SD	t	P
1	The appraisal system is effective in encouraging me to work hard	Male	78	2.30	.63	1.434	.155
		Female	22	2.09	.61		
2	The appraisal system of the school is motivating to the teachers	Male	78	2.59	.959	1.824	.071
		Female	22	2.18	.795		
3	Those who got the highest rank are given appropriate rewards	Male	78	2.58	1.14	2.133	0.35*
		Female	22	2.00	1.02		
4	I take part in the formulation of the performance appraisal system	Male	78	2.02	1.05	-1.379	.171
		Female	22	2.36	.848		
5	I am satisfied with the way I am being evaluated and ranked	Male	78	2.36	1.29	.301	.764
		Female	22	2.27	.631		
6	I take greater understanding of the results expected of me from appraisal.	Male	78	2.71	1.07	.136	.892
		Female	22	2.68	1.17		
7	Performance goals are clearly defined in the appraisal process	Male	78	2.46	1.02	-.157	.876
		Female	22	2.50	.963		
8	I am satisfied with the feedback aspect of performance appraisal	Male	78	2.60	.958	1.034	.304
		Female	22	2.36	.953		
9	The performance appraisal system improves the relationship with my supervisor.	Male	78	1.98	1.02	-.437	.663
		Female	22	2.09	.811		
10	All the information obtained from performance appraisal is confidential.	Male	78	2.76	1.20	-.012	.990
		Female	22	2.77	1.19		
11	Performance appraisal in my school is fair to all teachers	Male	78	2.95	1.31	1.434	.259
		Female	22	2.59	1.25		

Key: M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, N=Number of respondents, df= degree of freedom=98, *= Significant, P= Sig. (2-tailed), (M) [1-1.49] =strongly disagree, [1.5-2.49] =disagree, [2.5-3.49] = Moderate/Undecided, [3.5-4.49] = agree, and [4.5-5] = strongly agree

As shown in table 14 above, out of the eleven items, the respondents had moderate level of perception on three items i.e., ‘I take greater understanding of the results expected of me’, ‘All the information obtained from performance appraisal is confidential’ and ‘Performance appraisal in my school is fair for all teachers’. However, the respondents’ level of perception to overall PA practice is low for the remaining seven items, which ranged with mean value from a maximum of 2.46 to a minimum of 1.98 for each.

As most of the items analysis shows, it can be understood that teacher's perception/satisfaction toward overall practice of a system of TPA has earned mean of low to the eleven aspect of PA perception. Thus this mean score indicates that the perception of teachers of secondary schools in Halaba special Woreda toward the overall PA practice is low.

As shown in Table 14, the result of independent t-test, suggests that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of respondents on all items, except item 3. Significance level obtained for this item was, $t(98) = 2.133$, $p = .034$, that is less than 0.05. Therefore, the results are significant. According to these results, there is statistically significant difference in the perception of male and female respondents regarding to extent of practice of giving appropriate rewards for those who got high rank.

When the results were compared on the basis of mean score, it was found that male respondents were rated moderate/ undecided with ($M=2.58$, $SD=1.14$) but female respondents were disagree with ($M=2.00$, $SD=1.02$) on the statement.

4.2.5.2 Perception of teachers toward overall PA practice by their educational qualifications

Table 15: Mean Distribution of Responses and ANOVA-test Results on the perception of Teachers Performance Appraisal

No	Variable	Qualification	N	M	SD	F	P
1	The appraisal system is effective in encouraging me to work hard	Diploma	2	1.50	.707	1.629	.201
		BA/BSc	87	2.26	.637		
		MA/MSc	11	2.36	.504		
2	The appraisal system of the school is motivating to the teachers	Diploma	2	2.50	.707	1.39	.252
		BA/BSc	87	2.50	.938		
		MA/MSc	11	2.45	1.03		
3	Those who got the highest rank are given appropriate rewards	Diploma	2	2.00	1.41	4.33	.016*
		BA/BSc	87	2.34	1.04		
		MA/MSc	11	3.36	1.50		
4	I take part in the formulation of the performance appraisal system	Diploma	2	2.00	.000	1.88	.157
		BA/BSc	87	2.17	1.05		
		MA/MSc	11	1.54	.687		
5	I am satisfied with the way I am being evaluated and ranked	Diploma	2	2.00	.000	.721	.489
		BA/BSc	87	2.29	1.18		
		MA/MSc	11	2.72	1.27		
6	I take greater understanding of the results expected of me	Diploma	2	2.50	2.12	.768	.467
		BA/BSc	87	2.67	1.08		
		MA/MSc	11	3.09	1.04		
7	Performance goals are clearly defined in the appraisal process	Diploma	2	2.50	.707	.400	.671
		BA/BSc	87	2.43	.985		
		MA/MSc	11	2.72	1.27		
8	I am satisfied with the feedback aspect of Performance appraisal	Diploma	2	2.50	.707	.003	.997
		BA/BSc	87	2.55	.985		
		MA/MSc	11	2.54	.820		
9	The performance appraisal system improves the relationship with my supervisor	Diploma	2	2.00	.000	.065	.937
		BA/BSc	87	2.02	.939		
		MA/MSc	11	1.90	1.37		
10	All the information obtained from performance appraisal is confidential	Diploma	2	2.00	1.41	.668	.515
		BA/BSc	87	2.81	1.21		
		MA/MSc	11	2.54	1.03		
11	The appraisal system in my school is fair for all teachers.	Diploma	2	2.00	1.41	1.636	.200
		BA/BSc	87	2.80	1.30		
		MA/MSc	11	3.36	1.12		

Key: M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, N=Number of respondents, df= degree of freedom=99, *= Significant, P= Sig. (2-tailed), (M) [1-1.49] =strongly disagree, [1.5-2.49] =disagree, [2.5-3.49] = Moderate/Undecided, [3.5-4.49] = agree, and [4.5-5] = strongly agree

As shown in table 15 above, out of eleven items, the respondents had moderate level of perception/satisfaction on five items i.e., ‘The appraisal system in my school is fair for all teachers’, ‘I take greater understanding of the results expected of me from appraisal’, ‘I am satisfied with the feedback aspect of performance appraisal’, ‘All the information obtained from performance appraisal is confidential’, and ‘The appraisal system of the school is motivating to the teachers’. However, the respondents’ level of perception is also low for the remaining six items, which ranged with mean scores from a maximum 2.43 to a minimum of 1.5 for each.

This explains that perception of teachers toward the current TPA system is moderate inclined to low and they are dissatisfied with current practice in secondary schools of Halaba special *Woreda*, from the perspective of respondents (teachers) across educational qualifications categories.

Further one way ANOVA test was applied to identify if there is significant difference in opinions with respect to the perception teachers toward overall PA practice across educational qualifications of respondents. Accordingly ANOVA test result showed that there is statistically significant differences in perception of respondents on all items except item 3. For this item the significance level obtained was $F= 4.329$, $p= .016$ that is less than $.05$. Thus respondents were differed in opinion toward the practice of rewarding in relation to PA results.

Post Hoc Tukey showed that, the difference existed between first degree holder and master’s degree holder groups, whereby, Master’s degree holders perceived the practice of rewarding those who got highest rank in PA result higher ($M=3.3$) than first degree holders ($M=2.35$) (full data is attached in annex- 9).

4.2.5.3 Level of perception of teachers toward overall PA practice across experiences categories

Table 16: Mean Distribution of Responses and ANOVA test Results on perception of Teachers Performance Appraisal

No	Variables	Experience	N	M	SD	Total: N=100		F	P
						WM	SD		
1	The appraisal system is effective in encouraging me to work hard.	≤5 years	39	2.18	.644	2.2	.629	.995	.415
		6-10	13	2.38	.767				
		11-15	19	2.47	.77				
		16-20	9	2.22	.440				
		≥ 21 years	20	2.15	.36				
2	The appraisal system of the school is motivating to the teachers	≤5 years	39	2.46	1.23	2.50	.937	.822	.515
		6-10	13	2.15	.800				
		11-15	19	2.52	.749				
		16-20	9	2.55	.707				
		≥ 21 years	20	2.75	1.27				
3	Those who got the highest rank are given appropriate rewards	≤5 years	39	2.25	1.06	2.45	1.14	.562	.691
		6-10	13	2.46	1.33				
		11-15	19	2.68	1.002				
		16-20	9	2.67	1.50				
		≥ 21 years	20	2.50	1.14				
4	I take part in the formulation of the performance appraisal system	≤5 years	39	2.28	1.19	2.10	1.02	2.36	.059
		6-10	13	2.61	1.04				
		11-15	19	1.84	.688				
		16-20	9	2.00	.707				
		≥ 21 years	20	1.70	.864				
5	I am satisfied with the way I am being evaluated and ranked	≤5 years	39	2.30	1.19	2.34	1.18	1.90	.116
		6-10	13	2.30	1.03				
		11-15	19	2.16	1.11				
		16-20	9	3.33	1.00				
		≥ 21 years	20	2.15	1.26				
6	I take greater understanding of the results expected of me	≤5 years	39	2.25	1.16	2.71	1.09	4.83	.001*
		6-10	13	2.61	1.04				
		11-15	19	2.73	.933				
		16-20	9	3.22	.83				
		≥ 21 years	20	3.40	.82				
7	Performance goals are clearly defined in the appraisal process.	≤5 years	39	2.46	1.12	2.47	1.00	.228	.922
		6-10	13	2.61	1.04				
		11-15	19	2.58	.768				
		16-20	9	2.33	1.22				
		≥ 21 years	20	2.35	.933				
8	I am satisfied with the feedback aspect of Performance appraisal	≤5 years	39	2.33	.927	2.55	.957	.930	.450
		6-10	13	2.85	1.34				
		11-15	19	2.63	.830				
		16-20	9	2.67	.500				
		≥ 21 years	20	2.65	.988				
9	The performance appraisal system improves the relationship with my supervisor.	≤5 years	39	2.13	1.104	2.01	.979	.543	.705
		6-10	13	2.07	.493				
		11-15	19	2.05	.848				
		16-20	9	1.89	1.27				
		≥ 21 years	20	1.75	.966				
10	All the information obtained from performance appraisal is confidential	≤5 years	39	2.41	1.35	2.77	1.19	2.53	.045*
		6-10	13	2.84	1.14				
		11-15	19	2.68	1.00				
		16-20	9	3.00	1.41				
		≥ 21 years	20	3.40	.068				
11	The appraisal system in my school is fair.	≤5 years	39	2.02	1.18	2.85	1.29	10.09	.000*
		6-10	13	3.08	.759				
		11-15	19	3.16	1.07				
		16-20	9	3.33	.866				
		≥ 21 years	20	3.80	1.24				

Key: M=Mean, SD=Standard deviation, WM=weighted mean, N=Number of respondents, df= degree of freedom=99, *=Significant, P= Sig. (2-tailed), (M) [1-1.49] =strongly disagree, [1.5-2.49] =disagree, [2.5-3.49] = Moderate/Undecided, [3.5-4.49] = agree, and [4.5-5] = strongly agree

As shown in table 16 above, out of eleven items, the respondents had moderate level of perception/satisfaction on five items i.e., ‘The appraisal system of the school is motivating to the teachers’, ‘I take greater understanding of the results expected of me from appraisal’, ‘I am satisfied with the feedback aspect of performance appraisal’, ‘All the information obtained from performance appraisal is confidential’, and ‘The appraisal system in my school is fair’. However, the respondents’ level of perception is low for the remaining six items, which ranged with weighted mean from maximum 2.47, i.e. ‘Performance goals are clearly defined in the appraisal process’, to a minimum of 2.01 i.e. ‘the performance appraisal system improves the relationship with my supervisor’.

This explains that the current system of TPA is perceived in the low level and negatively satisfied in secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda, from the perspective of respondents (teachers) across experiences categories.

To test differences between responses, further statistical analysis was employed. Accordingly, One Way ANOVA shows that, there is no statistically significant difference in opinions of the study categories of respondents except item 6, 10 and 11. For these items i.e. 6, 10, 11, the significance levels obtained were ($t=4.829$, $p=.001$), ($t=2.537$, $p=.045$) and ($t=10.09$, $p=.000$) that are less than 0.05 level of significance. Since the data in Table 16 do not clearly show which groups of respondents contributed more to this difference, multiple comparison was necessary. To this end, Tukey - HSD procedure was used (full data is attached in annex-10).

As seen in the annex, the mean values of the teaching experience of the respondents ≥ 21 years ($M=3.40$) is higher and there is statistically significant difference at 0.05 level. The higher the mean value means the higher positive teachers’ perception the great understanding of once expected results from PA. The analysis revealed that teachers of the service year’s ≥ 21 years are most positively perceived the great understanding of once expected results from PA among the rest service year’s groups of teachers. The results also show that teachers of the service years of ≤ 5 years are the least positively perceived or disagreed on the statement (full data is attached in annex-10).

In addition, for item 10, the comparison indicated significant mean differences between the teaching experience of the respondents ≥ 21 years with higher mean value ($M=3.41$) and

respondents of service years ≤ 5 years ($M=2.41$) and there is statistically significant difference at 0.05 level(2-tailed). No other pairwise comparison was significant. The higher the mean value means the higher positive teachers' perception on confidentiality of all information in the PA process. The analysis shows that teachers of the service year's ≥ 21 years are most positively perceived the confidentiality of PA among the rest service years group of teachers. The results also show that teachers of the service years of ≤ 5 years are the least positively perceived (full data is attached in annex-11).

In the case of item 11, the comparison indicated significant mean differences between the teaching experience of the respondents ≤ 5 years with the lowest mean value ($M=2.02$), and respondents of service years in between 6-10 years with mean value ($M=3.08$) and teaching experience of respondents in between 11-15 years ($M=3.15$), group of respondents with teaching experiences in between 16-20 years ($M=3.33$) and respondents of service years ≥ 21 years ($M=3.80$). The Post Hoc tests analysis result clearly shows that statistically significant difference between above mentioned groups at 0.05 level (2-tailed). No other pairwise comparison was significant. The higher the mean value means the higher positive teachers' perception on fairness of the PA process.

From the analysis it is possible to infer that the majority of teachers across experiences categories (except the teachers with ≤ 5 years' experience) consider the current TPA system in secondary schools as being moderately fair for all teachers. While group of teachers with service of ≤ 5 years least positively perceived on fairness of PA (full data is attached in annex-12).

To sum up above findings from the above three tables 14-16, when looking at the statements as a whole, the results seem to be mostly negative with the majority of the respondents selected that they disagreed or strongly disagreed. There was also a significant amount of respondents who selected undecided. The figures for agreeing most part are very low.

The statement with the highest volume of disagreement/ least perceived is statement nine, which relates to the appraisal being improved the relationship between the teacher and the supervisor carrying out the appraisal. Thus majority of the teachers who involved in the survey didn't think the system helps to improve the relationship between them and their supervisors ($M=2.01$). They contend that rather than strengthening the relationship it leads to controversies and contradictions. Hence, it is apparent that in a school system there is poor communications and bad

relationships between the school leaders and their staff. The respondents overall seem not happy with the relationship with their immediate supervisor as a result of the performance appraisal.

However, as Fletcher (2004) confirmed, that one of the three things that employees being appraised looked for in a performance appraisal is their relationship with the appraiser. In the eyes of the employee, the performance appraisal is not effective if there is not a good relationship between them and the appraisers. Therefore, school under the study need to do a lot to minimize the risk of the existing scenario of weak relationship between teachers and supervisors emanating from the PA's weakness

As can be seen from the above findings, statement with the lowest disagreement is with weighted mean value ($M=2.85$), was statement eleven. This explains that teachers were not sure that the performance appraisal system is fair. From this one can conclude that there is maltreatment among teachers in the GSS of Halaba special Woreda. Research has shown, however, that the majority of employees want to perform well; the key is to provide them with the right environment in which to do so. Such an environment includes support, communication, collaboration and fair treatment- the very qualities created by effective performance appraisal systems (Delpo, 2005).

One of the most important statements in this question is whether teachers were involved in the formulation of appraisal system. Statement 4 asked the respondents to rate whether they are participated in the appraisal process. Overall response indicates that most of teachers were disagree on the statement (Mean=2.10). This echoes the results of question 2 in table 8, in where most of teachers responded that their participation in formulation of performance objectives and standards was low. For most the part of appraisal process, the schools' do not seem to participate teachers in Halaba special Woreda. This again clearly showed that they were left out in this vital process and the researcher had identified this as a factor which was influencing effectiveness of performance appraisal system.

However, the importance of appraisees participation in performance appraisal is colossal for the effectiveness of the procedure. In this connection, as Cawley et al (1998) stated that staff participation in the appraisal procedure has a major consequence on employee satisfaction and their acceptance of the performance appraisal.

With respect to analysis of item 3 in the tables above, the overall weighted mean (WM=2.45) for this item were lie in the range of low/disagreement about the extent of rewarding those who got high rank in their PA results. This question relates back to item 4 in table 3 about the schools' aims of performance appraisal. It asks the respondents directly whether their benefits and rewards are based on their performance ratings. Similarly, majority of respondents disagreed on the idea. These results showed that teachers who got the highest rank/competent teachers were not given any rewards and benefits in relation to their PA results. This is a clear indication that this particular performance appraisal system rewards performers and non-performers on equal measures. This will demoralize high performing teachers because the system is not able to recognize them and at the same time advantage non-performers. This is supported by the preceding findings on part 2 of study.

The interview from the school principals' shows that most of the teachers have negative reaction towards the implementation teachers' performance appraisals in their school they didn't satisfied towards the implementation of teachers performance appraisals due to different reason; as they mentioned most of the schools' teachers were first degree holder they consider that the result of performance appraisal were used for only career structured. In addition to that, those who were finished their career structure/development they consider performance appraisal as nothing. But few teachers' reactions were positive towards the practice of performance appraisal.

Generally, from above analysis, it is possible to infer that the teachers are not convinced and happy about the implementation of the appraisal system of the schools. It was clear that the appraisal system is not motivating hence not effective. Besides, as its process is not confidential enough so that the practice is also unfair. Therefore, it is indicative that the schools should revisit and redesign its performance appraisal policies and strategies in order to bring positive change. The schools should realize that teacher input is a vital element of an effective performance appraisal system. It is imperative to include the teachers in the performance management process to ensure that the teachers feel a sense of engagement in the process.

In order to examine the existence of the principles of PAS applied in the schools, the researcher will look into whether the process includes fundamental elements of an effective appraisal according to the literature. The elements that will be discussed are fairness, teachers-supervisors

relationship, rewards linked to appraisal, accurate feedback, clearly defined goals, confidentiality and teachers participation.

➤ **Fairness**

As can be seen from the above tables, respondents were perceived the fairness of the PA practice at moderate level (inclined to low) with weighted mean value (WM=2.85), as to the existence of biases in performance evaluation. This indicates the lack of objectivity of appraisers in the system of the secondary schools education that accommodates all teachers at equal level. However, accuracy and fairness in the use of appraisal system is one of the key issues in making the performance appraisal in practice credible. Further, Fletcher (2004) also listed fairness as a crucial element of effective appraisal. Overall, lack of fairness of the appraisal is still a major issue for the schools as it seems to be a missing part of their system and is not incorporated an element of appraisal the school values.

➤ **Teachers –Supervisors Relationship**

The majority of the teachers who involved in the survey responded that they didn't think the system helps to improve the relationship between them and their supervisors (WM =2.01). They contend that rather than strengthening the relationship it leads to controversies and contradictions. Hence, it is apparent that in a school system there is poor communications and bad relationships between the school leaders and their staff. This feature also lack at GSS of Halaba special Woreda because majority respondents (teachers) overall seem not happy with the relationship with their immediate supervisor as a result of the performance appraisal. This situation has a negative impact on their appraisal process because a relationship between individual and one's superior hugely affects the system effectiveness.

However, as Fletcher (2004) confirmed, that one of the three things that employees being appraised looked for in a performance appraisal is their relationship with the appraiser. In the eyes of the employee, the performance appraisal is not effective if there is not a good relationship between them and the appraisers. Therefore, school under the study need to do a lot to minimize the risk of the existing scenario of weak relationship between teachers and supervisors emanating from the PA's weakness.

➤ **Rewards tied to appraisal**

A large majority of respondents (teachers) responded that the extent of rewarding those who got high rank in their PA results, was low with weighted mean (WM=2.45). This indicated that TPA was not integrated with rewards and not practiced properly so as to improve teachers' effectiveness to help quality education accomplishments. As previously showed in part one of the survey, when teachers were asked to choose what they felt were the aims the schools had for PA, most of the respondents chose it was not to determine benefits and rewards. From looking at the responses, the schools in question does not appear to use the appraisal as a method for determining rewards and pay, this is necessarily a negative, and hence teachers were not totally benefited from the system and not developed professionally. But this absence of linkage of PA with reward is still big issue in this level as well.

➤ **Confidentiality**

As can be seen in the previous analysis, the most of teachers responded that they were didn't believe the data collected through the PA process stays confidential (WM=2.77). This shows that teachers have negative perception on confidentiality of PA process all times, as the schools under study are not doing enough to ensure confidentiality is across the school systems. However, Piggot-Irvine (2003) asserted that the confidentiality as a vital element for effective performance appraisal.

➤ **Specific and Accurate feedback**

To feedback to the employee generally aims at improving performance effectiveness through stimulating behavioral change. Thus is the manner in which employees receive feedback on their job performance a major factor in determining the success of the performance appraisal system (Delpo, 2005). As can be seen in above findings, majority of respondents perceived the practice of feedback process negatively with weighted mean value (WM=2.55). This shows that teachers are not satisfied with feedbacks given on their performance from their schools. This element seems to be presence in some appraisals but not in others. Performance Appraisals need to be parallel across the departments for the system to be effective throughout the whole schools. As most authors agreed providing feedback is the most common justification for schools because teachers will learn how well they did the task over the period and then use the information to improve their

performance in the future. Moreover, Fletcher (2004) also noted that ensuring feedback is specific and accurate is one of the most important elements of performance appraisal. This feature also lacks at Secondary schools of Halaba special Woreda. Therefore, the schools should work hard to design a system whereby teachers can have specific feedbacks on time and access to their results and make it transparent so the teachers will be able to know their weaknesses and strengths.

➤ **Teachers Participation**

The importance of teachers' participation in performance appraisal is immense for the effectiveness of the procedure. Effectively planned PA system increases the credibility of the system and employees get more motivated to implement behaviors and activities that support the organization (Longenecker and Fink, 1999). Furthermore, involvement of the teachers at the all levels of the system facilitates acceptance of the system and boosts cooperation. Thus, school leaders should involve teachers in the whole period of appraisal process.

However, when the respondents were asked whether they were involved in the process of setting goals, most of teachers replied that their participation was very low in connection to setting goals with weighted mean (WM=2.10). Exclusion of teachers in setting goals and designing the appraisal form ultimately affects the process of conducting and this further affects the effectiveness of the PA system at GSS of Halaba special Woreda. This is another negative response in terms of mutual involvement in the goal setting, it seems the appraisal system not participatory for most part of its process and needs to be dealt with.

➤ **Clear goals**

According to Longenecker and Fink (1999) the specific goals of the system must be identified and clearly communicated throughout the organization. However, the responses of the survey illustrate that teachers of the secondary schools is not completely acknowledged all of them. This is supported by most of respondents with weighted mean 2.24 claimed that most teachers are not clear about how they get measured and against what. As a result, teachers will get reluctant to participate in the review process honestly and openly. Also, if appraiser and appraisee are not on the one page about the rating criteria, the possibility of misunderstanding and conflict arises. So, there is an urgent need for the Secondary Schools to clearly define and communicate the objectives of the system to the every individual. Otherwise, it is diminishing the system efficacy greatly.

Looking at the schools appraisal in terms of the above elements, it is evident that many of them seem do not exist within the schools aims, but some are of rarely exist. Fairness, confidentiality and the specific and accurate feedback have been selected by respondents as being partially apparent in the appraisal process, while supervisor-Appraisee relationship, clearly defined goals, rewards tied to the appraisal and mutually set goals are almost weakest presence in the appraisal system at GSS of Halaba special Woreda. This indicates that the system of TPA in secondary schools have been implementing against the principles and effective elements of performance appraisal systems as mentioned in review of related literatures. To this line the earlier findings of the study revealed that the process of TPA in the secondary schools had various drawbacks occurring since the formulation its design.

So, the schools needs to clearly set out what they want to achieve from the appraisal and what it should encompass. At the moment there are a lot of varieties in the appraisals and what they aim to do. They need to take time to question the current procedure and the way things are done and build a performance appraisal methodology that is fair and effective.

4.2.6. Problems encountered by the respondents (teachers) in the implementation of the performance appraisal system.

This part of the analysis was to assess the views of the teachers on the problems that affect teachers' performance appraisal in the secondary schools of *Halaba special Woreda*. Hence, the following items have been identified in the study and the responses of the teachers were presented, analyzed and interpreted below.

Table 17: Problems of TPA

No	Challenges	Mean	St. Deviation
1	Teachers' misperception towards appraisal	2.57	1.132
2	Poor administration of the overall appraisal process	2.82	1.258
3	Appraisers lack the necessary knowledge, skill and experience to appraise teacher's performance objectively.	4.01	1.072
4	The inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria to appraise the teachers of secondary schools	3.89	1.115
5	Lack of rewards for outstanding performers/teachers	3.4	.9967
6	The purposes of the appraisal system being unrealistic	3.70	1.112

Items 3, 4 and 6 in table 17 reveals that lack the necessary knowledge, skill and experience to appraise teachers' performance objectively, inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria appraisers' and the purposes of the appraisal system being unrealistic were rated high with the weighted mean values 4.01,3.89 and 3.70 respectively. However, items 1 and 2 n the same table portrays that teachers' misperception towards appraisal and poor administration of the overall appraisal process were rated low with the weighted mean values 2.57 and 2.82 respectively. This shows that lack the necessary knowledge, skill and experience on the part of appraisers to appraise performance objectively, inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria and the purposes of the appraisal system being unrealistic were identified as main problems of TPA process in secondary schools. These three elements are considered as the major concerns of the design of any performance appraisal scheme. However, the data in table 16 reveal that due attention was not given to the design of the current appraisal criteria, the purposes which the system intended to serve, and the designation of appraisers for GSS teachers.

Moreover, interview from the school directors mentioned that there are different kinds of challenges which affect the proper implementation of teachers' performance appraisal. As they said:

Lack of resources, lack of knowledge and experience of appraisers, absence of training for appraisers, absence of full documentation of teachers work and lack of follow up, work

overlap/burden, the negative perception of teachers toward PA and lack of awareness of teachers, lack of reward were the major challenges which affect the implementation of teachers' performance appraisal.

Furthermore , in responding open-ended questions, as replied by respondents, there were a number of problems that encountered in the current teachers' performance appraisal: the lack of devotion on commitment and lack of confidence of principals, unfair evaluation system, the time given for evaluation is little, political interference, the absence of feedback, and follow up and lack of interest of teachers to evaluate their performance, were the problems for proper implementation of teachers' performance appraisal.

In this regard, it would be reasonable to presume that teachers were dissatisfied with the current performance appraisal system because of the aforementioned problems. This supports that the idea of Ivancevich (2004), even if the system is well designed, problems can arise if the appraisers are not cooperative and well trained.

So far the data assembled under five parts of the questionnaire have been processed to construct appropriate interpretations. Winding up the task of presenting and analyzing the data, the course of this paper leads to the last chapter that refers to the summary, conclusions and recommendations.

Chapter Five

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter focuses on the summary of the major findings of the research questions, conclusions and recommendations forwarded in light of the relevant literature developed by scholars and responses of research participants.

5.1 Summary of Major Findings

The main objective of this study was to assess the practice of teachers' performance appraisal system in *Halaba special Woreda* secondary schools by having the following basic questions to be addressed.

1. What is the perception of teachers toward the purposes of their performance appraisal in the General Secondary Schools of *Halaba special Woreda*?
2. What is the perception of teachers toward the process of their performance appraisal in secondary schools of *Halaba special Woreda*?
3. What is the perception of teachers toward the criteria used in their performance appraisal in secondary schools of *Halaba special Woreda*?
4. What elements of effective performance appraisal are present in the secondary schools of *Halaba special Woreda*?
5. What are the major challenges encountered in the implementation of teachers' performance appraisal in secondary schools of *Halaba special Woreda*?
6. Is there difference of perception between male and female teachers?

In order to address the above basic questions, descriptive survey research design was employed. Data was gathered through questionnaire, interviews, and document review were made to triangulate and increase the validity of the data obtained.

To collect representative data, 110 questionnaire copies were distributed for respondents (teachers) by using simple random sampling technique. Out of which, 100 of the questionnaires were collected. Furthermore, interview was also made with school leaders that were not incorporated in the questionnaire for triangulation.

The data obtained were analyzed using various statistical tools such as percentages, mean, t-test, one-way ANOVA and Tukey - HSD test. Finally, information obtained through open ended questionnaire, interview, and document review were thematically analyzed and interpreted. According to the results of the data analysis, the major findings of the study are the following.

1. With regard to the personal information of respondent: - largest of group the respondents (teachers) were males and education level of bachelor's degree holders. This indicates that there is a gender gap on teaching positions but schools have reasonably qualified teachers who have the knowledge and skill to perform organizational activities in line with new change. The data analysis also shows that the largest group of respondents were in the age range of less than 35 years old. This implies that the majority of the teachers were young and they may have strong perception for the practice teachers performance appraisal system in their schools. Whereas the majority of teachers had a teaching experience of greater than five years. This implies that respondents had better experience, knowledge of the secondary schools and familiar with practices and problems of performance appraisal of the GSS in Halaba special Woreda. Accordingly, the major findings of the analysis made were organized here under.
2. The main purpose of performance appraisal in Halaba special Woreda, as perceived by respondents (teachers) were used for career structure of teachers and to fulfill administrative formality with high weighted mean value 4.45 and 3.92 respectively. The other purposes were found to be not to the required level. In other words the appraisal system of the schools less moderately served both administrative and developmental purposes and teachers were simply appraised to fulfill the formality and they never understood what the appraisal process is purposed for. This indicated that the majority of the teachers did not have favorable attitudes toward performance appraisal system in the schools under study. They perceive that the appraisal system as a fault finding means.
3. As revealed in the data, the components of PA process i.e. appraisal done as per pre-established standards and feedback on progress is forwarded accurately and timely were rated moderately. However, orientation and training was in place prior to implementation of appraisal done (pre-appraisal conference), teachers and appraisers develop PA objectives mutually together and presence of post-appraisal conference were rated medium inclined to low with weighted mean

value 2.33, 2.6 and 2.5 respectively by teachers. They negatively perceived these major dimensions of PA system practiced in secondary schools.

4. The appraisal criteria being used to appraise teachers' performance in GSS of *Halaba* special *Woreda* were not clearly defined and objective, the current teacher's performance appraisal form did not discriminate good performers from poor performers, criteria were not exhaustive and relevant to measure teachers' performance and the overall PA criteria did not fulfill the required quality to appraise teachers' performance from the perspective of teachers. This also supported by the respondents' response. The majority of respondents' responded that their perception toward the issues related to criteria of PA is medium/inclined to low with ranged weighted mean (3.04-254) each. This shows that teachers have negative perception toward PA criteria used to measure their performance.
5. The findings of the research have shown that the system of TPA in the secondary schools does not contain many of the important elements and principles that make the system effective, but some are of rarely exist. Fairness, confidentiality and the specific and accurate feedback have been selected by respondents as being rarely apparent in the appraisal process, while supervisor-appraisee relationship, clearly defined goals, rewards tied to the appraisal and mutually set goals are almost weakest presence in the appraisal system at GSS of *Halaba* special *Woreda*. This indicates that the system of TPA in secondary schools have been implementing far beyond the principles and effective characteristics of performance appraisal systems as mentioned in review of related literatures. This finding is in harmony with the earlier findings of the study mentioned above.
6. As reported by the majority of teachers, the major challenges that encountered in appraising the performance of GSS teachers found to be: lack of the necessary knowledge, skill and experience on the side of appraisers and inadequacy and inappropriateness of the appraisal criteria to appraise GSS teachers.
7. To examine the existence of statistically significant differences between male and female teachers with respect to perception on PA dimensions, t-test analysis was employed. Accordingly, there was no significant mean differences between male and female teachers' with respect to their perception towards the purposes, criteria and process of TPA. Regarding the effective elements of PA, there was no statistically significant difference between male and female teachers and their perception except item 3, in table 14 shown above. In the regard, the

data shows that male teachers were more positively perceived the practice of rewarding based on PA results than female teachers.

5.2 Conclusions

On the basis of the data analysis, interpretations and summary made the following conclusions are drawn.

1. The current TPA in the schools has not almost served both the summative and formative/developmental purposes. It seems simply for career structure of teachers and to fulfilling the formality. As a result, teachers attach no value to their performance appraisal, and rather see it as a fault-finding activity. Thus, it is safe to expect that teachers to perform below their potential in improving quality education.
2. As revealed from the findings, teachers did not take part in the formulation of the current TPA objectives. The schools also did not give adequate training and information about the performance appraisal system before it start. Moreover, post appraisal meeting is conducted rarely in the GSS. Therefore, it is better to conclude that lack of training and information and absence of post appraisal meetings and non-participation of teachers in goal setting in the schools make difficult teachers to identify their strengths and weaknesses and lack of information on their consequent performance could contribute for the ineffectiveness of performance appraisal system in the GSS. This lacks affected the perception of teachers negatively to the PA system.
3. Based on the findings, the objectivity of the criteria implemented was not exhaustive and adequate enough to identify good performers from poor performers. Teachers also believed that the PA criteria are not clear and relevant to evaluate their performance. This will unfavorably affect perception of teachers toward a system of TPA and its effective implementation badly affected.
4. The result of the study indicates that the performance appraisal system that is conducted in these schools were not as of the principles and practices which are defined in different literatures. The PA system of GSS in Halaba special Woreda fails to serve the teachers' interests and expectations of the effective procedures, for example: the appraisal form was designed without participation of teachers and its goals were not meaningful measures to the

teachers. The standards against which teachers' performance were judged were vague and highly subjective. If these teachers didn't understand its goals as meaningful measures. Further, as teachers hardly received meaningful feedback, they could not capitalize on their strengths and improve on the weak areas and PAS doesn't improve the relationship with supervisor. Moreover teachers were not given bonuses or rewards related to their performance result. Finally, the responses also claimed that the performance results were biased and that these particular bonuses/rewards will not be enough to motivate them to perform better or sustain the same performance in future.

5. Problems related to the appraisal criteria, and the designated appraisers, were also found to be the major ones encountered in the appraisal of GSS teachers. Hence, it would be safe to conclude that due attention was not given to the formulation of the appraisal criteria, and the designation of appraisers for GSS teachers. It could also be said that most of teachers have been dissatisfied with the current system of TPA due to these and other problems of the appraisal scheme.

In general, TPAS implementation to government secondary schools teachers in Halaba special Woreda was ineffective. Low level in achievement of major purposes of appraisal system, failure to plan PA process, negative teachers' perception on TPA criteria, negative teachers' perceptions on TPAS implementation, incompetence of appraisers' in appraisal of teachers, contributed to ineffective implementation of TPAS. This might further suggest the need for revising the major components of the appraisal scheme if effective operation of the system is to be realized.

5.3 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings obtained and the conclusions reached at, the following suggestions forwarded:

- In order to make TPA a source for teachers' motivation and obtain the commitment and enthusiasm of the main actors (teachers), the result of TPA needs to be valued. The performance appraisal program, if appropriately planned and conducted in the schools, it has a profound implication on teachers' motivation and the quality of teaching learning process. Thus, to be the appraisal system is required to be effective, it should be used as an instrument

of motivation rather than for the sake of fulfilling the school's rule. Further, the performance appraisal result must be used for the teachers' development purpose rather than using only for career structure/promotion purpose in order to address the objectives of performance appraisal intended for it. Therefore, it is recommended that WEO and school leaders of GSS of *Halaba* special *Woreda* should plan and develop—the criteria that promote developmental purpose through the participation of teachers and there by enhance the contribution of performance appraisal for quality education and also it helps teachers to perceive positively on the performance appraisal system.

- To make TPA more practical in the GSS of *Halaba* special *Woreda*, school directors should carefully plan and provide teachers and appraisers with the necessary information and training about the purpose, criteria, methods and procedures of the system to be employed during pre-evaluation conference. On the other hand, after appraisal, the appraiser and appraisee must meet to review results of appraisal and discuss other information relevant to TPA after performance interview. Therefore, it is recommended that school directors should conduct pre-appraisal meetings periodically and consistently, furthermore, post-appraisal conferences between appraisers and appraisees should also be held consistently and immediately after classroom observation. Further, teachers should be encouraged to participate in the stage of system design and formulation and development of standard against which their performance is evaluated. Thus, participation increases the sense of fairness about PA system and lead teachers to have good perception and willing to the accomplishment of performance appraisal system.
- Based on the findings, the objectivity of the criteria implemented was not exhaustive and adequate enough to identify good performers from poor performers. Besides, some of them were irrelevant to teachers' actual work. To alleviate these problems, the investigator recommends that WEO should either: give the responsibility to secondary school teachers, principals and department heads to develop and propose a set of criteria against which teachers' performance is to be appraised and get revised and approved by the experts of the WEO or develop the draft of TPA criteria and Then, the draft will be open for discussions, criticisms, and modifications by teachers, principals and department heads at school level before putting into practice.

- First, the schools under study should revisit the criteria set forth in their current appraisal system in order to address the gaps that were identified by the teachers. In this regard, the schools should look to introduce a framework for performance appraisal that sets out a number of important objectives such as fairness, confidentiality, teachers' development and mutual involvement. This framework would need to be explained to all involved in the process and training provided so as to ensure school managers and teachers are aware of how the system works and can stick to the guidelines. During the design of performance appraisal system/framework in schools, the school management should consider all factors of effective systems so as to achieve the goals upon which they are designed. The major factors should include among others: Frequency of the appraisal, training of the appraisers, accurate record keeping system, teachers' performance measurement, the system as teachers' motivator, the system should be able to provide feedback to employees, the system should be void of biasness and the process and procedures for the systems should be ratable. The schools should encourage the participation of its teachers in the design of the form that is used to evaluate the performance. In order to sow and cultivate the fruit of PA in a way it maximizes (strengthens) the relationship of both teachers and supervisors, continuous and transparent evaluations of levels of teachers' performance is an essential measure that needs to be taken. Moreover, effective reward system is strongly recommended in order to motivate the teachers to work in the best interest of the students and the school as a whole. This also it helps teachers to perceive positively on the performance appraisal system. It is also important that the appraisal system be consistent and that appraisal results be assessed, analyzed and reviewed to classify competencies and development needs across all teachers.
- It is recommended that WEO should devise training for its appraisers i.e. principals, department heads, unit leaders and teachers so as to enable them acquire adequate knowledge and skill; and to acquaint them with the purposes, criteria, process and procedures of TPA scheme; and the methods of observation, data collection and other relevant issues of the appraisal scheme. This will minimize the error occurred in PA process and will enhance the confidence of teachers to the value and to accept the performance appraisal system. In addition, emphasis should be given to the assignment of principals by WEO on their fitness to the particular position. Therefore, it would be wise if graduates of Educational leadership or those

who have at least skill and knowledge of teachers' performance appraisal system or human resource managerial skill are assigned to run the GSS of Halaba special Woreda.

- Since TPAS implementation is not properly implemented to secondary school teachers, there is a need for policy makers to review the TPAS implementation system.
- Research needs to be conducted continuously on the issue of appraisal. As research able to improve the practice of appraisal and to minimize mistakes.