

**ORIGINAL****Is the Role of Teacher Performance Appraisal in Ethiopia Rhetoric or Reality? Convergence Between Knowledge and Implementation and Finding Solutions from the Process**

Tilahun Gidey Gebremeskal\* and Shanbel Yimam Tesema\*\*

**ABSTRACT**

*This study had two fold purposes. The first purpose was to investigate if there is convergence between the knowledge of both appraisees and appraisers on purposes of teacher performance appraisal and implementation of teacher performance appraisal in light of the purposes sought in full cycle primary schools of Merhabete Woreda, North Shoa Zone. The other was to suggest solutions based on the examination of process of teacher performance appraisal. Data were collected using questionnaires and interviews. Descriptive survey method was used as a design of research. The study was conducted on eight randomly selected full cycle primary schools selected using urban and rural stratification. Teachers, school administrative committee, students, and parents were participants of the study. Proportionate stratified random sampling technique was employed to select teachers. On the other hand, school administrative committee, students, and parents were selected by using comprehensive sampling, because of their limited population size. Survey questionnaires were developed and administered to 73 teachers, 32 students, and 64 school administrative committee members. Qualitative data were collected through interview from 24 parents who were involved in teacher performance appraisal in the sample schools. The data collected through the questionnaire were analyzed using Chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ), Kruskal – Wallis One Way Analysis of Variance (KWANOVA), and Dunn’s test. While the qualitative data were presented in narratives. The findings of the study revealed that the appraisers and appraisees were aware of the purposes of the current teacher performance appraisal. However, the practice was divorced from the intended purposes of teacher performance appraisal. Thus, it would be possible to say the role of teacher performance appraisal is rhetoric rather than a reality. The processes under which teacher performance appraisal takes place seems to contribute to the mismatch between the knowledge and the practice in teacher performance appraisal. Following the findings several recommendations were forwarded among which one was provision of training for appraisers and appraisees on how to conduct teacher performance appraisal.*

**Key terms:** *Appraisee, appraiser, Primary school, Teacher Performance Appraisal*

---

\*Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Bahir Dar University,  
email: [tilahun2000@yahoo.com](mailto:tilahun2000@yahoo.com)

\*\* Secondary and Preparatory School Supervisor, Merhabete Woreda,  
email: [shanbelyimam@yahoo.com](mailto:shanbelyimam@yahoo.com)

## INTRODUCTION

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

Similarly, school systems are social institutions created to achieve desired educational goals and purposes through and with a variety of people including students, teachers, administrative personnel, and the community at large. Among these human elements involved in the execution of educational goals and purposes of school system, teachers would be regarded as having the most significant role to play in the teaching-learning process. The central purpose of a school system is the education of the learner. Thus, in the formation of the character of the learner, the teacher is in a pivotal position to play a powerful role than do other schools personnel, fine building, and expensive equipment (Daniel, 2009).

Showing how important teachers are, Bradley (in Bollington, 1990:41), succinctly asserts:

... no matter how perceptive and far-sighted the national curriculum, no matter how well the school manipulates its funds, ... the single most significant factor in a child's learning is the teacher ... teachers are also the most expensive resources...teachers need and deserve support, reassurance and encouragement to go on extending their skills and exploring the frontiers of their knowledge.

Thus, if they assume a pivotal position in the education enterprise how do we know if teachers are playing their expected roles in their position? It is with this question in mind performance appraisal comes into the scene. By way of appraising teachers' performance it is possible to meet several purposes. Megginson (1981) summarizes that there are two overall purposes of performance appraisals. First, they can be used for making administrative decisions. Second, they can be used for employee career planning and development. Whether done for administrative or development purposes, appraisals can also serve the secondary purpose of motivating employees. When a performance appraisal links the rewards employees hope to receive and their productivity, that is, if the outcomes of performance appraisal are used when organizations terminate, promote, or pay people differently, we say the appraisal is serving administrative uses. On the other hand it can be a primary source of information and feedback for employees, which is the key to their future development. That is, when supervisors identify the weaknesses, potentials, and training needs of employees, inform employees about their progress, discuss what skills they need to develop, and work out development plans, performance appraisal serves development uses. Finally motivational purpose is emphasized when performance appraisal helps foster initiative, develop a sense of responsibility, and increase employees' efforts toward achieving personal and organizational goals.

A system of teacher performance appraisal (TPA from now on) properly designed and implemented, is believed to have favorable consequences in the professional development of teachers, teachers' job satisfaction, and ultimately the academic performance of the learner. But, when it is simply allowed to happen, TPA 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).

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). Hence, for teachers to respect their job and use their efforts to the fullest extent, they have to view their performance evaluation positively and get motivated by it.

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 (ANRSEB, 1996 E.C.). Depending on the results of performance evaluation and year of teaching service, primary school (which is the focus of the present study) teachers have the opportunity of going up six stages in the career ladder structure: beginner teacher, junior teacher, teacher, senior teacher, associate lead teacher and lead teacher (MOE, 1988 E.C.).

TPA in Ethiopia is not without any problems. Wondosen (2007) in his study on "The design and implementation of TPA in primary schools" observed that TPA has different problems. His findings indicated that the appraisers' bias, unrelatedness of performance criteria to teachers job and negative attitude of appraisees to accept negative feedback from their appraisers are some of the problems related to TPA.

In other studies, it was indicated that in the current TPA there are a lot of problems in its implementation. These are absence of feedback for teachers, lack of participation from the subordinates in the process of its

implementation and ineffective criteria (Dereje, 2007; Grima, 2011; and Habtamu, 2005). Many other studies (for example: Birhanu, 2006; keno, 2009 ; and Wondosen, 2007) found the following complaints concerning the manner in which the appraisal was conducted: there was no mutual involvement of principals and teachers in developing the appraisal criteria, difficulty to prepare the appropriate performance criteria, inadequate follow up and feedback mechanism in the process of appraisal, insufficiency of training for those who are involved in the process and absence of consequences of the appraisal result. A survey study conducted in Amhara Region on 130 school teachers reported that teachers had negative attitude towards TPA criteria (Birhanu, 2006 and Kibre, 2005).

From the above text one can understand that the current system of TPA has several problems. But to the researchers' knowledge no study has assessed the knowledge about the purposes of TPA among all relevant stakeholders in the study area. Moreover, one of the researchers, being a member of Merahabete Woreda Education office management committees, observed dissatisfaction of teachers in the overall process of teacher performance appraisal. Thus, addressing the issue of shared knowledge about the purposes of teacher performance appraisal and whether the implementation is consistent with the presumed purposes is timely and important issue, given the ever increasing emphasis given to improving quality of education. Thus, the purpose of this study is to examine whether those that directly involve in TPA have adequate knowledge over its purposes, and whether there is convergence between the intended purposes and the addressed purposes in implementation of TPA in full cycle primary schools of Merhabette woreda, North Shoa zone. This study would help educational leaders to make efforts targeted

to specific group of stakeholders to make sure there is shared understanding on the purpose of as well as efforts in meeting purposes of TPA. This eventually leads to meeting the ultimate of aim of TPA, improving quality of education. In this research, hence, the following basic questions were examined:

1. What is the level of appraisers' knowledge on the purposes of the current TPA?
2. What is the level of appraisees' knowledge on the purposes of the current TPA?
3. To what extent does the current TPA implementation meet the purposes of TPA?
4. What process factors are impeding the current TPA from meeting its intended purposes?

## Materials and Methods

### Design of the Study

Descriptive survey method was mainly employed for the study. A descriptive survey describes and interprets what is there currently. For the present research, it allows for investigating the opinions of teachers, school administrative committee (SAC from now on) members, students, and parents concerning their views on the intended as well as the practical purposes of performance appraisal of teachers in primary schools. Surveys are especially important in educational research to describe attitudes, beliefs, and opinions.

### Population, Sample and Sampling Techniques

In Merhabete Woreda, there were 15 full cycle primary schools. Out of these a total of eight schools were taken randomly from urban areas and rural areas. In the eight full cycle primary schools, there were 204 teachers, 72 SAC members (8 principals, 3 vice principals 32 department head teachers, 8 female teachers' representatives, 8 representatives from teachers' association and 13 unit leaders), 32 student representatives and 24 parents representatives,. These people constitute the target population of the study. It should be noted that though it was eight schools that were sampled, only three of them because of their student population size had vice principals. Urban rural stratification was used in this study as Ivancevich and Glueck (1989:61) argue geographic location of the organization is an important factor affecting performance appraisal. Seventy three (36% of the teacher population) teachers were selected through proportionate stratified random sampling technique. All SAC members (that includes department heads, female representatives, teachers' association representatives, vice principals, unit leaders), student representatives, and parents were selected by using comprehensive sampling because of their limited population size. Table 1 displays characteristics of the samples.

**Table 1.** Population and sample size of respondents

School Location	Respondents							
	SAC		Teachers		Student representatives		Parents	
	Pop.	Sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Pop.	Sam.	Pop.	Sam.
Urban (3 Schools)	27	27	90	32	12	12	9	9
Rural (5 Schools)	45	45	114	41	20	20	15	15

**Note:** Pop. = Population, Sam.= Sample

**Data Gathering Instruments**

Data from SAC, teachers, students and parents were collected using questionnaire, and semistructured interview.

**Questionnaire**

A three sections questionnaire comprising a total of 28 closed-ended items and background questions was prepared. Most of the items were developed by the researchers and some were adapted from previous studies (Asmare, 2011; Tigist, 2010; and Wondmagenehu, 2011). The close ended items were rated on a 5 point Likert scale with score values of 5 to strongly agree, 4 to agree, 3 to undecided, 2 to disagree, and 1 to strongly disagree. The first part of the close ended questionnaire deals with purposes of TPA, the second with implementation of TPA purposes and the third set of items tap data on the nature of the process of TPA. The questionnaires were distributed to SAC members, teachers, and students. Data were collected from these people because they are involved in the appraisal. According to ANRSEB (2000:38) teachers' performance is evaluated by teachers, SAC members, students, and parents.

**Interview**

A semi-structured interview with an interview schedule having seven items was conducted with parents on parent's knowledge of the intended as well as the practical purposes of TPA and the problems that might be impeding the current TPA from meeting its purported purposes. The purpose of the interview was to learn whether parents know the intended purposes of TPA, how they perceive the implementation of those purposes and problems that might be affecting the functions of TPA.

**Pilot Test**

The questionnaires used to tap data on the intended purposes and the purposes the appraisal is practically used for were

administered to 18 randomly selected teachers, four students and eight SAC members - totaling 30 respondents in one full cycle primary school (Alem Ketema Full Cycle Primary School), which was not included in the sample of the study. This enabled to establish face validity and reliability of the instruments. The reliability indices of the questionnaires as estimated through Cronbach alpha were found to be =0.92 for intended purposes of TPA, 0.84 for the practical purposes of TPA, and 0.78 for nature of TPA process.

**Procedures of Data Collection**

The questionnaire and the semi- structured interview items were prepared in English and then translated into Amharic with the help of an expert in Amharic language in order to avoid language barrier.

After conducting pilot test one of the researchers made contacts with the school principals, the vice principals, and teachers in order to get the necessary cooperation and support. After getting their willingness, orientations were given to participants on how to respond to the questionnaire items.

Finally, questionnaires were distributed and interviews conducted with the help of two assistants. Questionnaires were distributed to the sample teachers, students and SAC members in their respective schools. Following administration of the questionnaire, interviews were conducted with the parents at their children's schools at the mid of February 2012.

**Methods of Data Analysis**

Knowledge of appraisers and appraisees on the intended as well as the practical purposes of TPA and data on the nature of TPA process were determined using Chi-Square ( $\chi^2$ ) test. Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis of variance (KWANOVA) was conducted to determine if there is significant difference between the respondents' knowledge of the intended

purposes of TPA. Narrative descriptions were on the other hand made with respect to data obtained from interviewees. All the significance tests for the quantitative data were set at  $\alpha=0.05$ .

## **RESULTS**

This section of the study presents the results of analysis of data obtained from respondents with the use of questionnaire and semi-structured interview. Analysis was done on knowledge of appraisers and appraisees on the purposes of TPA, purposes of TPA in practice, and problems observed in the process of teacher performance appraisal. The analyses were done based on the data from 60 SAC members, 70 teachers, 30 students, and 24 parents because 12 questionnaires from SAC and two from students, and three questionnaires

from teachers were not returned or were incomplete.

### **Knowledge of Appraisers and Appraisees on the TPA Purposes**

One of the purposes of this study was to determine the knowledge of appraisers and appraisees with respect to the intended purposes of TPA. In addition, the knowledge differences between appraisees and appraisers were also examined. Data collected from teachers, SAC members and students regarding purposes of TPA were analyzed. Respondents who chose agree and strongly agree options were treated together and classified into an agree category, while those who chose disagree and strongly disagree options were treated together and classified into a disagree category. The undecided category remained untransformed. Tables 2 and 3 show the results.

**Table 2.** Knowledge of respondents regarding the intended purposes of TPA and Chisquare results of the difference between participants who knew and did not know each of the intended purposes of TPA

Items	SAC				$\chi^2$	Teachers				$\chi^2$	Students				$\chi^2$
	Knowledge on the intended purpose					Knowledge on the intended purpose					Knowledge on the intended purpose				
	Know		Did not know			Know		Did not know			Know		Did not know		
	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	
To improve quality of education	49	81.7	11	18.3	24.07*	42	60.0	28	40	2.81	28	93.7	2	6.7	22.53*
To enhance teachers' professional competence	50	83.7	10	16.7	26.67*	58	82.9	12	17.1	30.23*	26	86.7	4	13.3	16.13*
To provide feedback to teachers	54	90	6	10	38.40*	56	80	14	20	25.20*	24	80	6	20	10.80*
To decide on teachers' promotion	56	93.3	4	6.7	45.07*	55	78.6	15	21.4	22.85*	23	76.7	7	23.3	8.5*
To identify teachers' professional training needs	53	88.3	7	11.7	35.27*	41	58.4	29	41.6	2.06	18	60	12	40	1.20
To take disciplinary actions	5	8.3	55	91.7	41.67*	45	64.3	25	35.7	5.71*	15	50	15	50	0.00
To promote research on teaching learning process	52	86.7	8	13.3	32.27*	39	55.7	31	44.3	0.91	25	83.3	5	16.7	13.33*
To decide on teachers' transfer	1	1.7	59	98.3	56.07*	10	14.3	60	85.7	35.71*	9	30	21	70	4.80*
To motivate teachers' in their jobs	51	85	9	15	29.40*	48	68.6	22	31.4	9.67*	24	80	6	20	10.80*

*\*P<0.05*

As indicated in Table 2 with respect to item 1, 49(81.7%) SAC, 42(60.0%) teachers, and 28(93.7%) students agreed that one of the purposes of TPA was to improve quality of education. The Chi-square test results (for SAC  $\chi^2 = 24.067$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 60$ ,  $P<0.05$ ; for teachers  $\chi^2 = 2.807$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 70$ ,  $P>0.05$ ; and for students  $\chi^2 = 22.53$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 30$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) show that there was a statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents who do and do not know the purpose in favor of those who do for SAC and students. Thus it can be said that while SAC members and students know that one of the purposes of TPA was to improve quality of education, the situation with teachers was not conclusive.

Analyses of responses to item 2 showed that 50(83.7%) SAC, 58(82.9%) teachers, and 26(86.7%) students agreed that the other purpose of TPA was to enhance teachers' professional competence. The Chi-square test results (for SAC  $\chi^2 = 26.67$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 60$ ,  $P<0.05$ ; for teachers  $\chi^2 = 30.23$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 70$ ,  $P< 0.05$ ; and for students  $\chi^2 = 16.13$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 30$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) indicate that there was a statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents who do and do not know the purpose in favor of those who do for all groups of respondents. This indicates that all groups of appraisers knew that TPA has the intended purpose to enhance professional competence of teachers.

For item 3, 54 (90%) SAC, 56(80%) teachers, and 24 (80%) students agreed that the other purpose of TPA was to provide feedback to teachers. The Chi-square test results (for SAC  $\chi^2 = 38.40.067$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 60$ ,  $P<0.05$ ; for teachers  $\chi^2 = 25.20$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 70$ ,  $P<0.05$ ; and for students  $\chi^2 = 10.80$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 30$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) show that there was a statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents who do and do not know the purpose in favor of those

who do for all the groups of respondents. This means all the three groups knew that one of the purposes of TPA was to provide feedback to teachers.

Concerning item 4, 56 (93.3%) SAC, 55 (78.6%) teachers, and 23 (76.7%) students agreed that the other purpose of TPA was to decide on teachers' promotion. The Chi-square test results (for SAC  $\chi^2 = 45.07$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 60$ ,  $P<0.05$ ; for teachers  $\chi^2 = 22.85$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 70$ ,  $P<0.05$ ; and for students  $\chi^2 = 8.5$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 30$ ,  $P<0.05$ ;) show that there was a statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents who do and do not know the purpose in favor of those who do for all the groups of appraisers. This means all three groups of respondents knew the TPA purpose mentioned in item 4.

Analysis of responses to item 5 indicated that 53 (88.3%) SAC, 41 (58.4%) teachers, and 18 (60%) students agreed that the other purpose of TPA was to identify teachers professional training needs. The Chi-square test results (for SAC  $\chi^2 = 35.27$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 60$ ,  $P<0.05$ ; for teachers  $\chi^2 = 2.06$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 70$ ,  $P>0.05$ ; and for students  $\chi^2 = 1.20$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 30$ ,  $P>0.05$ ;) show that there was a statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents who do and do not know the purpose in favor of those who do only among the SAC members. Therefore, it is possible to say that while SAC members knew the TPA purpose mentioned in item 5, the situation with teachers and students was not conclusive.

With respect to item 6, five (8.3%) SAC, 45 (64.3%) teachers, and 15 (50%) students agreed that the other purpose of TPA was to take disciplinary actions. The Chi-square test results (for SAC  $\chi^2 = 41.67$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 60$ ,  $P<0.05$ ; for teachers  $\chi^2 = 5.71$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 70$ ,  $P< 0.05$ ; and for students  $\chi^2 = 0.00$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 30$ ,  $P>0.05$ ;) show that there was a statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents who



do and do not know the purpose in favor of those who do for SAC and teachers. Thus, it can be said that while SAC members and teachers knew the sixth purpose of TPA, the condition with students' knowledge was not conclusive.

For item 7, 52 (86.7%) SAC, 39 (55.7%) teachers, and 25 (383.3%) of students agreed that TPA intended to promote research on teaching and learning process. The Chi-square test results (for SAC  $\chi^2 = 32.27$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 60$ ,  $P<0.05$ ; for teachers  $\chi^2 = 0.91$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 70$ ,  $P > 0.05$ ; and for students  $\chi^2 = 13.33$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 30$ ,  $P< 0.05$ ) show that there was a statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents who have and who do not have knowledge on the purpose in question in favor of those who do among the SAC members and students. From these, we can maintain that while SAC members and students knew the TPA purpose in question, the results as regards teachers' knowledge of this purpose were not conclusive.

Analysis of responses to item 8 shows one (1.7%) SAC, 10 (14.3%) teachers, and nine (30%) students agreed that the other purpose of TPA was to decide on teachers transfer. The Chi-square test results (for SAC  $\chi^2 = 56.07$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 60$ ,  $P<0.05$ ; for teachers  $\chi^2 = 35.71$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 70$ ,  $P< 0.05$ ; and for students  $\chi^2 = 4.80$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 30$ ,  $P<$

0.05) show that there was a statistically significant difference between the proportion of respondents who do and do not know the purpose in favor of those who do among all groups of respondents.

With respect to the last item, item 9, 51 (85%) SAC, 48 (68.6%) teachers, and 24 (80%) students believed that TPA intended to motivate teachers in their jobs. The Chi-square test (for SAC  $\chi^2 = 29.40$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 60$ ,  $P<0.05$ ; for teachers  $\chi^2 = 9.67$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 70$ ,  $P< 0.05$ ; and for students  $\chi^2 = 10.80$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $N= 30$ ,  $P< 0.05$ ) shows that there was a statistically significant difference between the expected level and the actual knowledge level of respondents (teachers, SAC and students) with respect to that specific purpose in favor of actual knowledge. This means respondents knew that one of the purposes of TPA was to motivate teachers in their jobs.

In line with the purposes mentioned above, the interviews conducted with the parents revealed that they believed the purposes of TPA were to improve quality of education, to enhance professional competence of teachers, to provide feedback to teachers, to motivate hard working teachers, to decide on teachers' promotion and to take disciplinary action.

In general we can say that all the parties that take part in the TPA knew the intended purposes of TPA.

Table 3. Comparison of respondents regarding knowledge of intended purposes of TPA

Items	Mean Ranks			Differences of mean ranks			KWA NOV A $\chi^2$
	SAC	Teac- hers	Stud- ents	SAC& teac- her	SAC & Stud- ent	Teach er & stud- ent	
To improve quality of education	86.33	69.00	95.67	17.33	9.34	26.67	14.83
To enhance teachers' professional competence	80.17	79.79	82.83	0.38	2.66	3.04	0.24
To provide feedback to teachers	85.50	77.50	77.50	8	8	0	2.74
To decide on teachers' promotion	88.17	76.36	74.83	11.81	13.34	1.53	6.49
To identify teachers' professional training needs	95.17	71.36	72.50	23.81	22.67	1.14	15.29
To take disciplinary actions	54.67	99.43	88.00	44.76	33.33	11.43	43.01
To promote research on teaching-learning process	91.83	67.07	89.17	24.76	2.66	22.1	17.59
To decide on teachers' transfer	71.83	81.93	94.50	10.1	22.67	12.57	14.95
To motivate teachers' to their job	87.00	73.86	83.00	13.14	4	9.14	5.08

The critical values for the mean rank differences between SAC and teachers is 19.51, that between SAC and students is 24.80, and that between teachers and students is 24.2.

In table 3 results of Kruskal Wallis One Way ANOVA (KWANOVA) ( $\chi^2 = 14.83$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) showed that there were statistically significant differences among the three groups of respondents in knowledge of the first purpose of TPA. But the Dunn's test revealed statistically significant mean rank difference only between teachers and students in favor of students ( $Q = 26.67$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P<0.05$ ). Whereas the difference in knowledge that one of the purposes of TPA was to improve quality of education between SAC members and Teachers ( $Q = 17.33$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P>0.05$ ) and between SAC members and students ( $Q = 9.34$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P>0.05$ ) were not statistically significant. This shows that compared to teachers students knew this purpose better.

The KWANOVA results for item 2, ( $\chi^2 = 0.24$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $P>0.05$ ), for item 3 ( $\chi^2 = 2.74$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $P>0.05$ ), for item 4 ( $\chi^2 = 6.49$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $P>0.05$ ) and for item 9 ( $\chi^2 = 5.08$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $P>0.05$ ) showed that there were no statistically significant differences among the three groups of respondents in knowledge of the second, third, fourth and the ninth purpose of TPA. This elucidates that all the groups of respondents demonstrated knowledge about the second, third, fourth and ninth intended purposes of TPA with no difference in level.

The KWANOVA conducted for the fifth item ( $\chi^2 = 15.29$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) showed that there were statistically significant differences among the three groups of respondents in knowledge of the fifth purpose of TPA. But the Dunn's test revealed statistically significant mean rank difference only between SAC members and teachers in favor of SAC members ( $Q$

$= 23.81$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P<0.05$ ). Whereas the difference in knowledge of the fifth TPA purpose between SAC members and students ( $Q = 22.67$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P>0.05$ ) and between teachers and students ( $Q = 1.14$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P>0.05$ ) were not statistically significant. This shows that compared to the other groups of respondents SAC members knew this purpose better.

Results of KWANOVA on the sixth item ( $\chi^2 = 43.01$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) showed that there were statistically significant differences among the three groups of respondents in knowledge of the sixth purpose of TPA. The Dunn's test revealed statistically significant mean difference between SAC members and teachers ( $Q = 44.76$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) in favor of teachers and between SAC members and students ( $Q = 33.33$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) in favor of students. On the other hand, the difference in knowledge of the purpose in question between teachers and students ( $Q = 11.43$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P>0.05$ ) was not statistically significant suggesting compared to SAC members, teachers and students knew this purpose better.

Concerning item 7, the KWANOVA ( $\chi^2 = 17.59$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) revealed statistically significant differences among all groups of respondents in knowledge of the seventh purpose of TPA. The Dunn's test identified statistically significant mean rank difference only between SAC members and teachers ( $Q = 24.76$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) in favor of SAC members. On the other hand, the difference in knowledge of the purpose in question between SAC members and students ( $Q = 2.66$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P>0.05$ ) and between teachers and students ( $Q = 22.1$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P>0.05$ ) were not statistically significant indicating that teachers and students demonstrated similar level of knowledge over the seventh purpose of TPA. But compared to teachers, SAC members stood better.

Finally as regards item 8, the KWANOVA ( $\chi^2 = 14.95$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) revealed that there was statistically significant differences among the three groups of respondents in the knowledge of the purpose in question. The Dunn's test showed statistically significant mean rank difference only between SAC members and teachers ( $Q = 22.67$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ) in favor of teachers. On the other hand the difference in knowledge of the purpose in discussion between SAC members and students ( $Q = 12.57$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P > 0.05$ ) and between teachers and students ( $Q = 14.95$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $P > 0.05$ ) were not statistically significant. This shows that SAC members and students had equally good level of knowledge of the eighth purpose of TPA. But compared to SAC members, teachers stood better.

In general, as illustrated in Table 3 and interview results, all groups of respondents, both appraisers and appraisees demonstrated knowledge in most of the intended purposes of TPA. But in a few of the intended purposes not adequate knowledge was observed among respondents. Precisely, lack of knowledge was demonstrated among members of all the groups of respondents that TPA is intended to take disciplinary actions. There was also lack of knowledge among members of SAC that TPA is used to decide on teachers' transfer.

#### The Purpose of TPA in Practice

The purposes TPA was actually serving were examined by way of studying to what extent the purported purposes were being pursued. Table 4 shows the results.

**Table 4.** The Purposes TPA is Serving in Practice

Items	Responses									$\chi^2$
	Agree			Undecided			Disagree			
	N	%	Res	N	%	Res	N	%	Res	
To improve quality of education	58	36.25	4.7	9	5.63	-44.3	93	58.13	39.7	66.76*
To enhance teachers' professional competence	73	45.63	19.7	13	8.13	-40.3	74	46.25	20.7	45.76*
To provide feedback to teachers	42	26.25	-11.3	16	10	-37.3	102	63.75	48.7	72.95*
To decide on teachers' promotion	110	68.75	56.7	4	2.5	-49.3	46	28.75	-7.3	106.85
To identify teachers' professional training needs	35	21.88	-18.3	12	7.5	-41.3	113	70.63	59.7	105.09*
To take disciplinary actions	90	56.25	36.7	12	7.5	-41.3	58	36.25	-4.7	57.65*
To promote research on teaching-learning process	27	16.88	-26.3	7	4.38	-46.3	126	78.75	72.7	152.26*
To decide on teachers' transfer	10	6.25	-43.3	13	8.13	-40.3	137	85.63	83.7	196.96*
To motivate teachers' to their job.	57	35.63	3.7	14	8.75	-39.3	89	55.63	35.7	53.11*

**Note:** Res= Residuals

\* $P < 0.05$

Table 4 shows that the majority of respondents, 93(58.13%) disagreed 58(36.25%) agreed and nine (5.63%) remained undecided with the statement that the current system of TPA was serving the aim of improving quality of education. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 2.312$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) revealed statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree =39.7, R for undecided = -44.3, R for agree= 4.7) indicate that the opinion of respondents on the contribution of TPA in improving quality of education was mixed though the number leans slightly towards those who disfavored the issue. However, interviewee parents confirmed that TPA was not used to improve the quality of education.

With respect to item 2, 74 (46.25%) disagreed 73(45.63%) agreed and 13 (8.13%) were undecided to the statement that TPA was being used for enhancing professional competence of teachers. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 45.76$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that, there was a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree =20.7, R for undecided = -40.3, R for agree= 19.7) indicate that the belief of respondents on the contribution of TPA in meeting the second purpose was inconclusive. Nevertheless, interviewed parents confirmed that TPA was not used to enhance the professional competence of teachers.

Majority of respondents, 102 (63.75%) disagreed, 42 (26.25%) agreed and 16 (10%) were undecided to the statement that TPA was used as a means of providing feedback to teachers. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 72.95$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the statement. The standardized residuals (R for disagree =48.7, R for undecided = -37.3, R for agree= -11.7) indicate that respondents in

general did not believe TPA was being used as a means of providing feedback to teachers. This was well supported by the parent interviewees.

Majority of respondents, 110 (68.75%) agreed, 46 (28.75%) disagreed and four (2.5%) were undecided to the statement that TPA was being used to decide on teachers promotion. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 106.85$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) indicate a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree =7.3, R for undecided = -49.3, R for agree= 56.7) indicate that respondents in general believed TPA was being used to decide on teachers' promotion. Similar findings were obtained in interviews held with parents. Parents stressed that this was the only purpose TPA was serving.

Majority of respondents, 113 (70.63%) disagreed, 35 (21.88%) agreed and 12 (7.5%) were undecided to the statement that TPA was used to identify teachers' professional training needs. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 105.09$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that there was a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree =59.7, R for undecided = -41.3, R for agree= -18.3) indicate that respondents did not believe TPA was meeting the purpose mentioned in item 5. The interview results were not different either.

On the question whether of TPA was being used to take disciplinary actions, 90 (56.25%) agreed, 58 (36.25%) disagreed and 12 (7.5%) were undecided. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 57.65$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that there was a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree =-4.7, R for undecided = -41.3, R for agree= -36.7) reveal that respondents believe TPA was serving its purpose of

helping take disciplinary actions. The interview results showed quite the contrary.

Analysis of item 7 indicates that a great majority of respondents, 126 (78.75%) disagreed, 27 (16.88%) agreed, seven (4.38%) remain undecided to the statement that TPA was used to promote research on teaching- learning process. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 152.56$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that, there is a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree = 72.7, R for undecided = -46.3, R for agree = -26.3) reveal that respondents did not believe TPA was serving the purpose mentioned in item 7. Similarly, this purpose was reported by parents as not being served by TPA.

Similar to item 7, majority of respondents, 137 (85.63%) disagreed, 10 (6.25%) agreed, while 13 (8.13 %) remain undecided to the statement that TPA was used to decide on teachers' transfer. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 196.96$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) revealed a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree = 83.7, R for undecided = -40.3, R for agree = -43.3) indicate that respondents did not believe TPA was serving the purpose mentioned in item 8. Parents also confirmed this in their interviews.

With respect to the last item, over half of the respondents, (55.63%) disagreed, 57 (35.63%) agreed, while 14 (8.75 %) were undecided to the statement that TPA was used to motivate teachers to their jobs. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 53.11$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) revealed a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree = 35.7, R for undecided = -39.3, R for agree = 3.7) indicate that respondents knowledge of the role of TPA in motivating teachers was inconclusive though those who did not agree with the statement were proportionately higher than those who did. Like in most of the purposes parents also confirmed TPA fell short of motivating teachers.

Thus, we can say that TPA as practiced today is not serving the intended purposes.

#### **Problems observed in the process of teacher performance appraisal**

As indicated in the methodology chapter problems that had been observed in the implementation of TPA were identified through questionnaires administered to SAC, teachers, and students and interviews made with parents. Table 4 shows the results.

**Table 5.** Process factors in Teacher Performance Appraisal

Items	Responses									$\chi^2$
	Agree			Undecided			Disagree			
	N	%	Res	N	%	Res	N	%	Res	
Prior to any action both the appraisers and the appraisee meet and establish a agreed up on objective.	39	24.38	-14.3	8	5.00	-45.3	113	70.63	59.7	109.14*
Prior to the appraisal process, orientation about the appraisal is given for both the appraisers and appraisees.	32	20.00	-21.3	12	7.50	-41.3	116	72.50	62.7	114.20*
Appraisal of performance is made against the previously established objectives.	13	8.13	-40.3	7	4.38	-46.3	140	87.50	86.7	211.59*
There is post appraisal discussion between appraisers and appraisees.	124	77.5	70.7	15	9.34	-38.3	21	13.13	-32.3	140.79*
There is practice of providing feedback to the appraisees	10	6.25	-43.3	7	4.38	-46.3	143	89.38	89.7	226.21*
Appraisers take only one factor of a teacher (as positive or negative) and giving good or bad overall rating (halo error)	121	75.63	67.7	13	8.13	-40.3	26	16.25	-27.3	130.36*
Appraisers rate all or most teachers in the middle of scale (i.e. rating average)	111	69.38	57.7	18	11.25	-35.3	31	19.38	-22.3	95.11*
Appraisers' tend to rate high a person who is similar to them in attitude interest sex, etc and training low those who are not(similar to me error)	136	85.00	82.7	9	5.63	-44.3	15	9.38	-38.3	192.54*
Appraisers focus on the behavior of teaching just before the appraisal and ignoring behaviors which are the distant past (recent effect).	108	67.50	54.7	18	11.25	-35.3	34	21.25	-19.3	86.45*
Appraisers rely on personal relation(personal bias)	123	76.88	69.7	14	8.75	-39.3	23	14.38	-30.3	137.26*

*Note: Res= Residuals*

*\*P<0.05*

As shown in Table 5 item1, most of the respondents (70.63%) responded that appraisers and appraisees did not meet and establish agreed upon goals prior to any action. While 24.38 % replied that both appraisers and appraisees met and established agreed up on goals, 5% of the respondents were undecided. The Chi-square ( $\chi^2 = 109.14$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that, there was a statistically significant difference in level of agreement among respondents. The standardized residuals (R for disagree =59.7, R for undecided = -45.3, R for agree= -14.3) showed that respondents claimed there was no prior meeting between appraisers and appraisees to set agreed upon goals prior to any action. This was also confirmed by the interview held with parents.

When asked if orientation about appraisal was provided for both appraisers and appraisees on TPA, most of the respondents (72.50%) replied that there was no such orientation. On the other hand, 20% confirmed the existence of the orientation and 7.5% remained undecided. The Chi-square ( $\chi^2 = 114.2$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that, there was a statistically significant difference in level of respondents' agreement to the second item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree =62.7, R for undecided = -41.3, R for agree= -21.3) showed that there was no any orientation about TPA. The interview made with parents also indicated that this orientation was nonexistent. Strongly commenting on knowledge gap among appraisers, the participant parents stated that even those appraisers who have no experience in appraising teachers, especially new teachers and students were forced to rate teachers' performance without having know-how. As a result, this may end up in rating errors.

The other question posed was if there was post-appraisal discussion between appraisers and appraisees. Only 13.13% of

the respondents claimed so while the great majority (77.5%) revealed the absence. Undecided were 9.34%. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 140.79$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that there was a statistically significant difference in level of agreement among respondents. The standardized residuals (R for disagree =70.7, R for undecided = -38.3, R for agree= -32.3) showed that respondents claimed that there was no post appraisal discussion between appraisers and appraisees. Pre and post-appraisal discussions were reported also by interviewees as missing parts.

With respect to the fifth item, the great proportion of the respondents (89.38%) replied that there was no practice of feedback on TPA while a small proportion (6.25%) acknowledged the existence of the practice. On the other hand undecided were 4.38%. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 226.21$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that there was a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the fifth item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree =89.7, R for undecided = -46.3, R for agree= -43.3) showed that respondents claimed that there was no practice of providing feedback to appraisees. Similar responses were obtained in the interviews with parents.

In response to the sixth item, a large proportion of respondents (75.63%) agreed that appraisers took only one factor in appraising teachers. While 16.25% disagreed with the idea, 8.13% remained undecided. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 130.36$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that, there was a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the sixth item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree =-27.3, R for undecided = -40.3, R for agree= 67.7) showed that respondents claimed that appraisers depended on one factor to appraise teachers.



With respect to the seventh item, 69.38% of respondents claimed that appraisers rated most teachers in the middle of the scale while 19.38% disagreed with the idea. Undecided in this respect were 11.25% of the respondents. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 95.11$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that there was a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the seventh item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree = -22.3, R for undecided = -35.3, R for agree = 57.7) show that respondents in general agreed with the idea that appraisers tended to assign middle scores to appraisers.

The other item, item 8, asked respondents if appraisers' tended to rate high a person who was similar to them in attitude interest sex, etc and rate low those who were not (similar to me error) a higher proportion (85%) of respondents agreed while only a small proportion (9.38) disagreed. On the other hand 5.6% remained undecided. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 192.54$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that there was a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the eighth item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree = -38.3, R for undecided = -44.3, R for agree = 82.7) show that respondents in general agreed with the idea that appraisers tended to rate high a person who was similar to them in attitude interest sex, etc and low the one who was not similar to them.

Referring to which events appraisers considered in rating teachers, respondents were asked if appraisers focused on the behavior of teaching just before the appraisal and ignore behaviors which are the distant past. Over 67% agreed with the statement. On the other hand, while 21.25% of the respondents disagreed, the remaining 11.25 % were undecided. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 86.45$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that there was a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the ninth item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree = -19.3, R for

undecided = -35.3, R for agree = 54.7) show that respondents in general agreed with the idea that appraisers tended to appraise teachers based just on teaching behaviors that happened just before the appraisal takes place.

With regard to the last question, if appraisers relied on personal relation (personal bias) when rating teachers, close to 77% of the respondents agreed while a little above 14% disagreed. Close to 9% of the respondents were undecided. The Chi-square test ( $\chi^2 = 137.26$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $N= 160$ ,  $P<0.05$ ) shows that there was a statistically significant difference in level of agreement to the tenth item. The standardized residuals (R for disagree = -3.03, R for undecided = -39.3, R for agree = 69.7) show that respondents in general agreed with the idea that appraisers relied on personal relations when appraising teachers.

In general, we can say that the overall process of TPA was surrounded by problems which could undermine its functions.

## DISCUSSION

The major purposes of this study were investigating if there was adequate knowledge among appraisers and appraisees in TPA and determining if there was convergence between the intended purpose and what is being practiced in TPA. Results indicated that both appraisers and appraisees were aware of the purposes of TPA. However they demonstrated differences in their levels of knowledge in some of the purposes. For instance, with respect to the first purpose of TPA students and teachers stood better in their knowledge that one of the purposes of TPA was to improve quality of education. With respect to the fifth purpose of TPA that it was used to identify teachers professional training needs, SAC members

had better knowledge. On the sixth purpose of TPA, to take disciplinary actions, teachers had better knowledge. SAC members and students know the seventh purpose, to promote research on teaching and learning process, better than teachers do. For effective TPA to happen the purposes of the evaluation should be the ones that are shared among stakeholders. Teachers should be informed about and understand the means by which they will be evaluated and that the evaluation should take into account any factors that affect evaluation results" (Seyfarth, 2002, p. 153). If purposes of TPA are not well communicated to and shared by stakeholders they might instill negative repercussions. Lack of knowledge among parties involved in TPA mainly may come from failure by the responsible to communicate the objectives of TPA. In line with this, a study in Thailand has revealed that the failure to communicate the objective of performance appraisal, from the Ministry of Education to teachers, to be the key problem leading to the negative attitude towards the system (Pimpa, 2005).

Though appraisers seemed to know in general terms the purported aims of TPA, their practices were quite contrasting. From the respondents' replies it was found out except for deciding on teachers' promotion, and taking disciplinary action, TPA was not serving the purported aims. Writers (Aswathappa, 2005; Danielson, 2001) 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. But findings of the present study suggest that TPA is not being conducted in a way it meets intended purposes. Such a practice has been a problem in other school systems. For example, appraisees in Botswana

commented that TPA is not serving any purpose (Monyatsi, Steyn, and Kamper, 2006). Similar observations were documented in the USA (Marshall, 2005).

The problem in the match between the intended purposes and the reality may arise mainly from poor quality of the assessment process. The present study has revealed that there was no pre and post appraisal discussion between appraisers and appraisees. Writers in the field of TPA (for example Dessler, 2005) suggest that the involvement of employees in establishing objectives before appraisal takes place may motivate the employees in achieving those objectives, because they have participated in setting them. In this study orientation about TPA to both appraisers and appraisees was found to be nonexistent. This may lead to disagreement between the appraisal parties because they cannot establish common understanding and agreement. The other process issue identified was absence of feedback to appraisees. Quite contrasting this finding, several researchers (Mondy, Noe, Premeaux, and Knowles, 2001; Ahmad, 2011) opined that performance appraisal is a continuous process and feedback should be given to the employees at regular intervals because it helps the employees to track their performance and prepare for higher responsibilities. In principle it is the feedback that instills in teachers the belief that the teacher performance appraisal has a development purpose. In the absence of feedback the appraisee teachers are undergoing in the process to hold them just accountable. In this case the teachers may feel their personal goals are marginalized in favor of the organizational goals.

Rating problems were issues identified in this study. Appraisers were reported to rate all or most teachers in the middle of scale. Similar findings are documented by writers in the field in other settings (see Ahmad, 2011; Byars and Rue, 1997; Mathis and Jackson, 2000; and Noe, Hollenbeck,

Gerhart, & Wright, 2003 for example). Appraisers were also in this study reported to be influenced by halo effect. Byars and rue (1997), Cascio (2010), Mathis and Jackson (2000), and Mondy et al.(2001) maintain that appraiser commits an error in evaluating the performance of appraisee on the basis of single trait like appearance, punctuality, co-cooperativeness etc. Such a halo effect unless attended to may encourage some teachers who want to be rated high in the TPA to focus on those behaviors that shape the appraisers' impression at the expense of other important behaviors that would contribute to the quality of education. Appraisers were reported to rate high a person who is similar to them in attitude interest sex, etc and rate low a person who is not similar to them. Consistent results are obtained in other studies (see for example Mulu, 2001; Monyatsi, Steyn, and Kamper, 2006). Several authors (for instance, Mealiea and Latham, 1996; Noe, et al., 2003; and Robbins, 2000) suggest unless corrected, individuality and creativity may ultimately be eliminated. The other finding of the present study was that appraisers focused on the behavior of teaching just before the appraisal and ignore behaviors which are the distant past. This contrasts with the very purpose of TPA. Mathis and Jackson (2000), Megginson (1981), Monappa and Saiyadain (1996), Mondy et al. (2007), and Werther and Davis (1982) maintain that most employees know when they are scheduled for performance review. Although their actions may not be conscious, employees' behavior often improves and productivity tends to rise several days or weeks before the scheduled evaluation. It is only natural for raters to remember recent behavior more clearly than actions from the more distant past. Here we can argue that if what counts for TPA is what the teacher does just before the TPA takes place, some teachers may fail to internalize the professional competencies of good teachers and behave

very well when appraisal draws to a close. The last finding of the present study with respect to the process of TPA was that appraisers rely on personal relation (personal bias) in rating teachers. This is in agreement with findings of other studies (Mulu, 2006).

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION CONCLUSIONS**

From the findings of the study it can be concluded that both appraisers and appraisees very well knew the intentions of TPA. Since the parties involved appeared to know the purposes of the appraisal they should have been in a better direction to undertake the TPA effectively. Instead, the appraisal was not found to be meeting its intentions. This suggests the problems observed in the study area of the present study did not emanate from lack of knowledge from the actors in the teacher performance appraisal. This also shows that teacher performance appraisal is a complex process that needs serious attention from conceptualizing its purpose all the way to its implementation.

Several factors may account for the mismatch between the intended purposes of TPA and the purposes it is practically serving. One of the reasons behind could be the processes under which it takes place. Lack of preparations to undertake the TPA, absence of pre and postappraisal conference and ultimately absence of feedback to teachers, errors in rating such as halo effect, central tendency error, recency error and similar to me error were characteristic problems identified in the process of TPA. This shows that as it is being practiced today the role TPA plays can be characterized as rhetoric than a reality. Unless TPA meets its intended aims, it remains annual ritual or at worse a whim the more powerful will use to

dominate the less powerful which does not justify its existence. That TPA is not serving its purposes may even lead to resentment and consequently underperformance by appraisees which may exacerbate the quality problems the government strives to address.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

This study had revealed that knowledge on the part of appraisers was not translating into practice. Thus the researchers recommend that school systems and the government give serious attention to the process and examine the reasons behind.

Though not statistically significant number this study had shown a number of appraisers do the appraisal without having knowledge of the purpose. Thus, the researchers recommend in order to make the TPA effective both the school systems and the government have to make sure the knowledge of the purposes of TPA is shared by all appraisers.

This study had clearly shown both appraisers and appraisees were not well oriented about the process of TPA. Thus, the researchers recommend, to minimize

many of the problems identified in the process of TPA, orientations and trainings should be offered to both appraisers and appraisees at school level by the woreda or zonal education office..

Though this study was conducted at a woreda (district) level, it signals problem symptoms of TPA throughout the nation. This is because the overall arrangements with respect to TPA are nationwide similar. To cite just a few, schools are using more or less the same TPA criteria, which are centrally prepared by Ministry of Education and the composition of appraisers across schools is the same—teachers, SAC, and students. Thus, other provinces, districts, and localities may be suffering from the same problem. This entails that the government takes the issue at national level and take remedial actions to ensure quality of education.

Future researchers may look into the validity and reliability of the TPA results, quality of the overall process of TPA, impacts they have in students learning, and designing mechanisms to make better the TPA we have now.

**REFERENCES**

- Ahmad, S. (2011). *Technical Change with human Resources*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House Put. Ltd.
- Aswathappa, K. (2005). *Human Resource and Personnel Management*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw- hill Publishing Company Limited.
- Birhanu Moytoa. (2006). Implementation of Result oriented Teachers' performance Appraisal; as perceived by principals and Teachers. unpublished master's Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Bollington, R. (1990). *An introduction to teachers Appraisal*. London: Cassel Educational Limited.
- Byars, L.L., & Rue, L.W. (1987). *Human Resource Management*. Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Cascio, W.F. (2003). *Managing Human Resources Productivity, Quality of Work life, profits* .7<sup>th</sup> ed. New Delhi: Tata McGraw- Hill.
- Daniel Gelegela. (2009). Secondary and preparatory school teachers' performance appraisal in West Shewa zone of Oromiya Regional state unpublished Master's Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Danielson, C. (2001). *New Trends in Teachers Evaluation [Electronic Version]*. The Leadership Academy Develops, 1 (3), 1-3.
- Dereje Abebe. (2007). Result-oriented Appraisal of principals performance in primary schools of Guji zone. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Dessler, G. (1982). *Organization and Management*. Virginia: Restone published company.
- Girma Kelmework. (2008). Assessment on the implementation of the current Teachers' Performance Appraisal In selected public TVET College in Addis Ababa. (AAU).unpublished MA Thesis.
- Habtamu Gezahagn. (2005). Instructors' perception of performance Appraisal in Government Teacher Training colleges of Amhara Region. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Addis
- Harris, D. (1986). *Developmental Teacher Evaluation*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon,inc
- Ivancevich, J.M., & Glueck, W.F. (1989). *Foundations of personnel Human Resource Management*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Boston: BPI/IRWIN.
- Keno Gerbaba. (2009). An assessment of teachers' performance appraisal system in high schools of Western Wollega zone. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Addis Ababa university.
- Kibre Tadesse. (2005). Reaction of Teachers Towards Out Come-Based Teachers' Evaluation. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Marshall, K. (2005). *It's time to rethink Teacher and Evaluation*. Phi Delta Kappan, 86(10), 727-735.
- Martin, M., & Tricia, J. (2000). *Personnel Practice*. London: Cromwell press.

- Mathis, R.L., & Jackson, J.H. (1997). 5<sup>th</sup> ed. *Human Resource Management*. New York. West Publishing Company.
- Mealiea, L.w., and Latham, G.P. (1996). *Skill for Managerial success: Theory, Experience, and Practice*. Chicago: IRWIN.
- Megginson, L.C. (1981). *Personnel Management: A Human Resources Approach*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Homewood: Richard D. IRWIN, INC.
- Millman, J., & Linda D.H. (Eds.). (1990). *Teacher Evaluation* Newbury park: SAGE publication.
- Monappa, A., & Saiyadain, M. (1996). *Personnel Management*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.
- Mondy, SPHR, R.W., Noe, S.R.M., Premeaux, S.R., & Knowles R.A. (2001). *Human Resource Management*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, Toronto: Prentice Hall.
- Monyatsi, P., Steyn T., & Kamper, G. (2006). Teacher appraisal in Botswana secondary schools: a critical analysis *South African Journal of Education*, 26(2)215–228
- Mulu Legese (2001). Teacher's Perceptions of the current Teacher's Performance System in Addis Ababa Secondary Schools. Unpublished Master's thesis, Addis Ababa University, Faculty of Education, Addis Ababa.
- Noe, R.A., Hollenbeck, J.R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P.M. (2003). *Human Resources Management*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Pimpa, N.(2005). Teacher Performance Appraisal in Thailand: Poison or Panacea? *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*,4, 115–127
- Robbins, S.P., and Coulter, M. (1996). *Management* .5<sup>th</sup> ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Tigist Metaferia. (2010). The current practice and problems of teachers': performance appraisal in government high schools of Addis Ababa. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Addis Ababa university.
- Werther, W.B., and Davis, K. (1982). *Personnel Management and Human Resources*. International Students Education. Tokyo: Tosho Printing Co. Ltd.
- West, M., & Bolington, R. (1990). *Teacher Appraisal: A practical Guide for Schools*. London: David Futon.\
- Wondmagegnehu Gogni. (2011). Teachers' performance Appraisal In secondary schools of South west Shoa zone. Unpublished master's Thesis, Bahir Dar University.
- Wondosen Hailu. (2007). The design and implementation of teachers' result-oriented performance appraisal in primary schools of Gurage zone. Addis Abba: AAU (unpublished Master's Thesis).
- አማራ ብሔራዊ ክልላዊ መንግስት ትምህርት ቢሮ (1996). የመምህራን ውጤት የዕቅድ አፈፃፀም ምዘና መመሪያ: ባህር ዳር
- ትምህርት ሚኒስቴር (1988). የመምህራን የደረጃ ዕድገት ሥርዓት አፈፃፀም መመሪያ ቁጥር 2. ትምህርት ሚኒስቴር: አዲስ አበባ