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ABSTRACT

Inspite of having many studies undertaken on performance appraisal in secondary schools there lacks a major and current study specifically undertaken to address the perceptions of teachers on performance appraisal feedback. This has resulted into wide gaps on how teachers have to deal with the appraisal feedback in order to improve the performance. The study therefore, seeks to: Identify how performance appraisal is conducted in Bungoma East Sub-County secondary schools, establish the perceptions of teachers regarding performance appraisal feedback in secondary schools and to determine other work related factors affecting performance appraisal in secondary schools. The study is guided by systems theory of organizations developed by a Biologist, Ludwig Von Bertalanify in the early 1950s. The systems theory regards the school as an organization that should be studied as a whole rather than fragments. The study was conducted through descriptive survey design because of its appropriateness in establishing the relationship between variables. The target population included all the head teachers and classroom teachers in Bungoma East Sub-County. The study was conducted in ten (10) public secondary schools comprising teachers who are employees of Teachers Service Commission. Fifty (50) teachers and ten (10) head teachers giving a total of sixty (60) were randomly selected from the accessible population of teachers and data collected. Data were collected using questionnaires and interview schedules comprising both structured open-ended questions and structured closed-ended questions that gave the opportunity to the respondents and informants to express their honest opinions. Selection of the two instruments was guided by the fact that they help the researcher to triangulate data which reduces personal biases that stem from single methodologies. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The main findings were summarized by use of frequency distribution, calculated in percentages and presented through tables. The study found out that performance appraisal is conducted in secondary schools where teachers jointly with the head teacher set targets for achievement and performance appraisal interview is conducted objectively. However, the study found out that the teachers do not like being appraised and consider performance appraisal feedback as a direct attack on their autonomy, they do not feel comfortable with the comments they are given especially when the targets have not been attained, the performance appraisal reviews are not held periodically, teachers are not facilitated to attend training and other professional development courses and as a result do not have appraisal skills which affects the implementation of performance appraisal in schools. The study, therefore recommends that the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) should set proper benchmarks on which to measure performance and collaborate with the teacher in determining their own targets based on the type of school. Secondly, the head teacher should jointly with the teachers develop performance appraisal policy for all the teaching staff in the school where all parties see it as a tool for improving performance. Further research should be undertaken in the wider County to compare the findings.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Chapter one discusses the background to this study leading to the statement of the problem on performance appraisal in secondary schools. This is followed by the objectives, research questions, assumptions, significance, limitations, delimitations and conceptual framework. The chapter ends with the definition of key terms that were used in the study.

1.2 Background to the Study

According to Birgen (2007) performance appraisal is a process of review by teachers, school heads, deputy school heads and other senior teachers of individual competencies, performance and professional needs. During performance appraisal process an individual teacher and a senior teacher collaborate in evaluating the teacher’s work as a professional person. It involves appraising all aspects of teaching including teachers organization of their classroom, how they manage the classroom activities, including the use of time and resources, how they behave towards the pupils, other teachers, school head, parents and the community. Kandie (2008) affirms that performance appraisal is conducted for the purpose of obtaining information that would enable the management make personnel decisions such as identifying training needs, promotions, transfers, salary increments, motivation and counseling.

According to Biswanath (2010) Performance appraisals begun in China in 222 AD and later on were introduced in the United States of America in 1883. In India performance appraisal was introduced after World War II and since then companies
around the world have embraced it. Malos (1998) notes that the latest approach to performance appraisal system is use of 360 Degree feedback which provides performance feedback from a full cycle ranging from employees to managers within the organization. In this latest development the performance of an employee is measured against set objectives and is usually called Management by Objectives (MBO).

Despite this performance appraisal pose a major problem for most organizations to implement starting with the officer being appraised to the one appraising. Kamuri (2012) notes that performance appraisal system is a product of performance contracting which was introduced in Kenya in 1990 but was never implemented until the National Alliance Rainbow Coalition (NARC) government came to power in 2003. Currently all the public sectors have embraced performance appraisals starting with cabinet secretaries down the ladder of hierarchy to the Counties. Wamari (2012) notes that like all ministries, state corporations and local authorities, the Teachers’ Service Commission (TSC) embraced performance appraisals during the year 2005/2006 financial year.

Birgen (2007) note that the TSC has designed performance appraisal forms which are filled during the appraisal of teachers.

However Nzyoka (2009) in his study notes that teachers through their trade unions, Kenya National Union of Teachers (KNUT) and Kenya Union of Post Primary Education Teachers (KUPPET) are resisting implementation of performance
appraisals in schools while other departments in the public service have implemented it and since inception, their performances have improved.

Gacheru (2010) confirms that implementation of performance appraisal in the public service has experienced changing attitudes in working styles that are manifested in the following areas; improved service delivery, intense competition among employees for limited resources allocated to realize set targets; high staff motivation towards attaining performance targets and improved accountability.

Eshiwani (1993) and Mbiti (1974) note that a head teacher is the chief executive officer (CEO) of the school and is ultimately responsible for the overall running and control of the school, maintenance of resources and all round standards. As a CEO she/he assists in identifying subject combination as per the national prescribed curriculum and schools resource provisions. The head teacher also ensures that the schemes of work, lesson plans and lesson notes for all subjects are prepared in good time and actually supervises the teaching in school. She/he must influence the teachers to make necessary decisions so as to improve on the results of the school.

Mbiti (1974) further note that the head teacher is the overall supervisor for curriculum implementation in the institution. She/he is therefore responsible for the management of teachers, students, parents, school workers as well as promoting good school community relationship.

Eshiwani (1993) asserts that it is important to have highly educated managers in the education system because they can understand the system better, can analyze
challenges facing the education management and provide proper decisions from an informed and rational angle. The success of any school depends on how effective the head teacher is as an administrator. The type of leadership style employed determines how successful the school becomes in terms of performance in national examinations as well as how teachers perceive performance appraisal systems put in place.

Alela (2010) observes that head teachers who have severed relationships with teachers often resort to autocratic style of leadership and as a result, staff adheres to rules and regulations out of fear and not as a matter of principles. Such scenario in schools inhibits and retards growth in teachers as they develop fear and follow rules to please the status quo but not to improve in results. Performance appraisals conducted in such an atmosphere in the school will obviously meet a lot of resistance in their implementation. Therefore head teachers should create mutual relationships in schools where the teachers feel free to be appraised and see themselves as agents of change.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

According to Schultz & Schultz, Duane (2010) performance appraisals generally don't receive positive ratings from anyone involved in an organization. As a result employees who are directly affected by the Performance Appraisals are less than enthusiastic about participating in them.

Further employees who are aware that their work performances have been less than perfect will not be willing to be evaluated. They also note that most workers just don’t appreciate constructive criticism or any criticism as a result employees tend to be
hostile knowing they could be given bad news on their performance. If indeed this is true then of what value are performance appraisals in the school system?

Kiplimo (2011) in her research aimed at determining the appraisal process and how it is perceived by the employees in the agricultural sector concluded that the performance appraisal policy as it was practised in the Kenyan public service agricultural sector exhibited weaknesses, which needed to be urgently addressed if the appraisal system was to be used to improve the quality of public agricultural sector's productivity.

This is a clear contradiction to earlier observations noted by Gacheru (2010) who asserts that performance appraisal has improved efficiency in the public service which has experienced changing attitudes in working styles that are characterized by improved service delivery, intense competition among employees and high staff motivation towards attaining performance targets.

Okoyo (2010) in his study on factors affecting the implementation of performance appraisal in Migori teachers training college found that there was lack of officially designed appraisal documents in the institution, lack of clear policy framework on which to implement the performance appraisal process, lack of executive support and failure to show serious concern for performance appraisal by the management of the institution.

These findings raise the question as to how is the state of performance appraisal in secondary schools if teacher training colleges have no clear policy on appraisal?
Given the above inconsistencies on performance appraisal implementation in the public service and the teacher training institution the researcher seeks to establish the perceptions of teachers’ on performance appraisal in secondary schools within Bungoma East Sub-County, Bungoma County.

1.4 The Objectives of the Study
The objectives of the study are:

i) To identify how performance appraisal is conducted in Bungoma East Secondary schools

ii) To establish the perceptions of teachers on performance appraisal in secondary schools

iii) To determine other work related factors affecting performance appraisal

1.5 Research Questions
The study seeks to answer the following research questions:

i) How is performance appraisal conducted in secondary schools in Bungoma East Sub-County?

ii) How do teachers perceive performance appraisal in secondary schools?

iii) What are the work related factors that affect performance appraisal?

1.6 Assumptions of the Study
In this study the following assumptions are made:

i) All respondents and informants will be cooperative and provide reliable responses.

ii) The researcher does not know the perception of teachers regarding performance appraisal in secondary schools.
1.7 **Significance of the Study**

It is hoped that the study will provide useful knowledge on this subject that should form the basis for reference to other researchers and readers in general.

The study is also expected to suggest significant policy statements through its recommendations for policy makers as well as stakeholders to intervene. These include: the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology (MOHEST), head teachers, heads of departments and teachers among others.

1.8 **Limitations of the Study**

The study was limited to only one sub-county in Bungoma County. For more conclusive results, all the nine sub-counties should have been studied. However this was not possible due to financial and other logistical constraints such as inaccessibility.

1.9 **Delimitations of the Study**

The study confined itself to teachers in public secondary schools in Bungoma East Sub-County, Bungoma County. Although performance appraisal is conducted in both private and public secondary schools only teachers from public secondary schools are involved in the study. This is because private schools teachers are not employees of the TSC. Therefore generalization to other parts of the country and sections of the school system can only be done with care.
1.10 Theoretical Framework

This study is guided by systems theory of organizations developed by a Biologist, Ludwig Von Bertalanify in the early 1950s. Systems theory emerged as part of the intellectual development following the World War II although its roots are much older. Systems theory is an alternative to the classical and neo-classical organization theories which the researcher felt are not applicable because of their emphasis on schools as fragmented and closed social units independent of external forces rather than as open systems (Owens, 1981).

The only meaningful way to study an organization including a school is to regard it as an open system. Schools should be managed more like open systems where educational programmes are innovated and re-innovated to realize the importance each part contributes to the whole, and eliminate those parts that make negative contributions.

With the development of various departments in the school considerable overlap is inevitable among the departments. Because of these interactions schools are better studied as wholes rather than parts. Owens (1981) notes that all organizations need clear aims and objectives which determine the nature of inputs and series of activities required to achieve the outputs and realization of goals. Feedback on the performance of the system and the effects of its operation on the environment are measured in terms of achieving the aims and objectives.

As adapted in this theory, the systems theory holds that performance appraisal of teachers from various departments in the school is key to improving the general
performance of the school. Teachers from all departments within the school must be appraised to keep improving on their pedagogical skills as well as determining the needs of the school as an entity.

However, in adapting the systems theory for this study the researcher is not ignorant of its shortcomings. The interrelationships among the parts of the system have to be recognized and understood by all the people involved. This theory requires a shared vision so that all the teachers in the school have an idea of what they are required to accomplish. It requires that all the teachers collectively collaborate to achieve the school objectives a task that is not easy to achieve.
1.11 Conceptual Framework

Figure 1.1: Conceptual Framework on Performance Appraisal Process

- Head of department (HOD) assemble data
  - Appraisal form
  - Teacher prepared

- Appraisal interview conducted

- Performance Standards
  - Specific activities / tasks

- Leads to Job Improvement Plan

- Rewards
  - Promotion
  - Allowances

- Sanctions
  - Transfers
  - Demotions

Independent variables

{Adapted from Birgen, (2007:22)}
In the conceptual framework depicted in Figure 1.1 above performance appraisal is hypothesized to influence the job improvement plan.

Performance appraisal involves the head of department (HOD) or appraiser assembling all the data required for appraisal, preparing the teacher, conducting the appraisal interview and together with the appraisee setting performance targets for the subject in the school. The appraiser is expected to be familiar with appraisal techniques in his or her area of specialization such as subject content and methodologies as s/he is well placed to appraise the teacher in his or her department on grounds that s/he thoroughly understands the subject and would therefore avoid problems that may paralyze the appraisal program.

The framework postulates that data obtained or assembled from the interview process and setting of performance standards influences the job improvement plan to be undertaken by the school such as rewards, job training and development and sanctions.
1.12 Definition of Key Terms

Appraise - Is to make a formal value judgment about the worth of the teachers work after discussing it with the teacher.

Appraisee - The teacher being appraised

Appraiser - The person who appraises the teacher or the supervisor

Feedback - Is a report about how well or badly the job is done.

Informant - is a teacher who is interviewed

National Examinations - Refers to Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) Examinations

Performance appraisal - is the process where the progress, performance, results of an employee are reviewed and assessed by his/ her immediate supervisor against pre-agreed targets

Performance appraisal form - Is a document containing performance ratings and spaces for filling while appraising the teacher.

Respondent - is a teacher who filled the questionnaire either as a head teacher or a teacher

Students Performance – Results achieved by the students after sitting a national examination in terms of grades.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the literature reviewed for the study starting with the evolution of performance appraisal, performance contracting in Kenya, purposes of performance appraisal, staff appraisal process, self appraisal and classroom visit, performance appraisal interview and follow up discussion. The chapter ends with the summary.

2.2 Evolution of Performance Appraisal

According to Biswanath (2010) formal appraisal of an individual’s performance began in China in 221-265 since the birth of Christ (AD). Later on in 1883, New York City civil service in the United States of America (USA) introduced a formal programme shortly before the world war I. Harry (1999) notes that in The USA the urban Institute Pioneered methods for government and human agencies to measure the performance of the programmes.

The information obtained through performance measurement provided the basis for establishing accountability so that the citizens and elected officials could assess what programmes had achieved with the funds provided. This has spread to all levels of the USA government, in non-profit agencies and around the world.

Biswanath (2010) notes that in India, the use of formal appraisal system started after World War II. This was first introduced in Union Carbide in 1940s and was followed
by other business houses. He further says that the Indian companies use performance appraisal for training and development, providing feedback to employees and personnel research which is a tradition that was adopted from American companies. DeNisi (2006) notes that while there are many potentials of performance appraisal there are drawbacks that may result in legal issues if not executed appropriately as many employees tend to be unsatisfied with performance appraisal process.

Hofstede (2001) notes that performance appraisal created and determined in the United States of America and the Indian companies are not transferable cross culturally. When not carried out appropriately, legal issues could result that place the organization at risk. Similarly their improper application and utilization can affect the employee negatively leading to legal action against the organization. Muchinsky (2012) and USAID (2012) note that historically performance appraisal has been conducted annually or long cycle appraisals. However, many organizations are moving towards short cycles (every 6 months or quarterly) and some have been moving in shorter cycles (weekly). Schools like other organizations need to move towards this developing trend.

Smart (2005) concurs that performance appraisals conducted more frequently (more than once a year) may have positive implications for both the organization and the employee.

Similarly Hofstede (2001) notes that performance appraisal feedback provided to the employees may quell any unexpected friction within the organization and hence performance appraisal should be done formally and more frequently perhaps a month
and recorded twice a year. Schultz and Schultz (2010) argues that performance appraisals don’t have any positive ratings from the employees.

As noted performance appraisals affect employees either negatively or positively depending on its execution. At the same time performance appraisals are not transferable across countries but are deeply rooted in the norms, beliefs and values of the society therefore the researcher sought to determine the general perception of the teachers in Bungoma East Sub-County on performance appraisals.

2.3 Performance Contracting in Kenya

According to Kamuri (2012) a performance contract is a written agreement between an employer and employee about the employee’s responsibilities and performance over agreed targets that are pegged on a specific period of time under review. Kamuri (2012) also notes that performance contracting was introduced in the public service in Kenya in 1990 but it was not implemented until 2003 when the National Alliance Rainbow Coalition (NARC) government came to power.

The Performance contracting was introduced as a result of the performance contracting steering committee (PCSC) which was established in 2003 and later gazetted on 8th April, 2005. Its mandate was to spearhead the introduction and implementation of performance contracting in the public sector.

United States Agency of International Development, USAID (2012) notes that performance based management entails four key areas which include: presence of parties involved which are the appraiser and the appraisee, time frame within which
performance is to be measured, expected performance standards and availability of resources. Currently all the public sectors in the country have adopted performance based management and are utilizing performance appraisal as tools for managing the performance of employees.

Gacheru (2010) notes performance based management practices were introduced in the public service in 2008/2009 financial year and have since experienced changing attitudes in working styles which have been manifested in improved service delivery, intense competition among employees and high staff motivation.

However, Kiplimo (2011) contradicts Gacheru by noting that performance appraisal policy as it was practised in the Kenyan public service with reference to agricultural sector exhibited weaknesses, which needed to be urgently addressed if the appraisal system was to be used to improve the quality of public agricultural sector’s productivity.

The association of performance appraisal with performance contracting has met a lot of resistance from trade unions representing teachers. Nzyoka (2009) notes that teachers through their unions have opposed performance contracts arguing that they are hired on permanent terms and this would change their employment status.

In a move to address the teachers’ fears over performance contracts, Oduor (2012) reports that the Teachers Service Commission has developed performance appraisal mechanisms which are meant to empower teachers to work even harder in their areas but are not job contracts as claimed by their representatives.
According to Okoyo (2010), there is no clear policy framework on which to implement the performance appraisal process, lack of executive support and failure to show serious concern for performance appraisal as an integral component of staff management by the Teachers Service Commission and the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology.

Mutua (2005) in her study about factors affecting performance appraisal in public service in Kenya only covers employees (secretariat) of TSC excluding both primary and post primary teachers who are key partners. The researcher sought to determine the situation in public secondary schools given that they too are managed by the Teachers Service Commission.

2.4 Performance Appraisal

Cardy & Dobbins (1994) note that human resource management (HRM) conducts performance management. Performance management systems consist of the activities or processes embraced by the organization (school) to improve the employee performance (teacher), and therefore the performance of the organization.

Cardy & Dobbins (1994) further note that performance appraisal is the most important function in human resource management and therefore the leadership within the organization must create a performance management policy which influence employee performance input.

Okoyo (2010) identified among others lack of clear policy framework on which to implement performance appraisal as well as failure by the management to show serious concern for performance appraisal as an integral component of staff
management. As a result the employees did not find performance appraisal as being relevant.

According to the Ministry of Education (2000a), performance appraisal is a process of review by teachers, school heads, deputy school heads and other senior teachers of individual competencies, performance, and professional needs. Performance appraisal requires that the head teacher and teachers agree on what needs to be done and therefore set targets or standards of achievement.

Performance appraisal involves appraising all aspects of a teacher’s organization which includes lesson organization, class control, instructional activities, time management and resource utilization, behavior of the teachers towards students, other teachers, school head, parents and the community. Birgen (2007) notes that individual teachers are held accountable for the achievement of the targets so that appraisal evaluate how well the teacher has done his job when compared to set targets.

After appraisal the factors responsible for the performance shortfalls from the teachers’ expectations are established and communicated to the teacher. Teachers have to participate in setting their own goals and when they fail to achieve them, they can be able to suggest the reasons behind failure or revise their targets.

Kamuri (2012) suggests that performance appraisal should be done in an environment where the teacher and the employer work together to determine measurements for evaluating each of the objectives. During the appraisal every person must be actively involved and informed throughout the process. However, Mutua (2009) notes that
appraisal systems as used by the TSC are strictly confidential and employees have no chance of knowing the contents of the evaluation report. Similarly Kandie (2008) in his research at Kerio Valley Development Authority notes that performance appraisal information obtained is not fully utilized as per the organization objectives and feedback from appraisal process is not fully communicated to the employees.

Additionally the management at Kerio Valley did not have a positive perception towards appraisal in the organization. And together with the employees they did not find performance appraisal being appropriate and effective.

This study therefore seeks to unravel the true picture concerning the status of performance appraisal feedback in secondary schools within Bungoma East Sub-County.

2.5 Purposes of Performance Appraisal Interview

In a school set up performance appraisal is a formal face to face interview meeting between the teacher and the head teacher or HOD about the teachers’ performance. Birgen (2007) notes that appraisal interviews are meant to: evaluate the teachers performance, formulate job improvement plans, identify problems and examine possible opportunities related to the job, improve communication between the school management and the staff, identify potential possibilities for promotion or transfer and lastly identify training and development needs. Mutua (2005) acknowledges that performance appraisal influence the employee work output. But her assertion that performance appraisals do not necessarily improve the quality of work by the employees is the subject of this research.
2.6 **Staff Appraisal Process**

A good appraisal process depends on the spirit of mutual trust between the head teacher and members of staff. When there is no trust, teachers will not be sincere to reveal their weaknesses because they would feel the role of performance appraisal is to victimize them. The Ministry of Education (2000a) notes that the person appraising need to have discussions with the staff as a whole so as to lay the foundation for appraisal. This creates confidence in the teachers so that they can be open and where they feel the management style is faulty they can say this in the knowledge that the appraisee and other members of the management team will review their own style.

Agesa (2009) note that there exists negative perceptions on performance appraisal where the teachers appraised are uncomfortable, distressful and as a result performance appraisal has been a potential cause of tension between head teachers and teachers. Consequently the head teachers and teachers do not trust each other and therefore believe they will not benefit from the process. How true these sentiments are was of concern to the researcher.

The Ministry of Education (2000a) reaffirm that during appraisal, the teacher should be treated as stakeholder who works in a collaborative way to become as good as possible. Therefore the person conducting appraisal must be professional in the way they carry out the exercise, be respected for their competence and be of good relations. In appraising teachers, the head teacher should make his or her comments in a kind and respectful manner that is constructive for feedback.
Agesa (2009) contradicts this by noting that performance appraisals in secondary schools are often based upon the head teachers’ perception of the teachers’ performance and therefore teachers are evaluated subjectively rather than objectively. In this case performance appraisal is influenced by many performance factors such as teacher likeability, previous mistakes or success made by the teacher.

Biswanath (2010) notes matters discussed during the appraisal process should be treated as confidential and not as a means of making comparisons against other teachers because the discussion of the evaluation can have both negative as well as positive motivational consequences.

Mutua (2005) in her research disagrees by noting that there exist vested interests in the outcome of performance appraisal by the management at TSC for job growth and the employees are compared and judged based on who is receiving the report.

Les Bell (1992) warns that staff appraisal is a very sensitive issue whose introduction has to be carried out with diplomacy and full cooperation of the staff. Teachers from the onset should be involved in the discussion about the proposed process and to respond openly to their natural fears and reservations as this helps to gain commitment so that both parties treat the appraisal as a genuine opportunity for improvement. The researcher sought to determine the situation in Bungoma East Sub County given the many contradictions’ from various researchers in different regions in the country.
2.6.1 Self-Appraisal and Classroom Visits

Before a head teacher conducts classroom visits it is important that the teacher does self appraisal. The Ministry of Education (2009a) clarifies that the process of appraisal should start with the teachers’ own personal review of successes, failures, professional and personal needs. One method that is often used is to keep a diary to record thoughts about the daily activities of the classroom and outdoor activities. Classroom visits should not be viewed with suspicion as teachers should be encouraged to accept performance appraisals. Therefore the head teacher or the person appraising should communicate this as early as possible to the person being appraised since the purpose is to assist in professional development and learning experience.

Agesa (2009) note that performance appraisal has met a lot of resistance by some teachers who believe that their colleagues in middle or senior management cannot carry it out effectively because of past professional difficulties. Further most teachers involved in conducting appraisals do not have skills on appraisal.

According to the Ministry of Education (2000b) performance appraisal of teachers should be very systematic and objective as possible to eliminate any form of biasness. However, Mutua (2005) argues by noting that there is lack of objectivity and ability to separate personal relationship from professional relationship and courage in application of performance appraisal to all colleagues which creates tension among employees.
Schultz and Schultz (2009) asserts that most workers around the world just don’t appreciate constructive criticism or any criticism originating from performance appraisal and they tend to be hostile knowing they could be given bad news on their performance. If indeed this is true then how do the teachers in Bungoma East Sub County perceive performance appraisal? The Ministry of Education (2000b) note that after appraisals the teachers should be motivated by recognizing and rewarding the best performers because when this is not done teachers become demotivated hence affecting teaching in school.

As observed in this section there are a lot of contradictions between what is and what ought to be in the various departments in the public sector which casts a lot of doubt on the effectiveness of performance appraisal in the realization of school objectives and individual needs of the teachers.

### 2.6.2 Appraisal Feedback and Target Setting

Time should be set aside for the discussion of classroom observation. The person appraising should create an enabling environment that promotes feedback and does not intimidate or harass the teacher. Wango (2010) asserts that during performance appraisal feedback, officers must be clear in explaining their judgments about the quality of teaching and any identified strengths and weaknesses, so that the teachers will identify how to improve their work.

This calls for objective evaluation of the teacher and the teaching process. Feedback from performance appraisal provides the basis for professional growth of the teacher.
in terms of quality and quantity. How well it is handled determines the future state of
the teacher in terms of competences.

2.6.3 Follow up Discussion

Sessions should be arranged between the appraisee and the appraiser to be able to
determine whether issues discussed in the appraisal interview are being implemented
or not. In this context, Biswanath (2010) note that it is important for the manager to
either initiate corrective action where necessary to deal with any observed symptoms
often described as ‘putting out fires’ or seeks to adjust the deviation permanently.
The discussion should focus on identified specific activities or tasks that required
modification or implementation during the review period.

2.7 Summary

The literature reviewed indicates that performance appraisal can be successfully
introduced into the educational system as in the case of United States of America and
Indian companies. However the literature does indeed point to the fact that
performance appraisals are not transferable cross culturally. Proper application and
utilization of performance appraisal may have positive implications for both the
employee and the organization. However when improperly applied and utilized,
performance appraisal may affect the employee negatively resulting to legal action
against the organization. Further research is therefore necessary to establish how
teachers’ perceive performance appraisal feedback in secondary schools. This is the
gap that this study seeks to address.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

3.1 Introduction
This chapter discusses the research design and methodology that was followed in carrying out the study. It starts by giving the research design, location and target population, sampling, research instruments, piloting, validity, reliability, data collection procedures, data analysis and ethical considerations.

3.2 Research Design
This study was conducted through descriptive survey research design. This was informed by Orodho (2009) who notes that descriptive survey is the most frequently used method for collecting information about people’s attitudes, opinions, habits or any of the variety of education or social issues. Further, Gray (2004) also notes that descriptive surveys are the source and stimulus for policy changes and social action. This justifies the need to describe accurately and thoroughly the puzzles behind performance appraisals which could only be identified through descriptive survey.

3.3 Location of the Study
The study was carried out in Bungoma East Sub-County which is among the 9 Sub-Counties that form Bungoma County. As a sub county Bungoma East comprises of three divisions Ndivisi, Bokoli and Webuye. The sub county has 38 registered public secondary schools and 5 private secondary schools (DEO).
Based on the above profile the study was carried out in this Sub-County because,

a) Bungoma East Sub-County took the 2nd last positions in three consecutive years, 2009, 2010, 2011 KCSE results and this created my interest to know if effective performance appraisal was being conducted in the schools by the relevant persons.

b) The researcher had limited financial resources that could only afford conducting research in the sub-county as opposed to the entire county.

c) The regular concern by the residents of Bungoma East Sub-County over poor performance in KCSE results compared to other Sub Counties in Kenya whose economy is unstable.

3.4 The Population of the Study

The study targeted a population of 38 public secondary schools registered in Bungoma East Sub-County with 512 teachers and 38 head teachers. This is because secondary school education is considered to be the determinant in molding the future career of any student and hence the success or failure in KCSE is carried over in the entire lifespan of a person. Chava Frankfort, Nachmias, David Nachmias (2009) note that a sample of 12 % is valid enough for research which justified the selection of sixty teachers for the study.

3.5 Sampling

Stratified sampling was used to select the 10 schools for research in Bungoma East Sub-County to act as research sites. This figure was based on the 12 % sample size recommended by Chava et al (2009) as adequate for descriptive survey. The schools were divided into 4 strata’s’ namely Boys boarding, Girls boarding, Mixed day and
Mixed day and boarding. According to Black (1999) to get appropriate sample the following formula was used.

\[ S = \frac{n \times 10}{39} \]

Where \( S \) = sample size while \( n \) = target population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Schools to visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys boarding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls boarding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed day boarding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed day</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From each group, representative samples were drawn through simple random sampling method. This was informed by Harris (1970) and Orodho (2010) who note that in a random sample each subject in the population has an equal chance of being selected. By this means, bias in selection by the researcher is eliminated as inclusion in the sample is a matter of chance.

3.6 Research Instruments

The research instruments that were used included a questionnaire and interview schedules as explained below.
3.6.1 Questionnaires

This was the main instrument used to get information from the head teachers as accounting officers (CEOs) of the schools. As the custodians of the curriculum delivery, financial and physical development of the school, head teachers’ seem to be at a good position to fulfil the needs of the research. The choice of questionnaire technique was informed by Gray (2004) and Orodho (2010) who agree that, questionnaires have the ability to collect large amount of information in a reasonably quick space of time, from a large number of people and the questions can be easily analyzed. Further, Gray (2004) observes that through questionnaires, the respondents are not influenced or tempted to impress by exaggerated responses or socially desirable responses hence able to achieve higher response rates. Questionnaires were administered to 40 teachers and 10 head teachers while interview schedules to 10 teachers who acted as informants.

Although head teachers are the CEOs of the schools, the teachers play a central role in ensuring that the subject performance is improved to the expected standards and therefore the questionnaire sought to get their opinion on how they perceive performance appraisal feedback conducted by head teachers.

3.6.2 Interview Schedules

This instrument was used by the researcher in which semi structured questions were posed to one teacher selected in each of the ten schools visited who acted as informants. This instrument helped the researcher to balance between quantity and quality of data collected. This was justified by Mugenda (1999) who asserts that interviews provide in-depth data which cannot be obtained from a questionnaire. This
instrument assisted in some occasions where some teachers who were not identified in the random sampling for questionnaires had the opportunity to share their views concerning performance appraisal feedback.

3.7 **Piloting**

The instruments were piloted or pre-tested by administering them to five teachers selected from one school which was not included in the study sample and modified to improve on their validity and reliability. This was justified by Mugenda (1999) who argues that questionnaire should be pre-tested to a selected sample but the subjects in the actual sample should not be used in the pre-test.

The purpose of pre-testing was to enable the researcher to discover weaknesses in the research instruments, check on clarity of the questions or items and also attract comments from the respondents and informants that would assist in improvement and modification of the instrument. However, expert suggestions were also sought from my supervisors who anchored the research tools to research objectives and research questions.

3.8 **Validity**

Contend validity which is a more systematic approach was used to obtain an idea on how valid the instruments were. Oso and Onen (2008) define validity as the extent to which research results can be accurately interpreted and generalized to other populations. It is the extent to which research instruments measure what they are intended to measure. Therefore to establish validity the instruments were given to my supervisors to evaluate the relevance of each item in the instrument to the research
objectives. Discussions between the researcher and supervisors were held, adjustments were made to address areas of concern and the supervisors approved them as relevant. Further, Mugenda (1999) argues that a structured questionnaire could be supplemented with in-depth interviewing to improve on validity which justified the use of the two instruments to reduce on personal biases that stem from single methodology.

3.9 Reliability

According to Black (1999) and Orodho (2009) for a research instrument to be reliable it must consistently measure what it is set to measure. The researcher used test-retest method to determine the reliability of the research instruments. The developed instruments were administered twice at an interval of one week to five teachers of one school which was not included in the research study. Pearson’s Product Moment Formula was used to calculate the correlation coefficient between the two tests. The formula used is given below.

\[ r = \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}} \]

Where \( r \) is Pearson’s coefficient of correlation coefficient

\( N \) is the number of respondents completing the questionnaires

\( X \) — Scores of the 1\textsuperscript{st} administration

\( Y \) — Scores of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} administration

According to Orodho (2010) a coefficient correlation (\( r \)) of about 0.8 and above is considered high enough to judge the instrument as being reliable. The value of (\( r \)) was found to be 0.83 and hence the instruments were considered reliable.
3.10 Data Collection Procedures

The researcher sought the permission from Kenyatta University, the Ministry of Higher Education Science and Technology (MOHEST) and County director of Teachers Service Commissioner before embarking on the research. The researcher made appointments with the schools sampled for study two weeks prior to the actual visit. In the first visit the researcher explained to the head teachers the purpose of the visit and made appointments when he would come for actual data collection. On agreed date and time the researcher visited different schools to meet with the respondents to collect data using the instruments prepared. A total of 10 head teachers and 40 teachers who were sampled for questionnaires participated in the study. 10 teachers who were not sampled for questionnaires participated in the interview process as informants. All the participants were assured that the information they gave was solely for the purpose of the research and would remain confidential. The questionnaires were personally administered to the head teacher and teachers were sampled through simple random sampling technique.

3.11 Data Analysis Procedures

After receiving raw data from various selected schools, data was coded, checked for completeness and analyzed manually using descriptive statistics. At this stage the larger field raw data was condensed into manageable groups and tables for further analysis. As Gay (1976) observes one of the most commonly used method in reporting descriptive survey is the use of frequency distribution, calculating percentages in whole numbers and then tabulating them appropriately.
After organizing the data collected and classifying them into purposeful and usable categories, tables and figures were used to explain the findings in relation to the objectives. Qualitative data from informants obtained through interviews schedules was analysed by content analysis.

3.12 Ethical Considerations

Gray (2004) notes that the central ethical issue surrounding data collection through interview is that, the participants should not be harmed or damaged in any way by the research. To ensure privacy and confidentiality on the respondents and the informants about their opinion on performance appraisal, the researcher sought the respondents’ informed consent and assured them that the information obtained shall only be used for the sake of this research and at no time shall their identities be made public.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction
The overall purpose of this study was to determine how teachers’ in Bungoma East Sub-County secondary schools perceive performance appraisal feedback and how it’s conducted. This chapter covers data analysis, presentation of findings of the study and discussion. The structured questions generated quantitative data while the semi structured questions on the interview schedule generated qualitative data. Quantitative data was analyzed manually using descriptive statistics and presented in the form of frequency tables and percentages while qualitative data was analyzed by use of content analysis. The results obtained formed the basis for the discussion, interpretation of findings as well as the conclusions of the study.

4.2 Demographic characteristics of the respondents and informants
This section presents demographic characteristics of the respondents and informants for qualitative data. They include gender, age in years, highest academic achievement and duration of stay in the present school for both teachers and head teachers. The rationale behind inclusion of these attributes in the analysis is that they help to shed light of personal traits of the teachers and head teachers as instructional supervisors. The analysis is presented in the form of frequency distribution tables expressed in percentages and interpretation to that effect.
4.2.1 Gender of the respondents and informants

The government policy according to the Republic of Kenya (2010) constitution notes that all appointments in the public sector including the TSC must ensure that at all times at least one-third should be members of the opposite sex. To ascertain this, the respondents that are head teachers and teachers as well as informants were asked to state their gender and they reacted as in the tables below.

Table 4.1: Head teachers’ responses by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings showed that majority (60 %) were male while 40 % were female. This indicates that the number of male head teachers is higher than their female counterparts with a whole 20 % difference. Despite the difference, the percentage of female head teachers is far above the stipulated threshold according to the Republic of Kenya (2010) constitution which requires at least one-third of any employment to be members of the opposite sex.

Table 4.2: Teachers’ responses by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results revealed that majority (52.5 %) of the teachers were males and 47.5 % were females. This indicates that the number of male teachers is also higher than female teachers who responded with a small difference compared to that of head teachers. The responses show that there is no discrimination in employment opportunities based on gender in the schools.

### Table 4.3: Informants by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from informants who participated in the interview revealed that 70 % were male while only 30 % were females. The results show that the researcher was not insensitive on gender during the selection of interviewees.

### 4.2.2 Age of the respondents and informants

A head teacher being CEO of the school is expected to be senior in age to be able to command respect and admiration from other teachers. Performance appraisal being an issue of policy those in leadership must be experienced enough in order to influence others in the teaching profession. To be able to understand the ages of head teachers and teachers who were respondents and teachers who were informants, the findings are as in the tables below.
Table 4.4: Distribution of Head teachers’ by their Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age ( years )</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage ( % )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses showed that 50 % of the teachers are between 41- 50 years and 50 % between 51 to 60 years. There was no principal in the age bracket of 21-30 and 31-40 years. This indicates that most head teachers in Bungoma East Sub County schools are experienced enough to manage the schools. This agrees with Mbiti (1974) who observes that to command respect from the teachers the head teachers as lead instructional supervisor must have the experience with the education system.

Table 4.5: Distribution of Teachers’ by their Ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age ( years )</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage ( % )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5 above showed that majority of the respondents (70%) were between 31-40 years, followed by 21-30 years (22.5%) and only 7.5% were between 41-50 years. This indicates that there are few teachers who have attained the managerial age or others deliberately decided not to participate in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results revealed that majority 40% of the informants are in the age bracket of 31-40 years, 30% in ages of 41-50 years while 10% in 51-60 years and 21-30 years respectively. It is the view of the researcher that the majority of the informants are well aware of what goes in their schools due to their age.

4.2.3 Professional Qualification of the respondents and informants

Nidiadwala (2009) observes that academic qualification of a person ensures that an individual is grounded in learning. In order to prove that someone has acquired knowledge, they are tested and if found satisfactory they are awarded a certificate to indicate their performance. Individuals with good academic performance are therefore expected to perform well in life and excel in other areas. The respondents and informants were asked to indicate their professional qualification and they reacted as in the tables below.
Table 4.7: Head teachers’ responses on Professional Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Education (MED)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts (MA)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Science (MSC)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Education (BED)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science with Post Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma in Education (BSC /PGDE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science Agriculture Education (BSC /AGED)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other qualifications (Others)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 above shows that majority (90%) of the head teachers had a Bachelor of Education degree, 10% of the respondents had a Bachelor of Science degree with a post graduate diploma in education. The study implied that both the male and female respondents who answered to the questions were highly learned and qualified for the positions they held in the schools. This is because majority had Bachelor of Education degree. The above information agrees with Eshiwani (1993) who notes that it is important to have highly educated managers in the education system because they can understand the system better, can analyze challenges facing the education management and provide proper decisions from an informed and rational angle.
The study however identified that none of the respondents had a master’s degree; this casts a lot of doubt on the teacher aggressiveness for higher studies.

Table 4.8: Teachers’ responses on Professional Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.ED</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSC PGDE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that Majority (70%) of the teachers had a Bachelor of education degree while 10% of the teachers had Bachelor of Science with Post graduate degree, Diploma and others respectively. The results reveal that majority of teachers are well grounded in learning to teach in the secondary schools and therefore are aware of performance appraisal in schools.
Table 4.9: Informants’ responses on Professional Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.ED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.ED</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSC PGDE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results obtained indicate that majority (90%) of the informants have a bachelor’s degree and only 10 % have others. This agrees with Eshiwani (1993) and Nidiadwala (2009) who proposes that teachers must be knowledgeable to teach in secondary schools.

4.2.4 Duration of stay in present school

For school policies to be evaluated effectively there is need to provide adequate time for feedback on how the implementation process is conducted. Teachers who have stayed in one school for a longer time are better placed to evaluate what goes on in the school. The respondents and informants were asked to indicate the period of stay in the present school and they responded as below.
Table 4.10: Head teachers’ responses on duration of stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage ( % )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and above years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the head teachers (40 %) had stayed in the present school between 7-9 years, 30 % between 4-6 years, 20 % 1-3 years and 10 % above 10 years. The results reveal that the information given is out of experience in their respective stations of work.

Table 4.11: Teachers’ responses on duration of stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage ( % )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and above years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen majority (55%) of the teachers have stayed in their current between 7-9 years, 25 % between 4-6 years, 15 % 10 years and above while only 5 % between 1-3 years. The findings indicate that majority of the teachers are better placed to
respond to the items of research as they have evidence of what goes on in the schools where they teach due to the length of stay in the present station.

Table 4.12: Informants’ responses on duration of stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 and above years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings reveal that majority (60%) of the informants have stayed in the current station between 4-6 years hence able to accurately assess how the school has conducted performance appraisals. 20% of the informants have stayed for above 10 years while 10% between 1-3 years and 7-9 years respectively.

4.3 Teachers responses on how performance appraisal is conducted in Bungoma East Sub-County

The role of a head teacher in relation to school management is diverse. Mbiti (1974) observes that a head teacher has the following roles to play: Supervision of approved curriculum, staff personnel, student personnel, performance appraisal, Promotion of school community relationship and supervision of physical resources in the school.

The first objective of this study was “to find out from the teachers how performance appraisal was being conducted in Bungoma East Secondary Schools”. To achieve this objective, the respondents were asked to react to several
statements intended to describe the status of performance appraisal in the public secondary schools. The status was rated as strongly agree, agree, no opinion, disagree and strongly disagree. The results obtained were presented as in Table 4.13 below.

Table 4.13: Head teachers’ responses on how performance appraisal is conducted in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage self-appraisal</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss and set targets</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure feedback is confidential</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal is objective</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure teacher knows what is wrong and right</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority (60%) of the head teachers strongly agreed that they regularly conduct self appraisal and 40% agreed. Majority (70 %) of them strongly agreed that they discuss with teachers on what needs to be done and jointly set targets for achievement and 30% agreed. Majority (90 %) of the head teachers strongly agreed that they ensure feedback provided during the interview is confidential and 10 % agreed. 100 % of the head teachers strongly agreed that they appraise teachers based on observation, assessment of ability, readiness and their potential hence objectively however none has a contrary opinion.
On the last question item, 100% of the head teachers said that they ensure the teacher leaves the interview room knowing specifically what she/he is doing right or wrong. This observation agrees with the Ministry of Education (2000b) which notes that performance appraisal of teachers should be very systematic and objective as possible to eliminate any form of biasness. In order to make a valid judgment of the state of performance appraisal in secondary schools the teachers were equally given a chance to make their assessment on how performance appraisal is conducted and they responded as in the table 4.14 below.

Table 4.14: Teachers’ responses on how performance appraisal is conducted in Bungoma East Sub County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage self-appraisal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss and set targets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure feedback is confidential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal is objective</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure teacher knows what is wrong and right</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher observed that majority (70 %) of the teachers agreed that they are encouraged to conduct self appraisal. 26 % of the respondents had no opinion on whether they are encouraged to conduct self appraisal while 26 % of the respondents disagreed. Majority (74 %) of the respondents strongly agreed that they discuss with the head teacher on what needs to be done and jointly set targets for achievement which almost agreed with the observations made from head teachers’ responses, 18 % agreed and 8 % had no opinion. Majority (60 %) of the teachers agreed that the feedback provided during interview is confidential and does not filter to other members of the staff. 20 % had no opinion while 14 % disagreed and 6 % strongly disagreed. Majority (62 %) of the respondents agreed that performance appraisal is based on observation; assessment of ability, readiness and teachers’ potential hence objective, 6 % strongly agreed, 18 % had no opinion and 8 % strongly disagreed.

This disagreed with Agesa (2009) who observe that performance appraisals are often based upon the head teachers’ perception of the teachers’ performance and therefore subjective rather that objective. On the last item whether the teachers leave the interview room knowing specifically what she or he is doing right or wrong, majority (48 %) of the respondents agreed, 34 % had no opinion, 10 % disagreed and 8 % strongly disagreed. The results from the research indicates that teachers are conducting performance appraisal as opposed to the observations made by Okoyo (2010) who identified lack of clear policy framework on which to implement performance appraisal as well as failure by the management to show serious concern for performance appraisal as an integral component of staff management.
4.4 Teachers’ responses on perceptions on performance appraisal feedback

The objective number two was, “to establish the perception of teachers on performance appraisal feedback”. To achieve this objective the respondents were asked to react to certain question items and the findings are as in the table 4.15 below.

Table 4.15: Head teachers’ responses on their perceptions on performance appraisal feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular discussions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling environment created for feedback</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher feels comfortable with the comments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure consensus on action plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments are made in a respectful manner</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher observed that majority (70%) of the respondents have regular
discussions with the teachers about performance appraisal and 30% had no opinion.
Majority (60%) of the respondents said they create an enabling environment for
feedback with the teachers, 30% had no opinion and 10% strongly agreed. Majority
(60%) of the respondents indicate that the teachers feel comfortable with the
comments given during the interview and 40% had no opinion on how the teachers
perceived the appraisal feedback. Majority (70%) of the respondents agreed that there
is consensus on the action plan to be implemented after appraisal interview and 30%
had no opinion. On the last item majority (60%) of the respondents agreed that the
comments are made in a respectful manner that is constructive for feedback, 10%
strongly agreed and 30% had no opinion.

The results agree with the Ministry of Education (2000a) which notes that during
appraisal, the teacher should be treated as stakeholder who works in a collaborative
way to become as good as possible. The head teacher should create an enabling
environment for feedback and make his or her comments in a kind and respectful
manner that is constructive for feedback.

Teachers were also subjected to similar items and responded as in the table 4.16
below
Table 4.16: Teachers’ responses on their perceptions on performance appraisal feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular discussions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling environment created</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher feels comfortable with</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure consensus on action plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments are made in a respectful manner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results revealed that majority (62 %) of the teachers disagreed that they hold regular discussions with the head teacher to discuss performance of the job, 22 % had no opinion, and 10 % strongly disagreed while 6 % agreed.

Majority (54 %) disagreed that head teachers create an enabling environment for feedback with the teachers during the interview, 32 % had no opinion, 12 % agreed and 2 % strongly disagreed. Majority (68 %) of the respondents disagreed that they feel comfortable with the comments they are given by the head teacher during the
appraisal, 14 % agreed, 12 % had no opinion, and 6 % strongly disagreed. Majority (70 %) of the respondents disagreed that there is consensus on the action plan to be implemented after appraisal, 16 % agreed and 14 % had no opinion. On the last item, Majority (48 %) of the respondents disagreed that comments are made in a respectful manner that is constructive for feedback, 38 % had no opinion and 8 % agreed. The researcher observed that the findings from the head teachers contradicted those from the teachers. To be able to understand if indeed performance appraisal was an ongoing process in the schools 10 teachers were interviewed. The interview question was “How frequent is performance appraisal conducted in your school?” and the following findings were revealed as in the table 4.17 below.

Table 4.17: Informants’ responses on frequency of performance appraisal feedback in Secondary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrice a year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that majority (60%) of the informants are given feedback from appraisal once per year, 20 % twice, 10 % thrice and only 10 % had it throughout the year. Further, the researcher sought the interviewees’ opinion on whether they supported performance appraisal. The interview question was “In your opinion do
you support appraisal of teachers in secondary schools, Yes or No? Give reasons for your answer” and they responded as in table 4.18.

Table 4.18: Informants’ responses on whether they supported performance appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study revealed that majority (80 %) of the informants do not like being appraised and only 20 % were in support of it. informants who said ‘No’ regard performance appraisal as a direct attack on their autonomy and expressed suspicion about the ability of their colleagues in senior management in carrying out effective appraisals impartially. The informants noted that they would be placing themselves in a highly vulnerable position if performance appraisal required them to indicate their areas of weakness or requiring professional training.

These views agree with Schultz et al (2010) who observe that performance appraisals generally don’t receive positive ratings from anyone involved in an organization. As a result employees who are directly affected by the Performance Appraisals are less than enthusiastic about participating in them and therefore don’t appreciate constructive criticism or any criticism and therefore tend to be hostile knowing they could be given bad news on their performance. However 20 % of the informants who responded ‘Yes’ said that performance appraisal keeps them on toes, provides
feedback to both the appraiser and also creates an opportunity for the teachers to
gauge themselves and make necessary adjustments in relation to school expectations.

4.5 Work related factor affecting performance appraisal

Cardy & Dobbins (1994) observe that human resource management (HRM) conducts
performance management which comprise of the activities or processes embraced by
the organization to improve the employee performance. They note that the leadership
within the organization must provide sufficient resources to the employees and
develop appropriate mechanisms on how to improve employee performance.
Employees whose performance is below expected standards should be facilitated to
attend training in order to improve on their productivity.

The objective three of the study was “to determine other work related factors
affecting performance appraisal in secondary schools.” To achieve this objective
the respondents reacted to some question items as in the tables below.
Table 4.19: Head teachers’ responses on other work related factors affecting Performance appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide resources</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate training and development</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate views to improve standards in school</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide appraisal forms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep diary to record daily activities in the school</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the results majority (70%) of the head teachers provide required resources to facilitate teaching and learning and 30% strongly agreed. Majority (50%) of the respondents agreed that they facilitate teachers to attend training and other professional development courses, 30% had no opinion and 20% strongly agreed. Majority (80%) of the respondents agreed that they incorporate the views of the teachers on how to improve standards in the school and 20% strongly agreed.

Majority (60%) of the respondents agreed that they provide appraisal forms to teachers while 40% had no opinion. 100% of the respondents strongly agreed that
they keep diaries to record daily activities in the school. In order to be able to make a valid assessment teachers were subjected to similar question items and they responded as it table 4.20 below.

**Table 4.20: Teachers’ responses on other work related factors affecting Performance appraisal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate training and development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate views to improve standards in school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide appraisal forms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep diary to record daily activities in the school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that majority of the respondents (78 %) agreed that they are provided with the required resources for teaching and learning process, 16 % had no opinion and 6 % disagreed. Only 26 % of the respondents agreed that they are facilitated to attend training and other professional development courses, majority (48 %) had no opinion and 26 % disagreed. Majority (72 %) of the respondents agreed
that they do incorporate the views of the head teacher on how to improve standards in
the school, 18 % had no opinion 6 % agreed and 4 % disagreed. Majority (66 %) of
the respondents disagreed that they are provided with appraisal forms during the
interview, 18 % had no opinion, 12 % strongly disagreed and 4 % agreed. On the last
item majority (52 %) agreed that they keep a diary to record daily activities in the
school, 20 % had no opinion, 20 % disagreed, 4 % strongly agreed and 4 % strongly
disagreed.

These findings contradict Birgen (2007) who observes that effective performance
appraisals requires that teachers are facilitated to attend training and development
courses and also provided with appraisal forms at the onset of appraisal. The HOD
being at the centre of performance appraisal must have sufficient appraisal techniques
and resources on grounds that she / he thoroughly understand the subject matter and
would avoid problems that may paralyse the appraisal program. This findings agree
with Mutua (2009) who observes that appraisal systems as used by the TSC are
strictly confidential and employees have no chance of knowing the contents of the
evaluation report.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of major findings, conclusion and recommendations thereof in performance appraisal of teachers so as to bring about better motivation and higher self esteem of the teachers. The chapter also highlights suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of the Findings

The aim of this study was to investigate the teachers’ perception on performance appraisal feedback in secondary schools within Bungoma East Sub-County.

The objectives of the study were: to identify how performance appraisal is conducted in Bungoma East Sub-County, to find out the views of teachers about performance appraisal feedback in secondary schools and to determine other work related factors affecting performance appraisal.

Descriptive survey was used to carry out the study. The target population was 38 public secondary schools in Bungoma East Sub-County. The sample consisted of 10 head teachers and 50 classroom teachers who were randomly selected from 10 public secondary schools. Data was collected using questionnaires and interviews schedule with similar items for the head teacher and teachers.

The findings reveal that 10 % of the respondent schools were boys boarding, 20 % girls boarding, 10 % mixed day and boarding and 60 % mixed day schools. 60 % of
the head teachers who responded were male while 40 % were female. Data from the teachers revealed that 52.5 % were male and 47.5 % were female. Data from informants indicate that 70 % were male and 30 % females. 50 % of the head teachers who responded were between the ages of 41-50 years while 50 % were between 51-60 years. Data from the teachers revealed that 22.5 % of the respondents were between 21-30 years, 70 % between 31-40 years and 7.5 % between 41-50 years. Data from informants showed that 20 % were between 21-30 years, 40 % between 31-40 years and 30 % between 41-50 years and 10 % above 51 years.

The respondents were mainly first degree holders for the head teachers and none had a master’s degree. Teachers’ results revealed that 70 % had Bachelor of education degree, 10 % had Bachelor of Science degree with a post graduate diploma in education, 10 % diploma and 10 % untrained. Results from informants showed that majority 90 % had a Bachelor’s degree in education and 10 % were untrained. Most head teachers (40 %) had stayed in the current school between 7-9 years, 30 % between 4-6 years, 20 % between 1-3 years and 10 % above 10 years. Data from teachers who responded revealed 55 % had stayed in the schools between 7-9 years, 25 % between 4-6 years, 15 % above 10 years and 5 % between 1-3 years. Data from informants showed that 10 % had stayed in the schools between 7-9 years, 60 % between 4-6 years, 10 % above 10 years and 10 % between 1-3 years.
5.2.1 How performance appraisal is conducted in Bungoma East secondary schools

The study revealed that majority of the head teachers (60 %) strongly agreed that they encourage teachers to carry out self appraisal, 70 % strongly agreed that they discuss with teachers on what needs to done and set targets for achievement. 100 % of the head teachers strongly agreed that appraisal interview is based on observation, assessment of ability, readiness and potential of the teacher hence objective and 100 % strongly agreed that teachers leave the interview room knowing what they are doing right or wrong. The teachers results agreed with those of the head teachers that they are encouraged to make self appraisal, they discuss with the head teacher what needs to done to improve results, performance appraisal is conducted objectively and they leave the interview room knowing what they are doing right or wrong.

5.2.2 The perceptions of teachers on performance appraisal feedback in secondary Schools

The results revealed that 70% of the head teachers who responded agreed that they have regular discussions with the teachers about job performance, 60 % agreed that they create an enabling environment for feedback, 60 % agreed that the teachers feel comfortable with the comments they give especially when the targets have not been achieved. 70 % agreed that they build consensus on the action plan to be implemented after appraisal and 60 % agreed that comments are made in a respectful manner that is constructive for feedback.
The teachers’ responses regarding their perception on performance appraisal feedback disagreed with those of head teachers. 62 % disagreed that they regularly discuss with the head teacher about job performance. 54 % disagreed that head teachers create an enabling environment, 60 % disagreed that they feel comfortable with the comments they are given even when they have not attained the set targets. 70 % disagreed that there is consensus on the action plan to be implemented after appraisal and 48 % disagreed that the comments are made in a respectful manner that is constructive for feedback. 60 % of the informants noted that performance appraisal is conducted once a year, 20 % said twice, 10 % said thrice and only 10 % said it is continuous. 80 % of the informants do not support performance appraisal and regard it as a direct attack on their autonomy. They say accepting performance appraisal would make them highly vulnerable if the staff appraisal required them to indicate their areas of weaknesses. However 20 % of the informants who responded ‘Yes’ say performance appraisal keep them on toes, provides feedback to both the appraiser and also creates an opportunity for the teachers to gauge themselves and make necessary adjustments in relation to school expectations.

5.2.3 Other work related factors affecting performance appraisal

The study revealed that majority (70 %) of the head teachers who responded agreed that they provide required resources to facilitate teaching and learning in the schools. 50 % of the respondents agreed that they facilitate teachers to attend training and other professional development courses. 80 % of the respondents agreed that they incorporate the views of teachers on how to improve standards in the school.
60 % of the head teachers agreed to providing teachers with appraisal forms during the interview. 100 % of the head teachers strongly agreed that they kept a diary to record the daily activities in the school.

The results agreed with those of the teachers except for facilitation to attend training and other professional courses and provision of appraisal forms to the teachers. 78 % of the respondents agreed that they are provided with resources. 48 % of the respondents had no opinion on whether they are facilitated to attend training and other professional courses while 26 % disagreed. 72 % of the respondents agreed that they incorporate the views of the head teacher on how to improve standards in the school. 66 % of the respondents disagreed that that they are provided with appraisal forms during the interview. 52 % of the respondents agreed that they keep a diary to record daily activities in the school.

5.3 Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings. The study revealed that performance appraisal is conducted in secondary schools where teachers are encouraged to conduct self appraisal. The teachers jointly with the head teacher set targets for achievement and performance appraisal interview is based on observation, assessment of ability, readiness and potential of the teacher. On the perception of teachers on performance appraisal feedback, the study established that majority of the teachers do not like being appraised.
They consider performance appraisal as a direct attack on their autonomy and do not feel comfortable with the comments they are given especially when the targets have not been attained. On other work related factors the study observed that the head teachers provided the teaching and learning resources to facilitate teaching and learning. The teachers also keep diaries to record daily activities in the school. However the study established that most teachers are not facilitated to attend training and other professional development courses and as a result do not have appraisal skills. The teachers are also not provided with appraisal forms before the interview and therefore believe that the confidential reports written by the head teachers are appraisal forms. The government should ensure that all schools have established performance appraisal policy to facilitate professional growth of teachers.

5.4 Recommendations

From the overall findings of the study and conclusions thereof, the following recommendations are made on how to improve performance appraisal.

a) Performance appraisal as a cooperative effort

There is need for the head teacher to work with all members of the teaching staff in determining the performance goals for the school. The head teachers should further work with the teachers in determining the performance appraisal policy for the school. This would integrate the teachers’ efforts towards a shared vision for the school.

b) A good and relaxed working environment

A good and relaxed working relationship between the head teacher and teachers is the main ingredient to effective performance appraisal. The head teacher is urged to
cultivate a harmonious working relationship with the teachers where both can gain confidence in working with each other in order to achieve improved results. This would remove any suspicion and sense of fault findings which characterizes performance appraisal.

c) **Sequential review of performance appraisal**

The performance appraisal should be carried out regularly for example thrice a year or monthly to eliminate any form of suspicion from the teachers and quell friction in the organization. Recognition should be given to those who have excelled and those who have not should be encouraged positively.

5.5 **Suggestions for further research**

i) It is therefore suggested that similar studies be carried out in other parts of the country and results compared

ii) An investigation should be carried out on the effect of leadership styles employed by head teachers on performance appraisal in schools

iii) A comparative study on performance appraisal in public and private schools may shed more light on how to overcome the challenges of performance appraisal
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: Teachers’ Questionnaire

Introduction
I am a post graduate student at Kenyatta University and carrying out research on Teachers perception about performance appraisal feedback in secondary schools. This study is part of the requirement for the award of the Degree of Master of Educational Administration. Your assistance will be very helpful to me. The information you provide will be treated with confidentiality and will be used for the purpose of this research only. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Instructions:-

i) Please complete the appropriate items where necessary.

ii) Please indicate by a tick (✓) the correct responses to each of the following items where appropriate.

iii) In this questionnaire, the letters SA, A, U, D and SD shall be used as follows:-

SA- Strongly Agree    SD-strongly Disagree
A-Agree               U- Undecided     D-Disagree

Section A: Background Information

1. Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )

2. Age

18-20 yrs ( ) 33-35 yrs ( ) 49-51 yrs ( )
21-23 yrs ( ) 36-38 yrs ( ) 52 and above ( )
24-26 yrs ( ) 39-41 ( )
27--29 yrs ( ) 42-44 ( )
30-32 yrs ( ) 45-47 ( )
3. Professional qualifications:

a) Diploma ( )

b) Graduate –BED ( )

   BA PGDE ( )
   BSC PGDE ( )
   BSC-AGED ( )
   M.Ed ( )

M.A ( )

c) Any other specify (BOG) ...

4. Indicate the years you have been in this school.

  1-3 yrs ( )
  7-9 yrs ( )
  4-6 yrs ( )
  10 and above ( )

Section B

Please indicate by the tick (√) the correct responses to each of the following items

HOW PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IS CONDUCTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>You are encouraged to make self –appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>You discuss with head teacher on what needs to be done and set targets for achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The head teacher ensures that feedback provided during the interview is confidential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The appraisal interview is based on observation, assessment of ability, readiness and potential of the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>You leave the interview room knowing specifically what you are doing right or wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>You have regular discussions with the head teacher about your job performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The head teacher create an enabling environment for feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>You feel comfortable with the comments you are given especially when you have not attained targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is consensus on the action plan to be implemented after appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comments are made in a respectful manner that is constructive for feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OTHER WORK RELATED FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE

#### APPRAISAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>You are provided with required resources to facilitate teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>You are facilitated to attend training and other professional development courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>You incorporate the views of the head teacher on how to improve standards in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>You are provided with appraisal forms during the interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>You keep a diary to record daily activities in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II: Interview Schedule

1. How frequent is performance appraisal conducted in your school? ..

2. What challenges do the teachers encounter while carrying out performance appraisals? ..

3. In your opinion do you support appraisal of teachers in secondary school? Yes or No. Give reasons for your answer..

4. What suggestions do you give that would help improve appraisal of teachers in schools?

5. Are the teachers provided with sufficient resources in school to facilitate teaching and learning?
APPENDIX III: Head Teachers’ Questionnaire

Introduction

I am a post graduate student at Kenyatta University and carrying out research on Teachers perception about performance appraisal feedback in secondary schools. This study is part of the requirement for the award of the Degree of Master of Educational Administration. Your assistance will be very helpful to me. The information you provide will be treated with confidentiality and will be used for the purpose of this research only. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Instructions:

i) Please complete the appropriate items where necessary.

ii) Please indicate by a tick (√) the correct responses to each of the following items where appropriate.

iii) In this questionnaire, the letters SA, A, U, D and SD shall be used as follows:

   SA - Strongly Agree
   A - Agree
   U - Undecided
   D - Disagree
   SD - strongly Disagree

Section A: Background Information

1. Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )

2. Age
   18-20 yrs ( ) 33-35 yrs ( ) 49-51 yrs ( )
   21-23 yrs ( ) 36-38 yrs ( ) 52 and above ( )
   24-26 yrs ( ) 39-41 ( )
   27-29 yrs ( ) 42-44 ( )
   30-32 yrs ( ) 45-47 ( )
3. Professional qualifications:
   
a) Diploma (   )

b) Graduate –BED (   )

BA PGDE (   ) BSC PGDE (   )

BSC-AGED (   ) M.ED (   ) M.A (   )

c) Any other specify (BOG) .................................................................

4. Indicate the years you have been in this school.

1-3 yrs (   ) 7-9 yrs (   )

4-6 yrs (   ) 10 and above (   )

Section B

Please indicate by the tick (√) the correct responses to each of the following items

HOW PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IS CONDUCTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>You regularly conduct self –appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>You discuss with teachers on what needs to be done and jointly set targets for achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>You ensure that feedback provided during the interview is confidential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>You appraise teachers based on observation, assessment of ability, readiness and their potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The teacher leaves the interview room knowing specifically what s/he’s doing right or wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>You have regular discussions with the teachers about their job performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>You create an enabling environment for feedback with the teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The teachers feels comfortable with the comments you give during the appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is consensus on the action plan to be implemented after appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The comments are made in a respectful manner that is constructive for feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OTHER WORK RELATED FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>You provide required resources to facilitate teaching and learning in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>You facilitate teachers to attend training and other professional development courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>You incorporate the views of the teacher on how to improve standards in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>You provide teachers with appraisal forms during the interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>You keep a diary to record daily activities in the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX IV: Research Budget for the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit cost (Kshs)</th>
<th>Estimated amount (Kshs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>20 reams of photocopying papers</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two flash disks</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Travelling</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Secretarial, photocopying, printing, binding</td>
<td>$600/= per copy</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Travel and accommodation</td>
<td>For handing in concept paper, research proposal and report</td>
<td>$4000/= per trip to Nairobi</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Other costs such as mailing through G4S</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>87,100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX V: Time Framework for the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase/activity</th>
<th>Time (months)</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of Concept paper</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>January-April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Proposal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>May- December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and Piloting of Instruments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jan-March 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Organization, Analysis, Interpretation, typing and printing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sept 2013-Feb 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final project report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>March- April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing, Submission of corrected copy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>May-November 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates specific activities to be carried out and the time each phase is expected to last.
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