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ABSTRACT

Human resource management, H.R.M, in any organization educational or otherwise embraces all the core functions of general management. It’s focused on the people’s side of management, seeking to ensure that the objectives are met. H.R.M still has its so called operative functions which include recruitment and selection, appraisal and development. Appraisal formally appeared on the education scene about 1983 as part of a general move towards greater accountability in the service. Reactions from the teacher’s associations were generally positive until the issue became enmeshed in the negotiations over pay and conditions. In Kenya the inspectorate section of the Ministry of Education is charged with the responsibility of the appraisal of teachers in their classroom teaching (Casseter, 1996). The purpose of the study was to find out teacher’s feelings towards appraisal method used by QASO. The study was guided by 2 objectives which were to determine the method used by QASO in teachers’ performance appraisal and to find out teachers perception of performance appraisal by QASO. The study utilized purposive sampling for schools. It was conducted in 7 secondary schools in Igoji Division. 2 schools were already established schools and 5 schools were in the category of upcoming schools. 61 teachers and 6 head teachers responded. A quality assurance officer was also interviewed which made an entire sampling matrix of 68 respondents. The research instruments included open ended questionnaires for teachers and head teachers and interview schedule for the quality assurance officer. The questionnaires were piloted in a secondary school not in the sample to establish their validity and reliability. Authority was sought from various groups i.e. Ministry of Education, P.D.E’s and D.E.O’s offices and the principals of the sample schools to allow the researcher to collect data on different days in each school. Data collected was analyzed on its own merit by using tables, charts, and graphs depending on responses given. The study adopted an exploratory approach using a descriptive survey design to find out teachers perception on staff appraisal method used by QASO. The study found out that most teachers are not satisfied with the current method used to appraise them.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

In educational establishment, where people rather than inanimate objects are being 'processed', the focus on HRM is of utmost importance. Performance indicators or measures for evaluating what is being achieved in institutions including individual performance have been seen as increasingly important in British management. One of the most important areas in H.R.M borrowed from British management to Kenyan schools is staff appraisal which from the beginning was not to dehumanize educational process and products but to ensure that what is most desired is delivered to the students.

Appraisal should also not devalue teacher's contribution but it should give the teachers greater professional status by taking the relationship between the means and the ends of education rather more seriously than hitherto. Fielder (1992) notes that much of the writing on appraisal by educationalists has more of the flavor of accountability, assessment and evaluation. This reflects a stereotypical view of the assumed authoritarian style used by managers in industry and commerce.

It is therefore helpful to differentiate between the appraisal interview and the whole system of which it is a part. This is outlined in the GRIDS handbooks (Mc Mahon 1994) which envisage self review of individual teacher for internal development purposes as leading to staff development program whilst if focus were on formal external accountability then this would lead to a staff appraisal scheme. This implies a neat
conceptualization which identifies appraisal with accountability but not with development.

In designing a particular appraisal system, it is important to be quite clear about the extent to which it is intended to be evaluative and the extent to which it should lead to individual development. Teacher's behavior and attitude towards appraisal is greatly influenced by principal expectations and how clearly, consistently, directly and fact fully these expectations are communicated. The leader should also provide appropriate models whereby they are their own best examples of desirable behavior.

Teacher's performance appraisal is a process that starts with initial meeting. It is helpful for the appraisal process to begin with an initial meeting between the appraiser and the appraise. Some schools argue that, if the awareness raising and giving information with the whole staff have been thorough, this is unnecessary. However, there is always the need to ensure that, whatever may be understood in general, there is between each appraiser and appraise a clear understanding of the appraisal process as it applies to his or her particular situation. It is vital, for example that there is agreement that the job specification, written and agreed as long as two years ago, remains valid and that the goals, some of which may have been modified since the initial goal setting, are accurately recorded.

It's also important, particularly with the newly employed teachers, that the appraise is assured that the intentions of the appraisal are not judgmental, but concerned with the appraisee's personal and professional development with school's effectiveness. Schools
should to adopt an overriding principle of open behavior in which data is sought in a tripartive meeting.

After creating rapport through initial meeting, classroom observation follows. If appraisal is to have school improvement as its main concern, then it follows that what teachers spend most of their time engaged in, involving the learners in the learning process, must be a central feature of the appraisal process. Classroom observation reveals a view of the climate, rapport interaction and functioning of the classroom available from no other source (Everston and Holley, 1999). Not only is class observation valuable in its own right, as a vehicle for one-to-one in service education and the sharing of ideas within the school on teaching content and methodology; its also is vital in order to ensure both the goal setting and the interview elements of appraisal relate, not to abstractions, but to what is for most teachers the key element of their role. Both casual and formal classroom observation are needed for staff development.

Moran (1990) puts admirably that the old methods of walking through classrooms or occasionally shadowing the timetable of a particular teaching group are a poor substitute for the vigour of a structured attempt to improve the learning of pupils and the professional development of staff. Undoubtedly, the ready acceptance by pupils and teachers alike that classrooms are not restricted domains or no-go areas will facilitate classroom observation for teacher appraisal. It is important that a clear distinction is made between the casual and the structured observation. Both have their uses, but neither is a substitute for the other because they have different outcomes.
Once QASO is through with classroom observation, appraisal interview follows. During the interview with a teacher, QASO should provide an opportunity for genuine dialogue. A monopoly of the interview by the appraiser will be counterproductive.

Once the appraisal statement is finalized, all associated documentation is destroyed. When, after the period, the next appraisal statement for at least three months to cover any possibility of appeal that might require reference to it. It is normally sensible to retain statements on file for the equivalent of two complete appraisal cycles. One of the most important outcomes of the appraisal is identification of individual training needs. It is essential that the appraiser does not offer hostages to fortune during the interview by making promises that may not be kept. In every school, there is an individual, often the head teacher or a senior member of staff, or a team responsible for staff development. This is the initial arena for decision making on training. One individual’s needs must be set against those of all who have been apprised, and incidentally of those not in that year’s appraisal cycle – and also evaluated against the composite needs of the school and the amount of money available for training (Cyril and Doreen, 2003).

There remains among the components of teacher appraisal only the follow up meeting, which takes place in the alternate year. While this is not intended in any way as a full appraisal interview, it does not have a specific purpose that makes it more than a casual discussion. It is done to review progress, discuss whether targets set the year before are still appropriate, look at the value of training undertaken and provide the opportunity for the appraise to raise any career development needs. The QASO and teacher are required to annotate the appraisal statement with any modification to the targets previously set and the reasons for that modification.
1.1.1 Role of QASO

It is the QASO’s main responsibility to gather evidence from a variety of sources, to cross check the evidence through a process of triangulation, and to make judgments on the quality of education provided.

For appraisal to perceived positively, the QASO officials should devote ample time to orient new teachers to school, ensure that all teachers have sufficient number of appropriate textbooks and other teaching and learning materials, provide the means for teachers to attend professional development conferences and also of importance take time to listen to teachers problems.

QASO should also aim to agree with the teacher at the initial meeting what information would be appropriate to collect for the purpose of the appraisal, from what sources and by which methods.

Another main role played by QASO is to ensure that skilful questioning and probing gives the teacher opportunity to do most of the talking and, through it, heighten one’s awareness. It is important to accept that appraisal interview is reciprocal. There may arise situations in which the appraiser has to recognize that failures on their part to give adequate support to the appraisee have been in part responsible for inadequacies of performance.

QASO should then draft the appraisal statement. It’s important to share a draft of the appraisal statement before its finalized.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Despite the fact that staff appraisal provides an opportunity to review periodically the job description and to amend it to ensure that it is a faithful record of the current job, there are increasing concerns regarding teacher's perceptions towards the process.

Major concerns are in regard to how teachers embrace feedback given. This is because an overwhelming majority of teachers consider themselves as excellent performers. Performance appraisal may tell them bluntly that this is not the case. This, even if true, serves only to deflate the teachers and does little to improve performance or motivate the teacher.

When feedback is positive and is consistent with the teachers own self image, the inherent conflicts in the process are minimized; however when the feedback is critical of poor performance, a defensive reaction from the teacher may set up barriers which inhibit acceptance of this feedback and prevent open discussion of how performance might be improved.

Another major issue is that a teacher might have approached a task in what he/she perceived to be the best approach at that time and circumstance. The underlying problem might have been the supervisor's wrong instructions or the failure of the system to realize opportunities and threats correctly. In this case, it is difficult to reach a consensus during the interview schedule and also when giving feedback.

Another issue is that the teacher desires to confirm a positive self image and to obtain organizational rewards of promotion or pay. The QASO on the other hand want individual teachers to be open to negative information about them so that they can
improve their performance. As long as teachers see the appraisal process as having an important influence on their reward, their career and their self image, they will be reluctant to engage in the kind of open dialogue required for valid evaluation and personal development.

Another main concern is that appraisal is done after a specific period of time especially yearly by Q.U.A.S.O hence is seen as a routine but weaknesses should be discussed with the teachers as they happen and not stored up to be discussed at appraisal interview. On the same note, strengths should be acknowledged immediately so that they can be built upon.

Another major concern is that assessing the work of a teacher is difficult. There are no universally agreed criteria for good teaching and more fundamentally the relationship between the teaching and learning is not direct. It may well be that assessing teacher’s performance let alone pupil learning may not be defensible in any research sense but if it is part of a management process, then the test to be applied to the appraisal is one of fitness for purpose.” It is then important to decide on realistic standards of teachers performance appraisal for different categories of school.

1.2.1 Purpose of the Study

Based on the problem stated, the purpose of the proposed study is to find out teachers feelings about the performance appraisal by QASO. It also seeks the views of the teachers on what should be improved as well as the strength of the process.
1.3 Objectives of the Study

1. To determine the method used by QASO in teachers performance appraisal.
2. To find out teachers perception of performance appraisal by QASO.

1.4 Research Questions

1. How do the teachers perceive the method used by QASO in appraisal process?
2. Which alternative method should be used by QASO in teacher’s performance appraisal process?
3. How does the feedback and outcome of performance appraisal influence teacher’s perception of the process?
4. What is the main focus of teacher’s performance appraisal?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The findings of the study may have implications to the Ministry of Education, schools and to the individual teacher. To the ministry of Education, the study may lead to the improvement of strategies for the performance appraisal process. This includes the method used by QASO to appraise teachers, ensuring that QASO are well conversed with what goes on in schools and that they are adequately trained and prepared to undertake the role of appraisers. It may also give guidelines on how often teachers’ performance should be appraised and what considerations should be put in place when designing appraisal forms.

The study may also have positive implications to the schools. It might lead to school’s effectiveness because it focuses on highlight the weaknesses and strengths of teacher’s performance appraisal process and from this it may bring potential benefits such as the individual teacher becoming more productive.
To the individual teacher, the study might ensure that appraisal does not lead to creation of emotional anguish (stress to attain set targets), erosion of performance especially where teachers endeavors to set objectives easily achievable to ensure themselves a decent appraisal.

1.6 Limitations and Delimitation

1.6.1 Limitations

- The study limits itself to only one division. For more conclusive results, more divisions especially in hardship areas should have been studied. However this is not possible due to financial and other logistic constrains.

- Information obtained in teachers performance appraisal is confidential therefore the researcher may not have access to it, however it would have been a great contribution to the study.

1.6.2 Delimitation

- The study seeks to find only teachers perception, however for full improvement of the process of performance appraisal, head teachers and QASO perception should also be sought.

1.7 Assumption

Teachers, head teachers and QASO will be willing to participate and give accurate information especially on the weaknesses of the process.
1.8 Conceptual Framework

Collecting information: An approach used effectively by many appraisers is to have teachers fill in the appraisal form first. If this is done, it is important to ask teachers to provide the information only, not the ratings. After the teachers have provided the information, the appraiser can refine the document and enter ratings. This procedure gives the teachers a sense of ownership of the appraisal, creates an opportunity for appraiser to discuss any discrepancies in data or differences in perception before finalizing the appraisal, and ultimately improves appraisal accuracy. It also saves appraiser considerable time.

Interview schedule: It is useful to have a structure for appraisal discussions and to follow the structure in conducting these discussions with the teacher. What is the best structure? There is not a single structure that is best for all situations and all appraisers. The “trick” is to choose the approach that you are most comfortable with and that you believe will be most suitable for the type of work and the individual teacher you appraise. Here are some general tips for conducting an appraisal discussion in real world.
- Collecting information (Preparation)
  - Interview schedule
- Feedback (employee growth)
- Documentation

- No prior preparation
- Approach used by appraiser
- Feedback (corrective action)
- Documentation

- Teachers Perception
- Student's performance
- Teachers Performance of duties

Figure 1.1: Conceptual framework on policies and the effective conduct of staff appraisal
1.9 Theoretical Framework

Fig1.2: Performance appraisal model

Clarify role: The following questions are answered at this stage

What is the difference between job description and what a person actually does?

Does your line manager fully understand how much you do?

Has your job description changed at all in the last 12 months?

Have you taken new duties delegated?

NB: If there is a differing understanding of what the appraise does then appraisal will not be an accurate reflection of the individual.
Agree smart objectives

The objectives are guiding principles of what should be achieved. They should be agreed upon by both teachers and QASO in order to ensure that they are working towards a common goal.

Monitor and support

This involves daily management as teachers undertake their responsibilities.

Review evaluate

It involves holding regular meetings with teachers to assess their progress, review objectives and reset them if necessary.

Appraisal interview

This summarizes performance for the year or review period.
2.1 Introduction

Teacher Performance Appraisal is the process of evaluation for teachers that was developed by the Ministry of Education and is implemented by the employer through QASO.

An appraisal is an activity used in defining and retaining personnel after they have been deployed. (Cawley, 2000) in his book “Participation in Performance appraisal process and employee reaction” notes that Performance appraisal refers to evaluation of employee behavior at work place. It involves a process by which an employee and his or her superordinate meet to discuss the work performance of the employees. PA is often included in performance management systems. Performance management systems are employed “to manage and align” all of a school's resources in order to achieve highest possible performance. “How performance is managed in a school determines to a large extent the success or failure of the school. Therefore, improving PA for everyone should be among the highest priorities of contemporary” schools.

2.2 Concept of Performance Appraisal

The staff appraisal is a periodical advisory and support discussion between staff members and management, which also reaches agreements about objectives and the achievement of targets, which are then incorporated in target agreements (Denisi, & Pritchard, 2006). The staff appraisal provides the opportunity, in a systematic and structured way outside of
every-day working routine, to discuss matters that support and advance target-oriented cooperation.

A performance appraisal (PA) or performance evaluation is a systematic and periodic process that assesses an individual employee's job performance and productivity in relation to certain pre-established criteria and organizational objectives. Other aspects of individual employees are considered as well, such as organizational citizenship behavior, accomplishments, potential for future improvement, strengths and weaknesses (Erick, 1998).

Keeping, 1998 also defines Performance Appraisal as a formal two way system that aims to develop, motivate and improve performance of individuals through assessment and feedback on previous performance, consideration of current roles and responsibilities and agreement on future developments.

2.3 Teacher Performance Appraisal vs. Improved Performance

Despite all the potential advantages of formal performance appraisals (PAs), there are also potential drawbacks. It has been noted that determining the relationship between individual job performance and organizational performance can be a difficult task. Generally, there are two overarching problems from which several complications spawn.

One of the problems with formal PAs is there can be detrimental effects to the organization(s) involved if the appraisals are not used appropriately. The second problem with formal PAs is they can be ineffective if the PA system does not correspond with the organizational culture and system.
According to Sudarsan, 2009 a central reason for the utilization of performance appraisals (PAs) is performance improvement ("initially at the level of the individual employee, and ultimately at the level of the organization"). Other fundamental reasons include "as a basis for employment decisions (e.g. promotions, terminations, transfers), as criteria in research (e.g. test validation), to aid with communication (e.g. allowing employees to know how they are doing and organizational expectations), to establish personal objectives for training" programs, for transmission of objective feedback for personal development, "as a means of documentation to aid in keeping track of decisions and legal requirements" and in wage and salary administration. Additionally, PAs can aid in the formulation of job criteria and selection of individuals "who are best suited to perform the required organizational tasks". A PA can be part of guiding and monitoring employee career development. PAs can also be used to aid in work motivation through the use of reward systems.

There are a number of potential benefits of organizational performance management conducting formal performance appraisals (PAs) (Kanfer and Ackerman, 1999). There has been a general consensus in the belief that PAs lead to positive implications of organizations. Furthermore, PAs can benefit an organization's effectiveness. One way is PAs can often lead to giving individual workers feedback about their job performance. From this may spawn several potential benefits such as the individual workers becoming more productive.

Other potential benefits as outlined in the journal by Keeping and Levy, 2000 "Performance Appraisal Reactions: Measurement, modeling and method bias" include:
• **Facilitation of communication**: communication in organizations is considered an essential function of worker motivation. It has been proposed that feedback from PAs aid in minimizing employees' perceptions of uncertainty. Fundamentally, feedback and management-employee communication can serve as a guide in job performance.

• **Enhancement of employee focus** through promoting trust: behaviors, thoughts, and/or issues may distract employees from their work, and trust issues may be among these distracting factors. Such factors that consume psychological energy can lower job performance and cause workers to lose sight of organizational goals. Properly constructed and utilized PAs have the ability to lower distracting factors and encourage trust within the organization.

• **Goal setting** and desired performance reinforcement: organizations find it efficient to match individual worker's goals and performance with organizational goals. PAs provide room for discussion in the collaboration of these individual and organizational goals. Collaboration can also be advantageous by resulting in employee acceptance and satisfaction of appraisal results.

• **Performance improvement**: well constructed PAs can be valuable tools for communication with employees as pertaining to how their job performance stands with organizational expectations. "At the organizational level, numerous studies have reported positive relationships between human resource management (HRM) practices" and performance improvement at both the individual and organizational levels.
• **Determination of training needs:** "Employee training and development are crucial components in helping an organization achieve strategic initiatives". It has been argued that for PAs to truly be effective, post-appraisal opportunities for training and development in problem areas, as determined by the appraisal, must be offered. PAs can especially be instrumental for identifying training needs of new employees. Finally, PAs can help in the establishment and supervision of employees' career goals.

2.4 Teacher Performance Appraisal vs. Student's Achievement

High quality teaching is essential to improving student outcomes and reducing gaps in student achievement. Teacher performance appraisal system provides teachers with meaningful appraisals that encourage professional learning and growth. The process is designed to foster teacher development and identify opportunities for additional support where required. By helping teachers achieve their full potential, the performance appraisal process represents one element of the Ministry's vision of achieving high levels of student performance (Ministry of Education, 2003).

The main concern in teacher's performance appraisal and student achievement is the fact that assessing the work of a teacher is difficult. There are no universally agreed criteria for good teaching and more fundamentally the relationship between the teaching and learning is not direct. It may well be that assessing teacher's performance let alone pupil learning may not be defensible in any research sense but if it is part of a management process, then the test to be applied to the appraisal is one of "fitness for purpose".
2.5 Teacher Performance Appraisal vs. Teacher Perception

Numerous researchers have reported that many employees are not satisfied with their performance appraisal (PA) systems. Studies have shown that subjectivity as well as appraiser bias is often a problem perceived by as many as half of teachers (Spinks, 2003). Appraiser bias, however, appears to be perceived as more of a problem in government and public sector. Also, according to some studies, teachers wished to see changes in the PA system by making “the system more objective, improving the feedback process, and increasing the frequency of review.” In light of traditional performance appraisal operation defects, “schools are now increasingly incorporating practices that may improve the system. These changes are particularly concerned with areas such as elimination of subjectivity and bias, training of appraisers, improvement of the feedback process and the performance review discussion (Meche, 2009).

According to a meta-analysis of 27 field studies, general teacher participation in his/her own appraisal process was positively correlated with teacher reactions to the PA system. More specifically, teacher participation in the appraisal process was most strongly related to teacher satisfaction with the PA system (Cawley, Keeping & Levy, 1998). Concerning the reliability of teacher reaction measures, researchers have found teacher reaction scales to be sound with few concerns through using a confirmatory factor analysis that is representative of teacher reaction scales.

Researchers suggest that the study of teachers’ reactions to PA is important because of two main reasons: teacher reactions symbolize a criterion of interest to practitioners of PAs and teacher’s reactions have been associated through theory to determinants of
appraisal acceptance and success. Researchers translate these reasons into the context of the scientist-practitioner gap or the “lack of alignment between research and practice as noted by Keeping & Levy, 2000 in their journal “Performance appraisal reactions: Measurement, modeling, and method bias. “Journal of Applied Psychology”.

2.6 Teacher’s feelings about the Method Used by QASO in PA Process

As noted by Erick, 1998 in his book “The Appraisal Interview: an approach to training for teachers and school management”, there are three main methods used to collect performance appraisal (PA) data: objective production, personnel, and judgmental evaluation. Judgmental evaluations are the most commonly used with a large variety of evaluation methods.

Judgmental evaluation appears to be a collection of methods, and as such, could be considered a methodology. A common approach to obtaining PAs is by means of raters. Because the raters are human, some error will always be present in the data. The most common types of error are leniency errors, central tendency errors, and errors resulting from the halo effect. (Muchinsky, 2012). These errors arise predominantly from social cognition and the theory in that how we judge and evaluate other individuals in various contexts is associated with how we “acquire, process, and categorize information”.

Muchinsky further notes that an essential piece of judgmental evaluation is rater training. Rater training is the “process of educating raters to make more accurate assessments of performance, typically achieved by reducing the frequency of halo, leniency, and central-tendency errors”. According to Molleman, 2003 rater training also helps the raters
“develop a common frame of reference for evaluation” of individual performance. Many researchers and survey respondents support the ambition of effectual rater training. However, it is noted that such training is expensive, time consuming, and only truly functional for behavioral assessments.

Another piece to keep in mind is the effects of rater motivation on judgmental evaluations. It is not uncommon for rating inflation to occur due to rater motivation (i.e. "organizationally induced pressures that compel raters to evaluate ratees positively"). Typically, raters are motivated to give higher ratings because of the lack of organizational sanction concerning accurate/inaccurate appraisals, the rater's desire to guarantee promotions, salary increases, etc., the rater's inclination to avoid negative reactions from subordinates, and the observation that higher ratings of the ratees reflect favorably upon the rater.

2.7 Findings on PA Studies by QASO in Kenya

Method used by QASO in teacher’s performance appraisal

Barasa, 2007 notes in his book, *Educational Organization and Management*, that aside from traditional (annual, six month, quarterly or monthly) performance appraisals, there are many different methods of performance evaluation. The use of any of these methods depends on the purpose of the evaluation, the individual the assessor and the environment. The formal annual appraisal is generally the overriding instrument which gathers together and reviews all other performance data for the previous year. Annual teacher performance reviews appear to be the standard in most schools. However, “it has
been acknowledged that appraisals conducted more frequently (more than once a year) may have positive implications for both the organization and employee.” It is suggested that regular performance feedback provided to employees may quell any unexpected and/or surprising feedback to year-end discussions. In a recent research study concerning the timeliness of PAs, “one of the respondents even suggested that the performance review should be done formally and more frequently, perhaps once a month, and recorded twice a year.”

Other researchers propose that the purpose of PAs and the frequency of their feedback are contingent upon the nature of the job and characteristics of the teacher. For example, if teacher’s routine jobs involve performance maintenance, the goal would benefit sufficiently from annual PA feedback. On the other hand, if teachers are more discretionary in non-routine jobs, where goal-setting is appropriate and there is room for development, they would benefit from more frequent PA feedback.

**Teacher’s perception of performance appraisal**

According to Kikoski, 1999 performance appraisal should be positive experiences. The appraisal process provides the platform for development and motivation so organizations should foster a feeling that P.A.is positive opportunity in order to get the best out of the people and the process. In certain organizations, P.A. is widely regarded as something rather less welcoming on which to develop fear and resentment. Performance management removes much of the limitations of the PA process. It defines performance expectations and rewards or collects performance. The proactive nature of this approach allows for collecting mistakes or sounding alarm for improvements as when they occur,
changing wrong perceptions, challenging subjectivity, when the situation is live, rather than at a later stage when the issue is out of people's radar.

2.8 Summary

Numerous researchers have reported that many teachers are not satisfied with the performance appraisal method used by QASO. Studies indicate that subjectivity as well as appraiser bias is often the problem perceived by many teachers. Muchinsky, 2012 notes that things seldom happen as they are described in “the book”. The following are general tips for conducting an appraisal discussion in the real world in an effort to address the gaps noted in the appraisal process.

Recognize that evaluation stirs up emotions – Most people believe they are outstanding performers. Others like to put on a game face and make people think they are outstanding performers even though they know in their own full mind they are not. And still others are really hard on themselves and do not believe they are worthy a good rating. Whatever the case, the appraisal discussion is likely to stir up emotions when these teachers are faced with an evaluation of their performance. Be prepared.

Describe Performance, not personality – Feedback works best when it addresses what the person does rather who the person is. When teachers perform poorly, discuss their poor performance: how they missed three important deadlines and had to have their work redone several times. Do not discuss them as people: how lazy you think they are or how they must not be very bright if this is the best they can do.
Use feedback – Teachers long for real feedback, not platitudes. When supervisors provide concrete examples, teachers understand clearly what aspect of performance is being discussed.

Stress the contribution – Point out how the teacher’s accomplishments contribute to the schools mission. Teachers stay engaged when they can see clearly how their work fits into the bigger picture.

Address issues – If there is an obvious problem with a teacher’s performance and the supervisor does not bring it up, the supervisor’s credibility is diminished.

Stay on track – Supervisors should plan how they want to conduct the appraisal discussions with the teachers, the points they want to emphasize and the actions they want the teachers to take following the discussion.

No surprises – The end of year discussion is not the time to bring up any surprisingly new issues. Performance should be tracked and supervisors should be providing both positive and negative feedback to teachers throughout the year.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section covers research methodology which is organized under the following subheadings: research design, target population, locale of study, types of instruments, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques.

3.2 Research Design

The study adopted an exploratory approach using a descriptive survey design to investigate teacher’s perception on staff performance appraisal in efforts to ensure that the process is perceived as a means of improvement rather than fault seeking process. Gay, 1981 defines survey as an attempt to collect data from members of a population in order to determine the status of that population with respect to one or more variables. Julian, 2000 adds that survey research concerns itself with describing practices that prevail, beliefs, views, attitudes or perceptions that are held. Gay (1981) says that a descriptive study determines and reports the way things are and commonly involves assessing attitudes or opinions towards individuals, organizations and procedures. Descriptive data is typically collected through questionnaires, interview or observation. Gay adds that normally specific data collection instruments have to be developed since one is generally asking questions that have not been asked before. Descriptive survey design is used in preliminary and exploratory studies to allow researchers to gather information, summarize, present and interpret for the purpose of clarification (Orodho,
2002). By involving a broad-category of stake holders, the study fitted within the cross sectional sub-types of descriptive survey study designs.

3.3 Locale of the Study

The study was carried out in Igoji Division in Meru County. The division was preferred because it is one of the divisions with a large number of mushrooming schools in which standards have been compromised due to the lack of adequate preparations as the schools are put up. In fact most schools are extensions of existing primary schools and as the country faces acute shortage of teachers, T.S.C employed teachers in these schools are usually few. The teachers are therefore overloaded and may not be able to undertake the designated duties effectively and therefore appraisal set standards are not met.

Also the division have had stagnated K.C.S.E results in particular schools. This may have resulted from teachers doing the same old things over and over which is an indication that the sole purpose of appraisal which is improvement of weaknesses noted may not be taking place hence similar results.

Just like in the other schools in the country, the teachers in Igoji division opposed the idea of performance contracts which were to be renewed on the basis of teacher’s performance based on teacher’s appraisal and results produced by the teacher as reflected on the students’ results in exams. This is an indication that teachers have a negative attitude towards the appraisal process.

On a positive note, there have been promotions in the division so as to fill the heads and deputies positions in the upcoming schools. These promotions are based on one’s competency as noted during appraisal process.
3.4 Target Population

3.4.1 Schools

The study was carried out in public secondary schools in Igoji Division. The division has a total of 27 secondary schools which involves 5 girls’ boarding schools, 3 boys’ boarding schools and 19 mixed day / day and boarding secondary schools.

The schools were studied under two categories, the already established schools (boys / girls boarding) in the category of county or national schools and the upcoming schools which are the mixed day or day and boarding schools.

In the first category, the facilities were adequate and they were also well staffed with teachers from TSC. Teachers therefore shared the responsibilities to the fullest.

The other category of schools was characterized by inadequate facilities or the facilities do not exist at all, few teachers who may be required to handle a number of responsibilities. This may hinder teacher’s performance and consequently affecting the way they perceive performance appraisal.

3.4.2 Respondents

Two categories of respondents are crucial namely, informed specialists and consumers (Luck and Reuben, 1992). Consequently, this study targeted Quality assurance and standard officers and head teachers to represent the informed specialists. The teachers were also targeted to represent the users.

In Igoji Division, there is a total of 27 head teachers from the 27 secondary schools in the Division. The number of teachers in the division is $8 \times 16 = 128$ in the boys and girls
boarding schools and $19 \times 7 = 133$ in mixed day/day and boarding secondary schools. This gives a total of 261 teachers in the whole division.

The quality assurance officer was also targeted because the QASO carries out the duty of teacher's performance appraisal as stipulated in the Ministry of Education guidelines.

3.5 Sampling Techniques

3.5.1 Schools

The sampling units were schools that were purposively selected using the criteria of type of school. This involved 2 already established schools (1 boys boarding and 1 girls boarding) in which facilities were adequate and were well staffed with teachers from T.S.C. The number of teachers in these schools was large as compared with the number of teachers from the upcoming schools.

The other category of schools was 5 mixed day/day and boarding upcoming schools in which the facilities were not adequate or did not exist at all and had a few T.S.C employed teachers. The two categories of schools yielded a sample size of 7 schools in the whole division.

3.5.2 Respondents

Teachers from both categories of schools were randomly selected with the help of the deputy head teacher.

The sampling involved 16 teachers from each of the boys' and girls' boarding schools. This gave a total of 32 teachers from the already established schools. 6 teachers from each of the 5 mixed day/day and boarding secondary schools were also sampled. This
gave a total of 29 teachers from the category of upcoming schools. The two categories of schools yielded a sample size of 61 teachers.

The teachers involved were TSC employed and also BOG employed teachers. TSC employed teachers are assured of job security, better pay and in most cases are qualified and experienced unlike their counterparts employed by BOG whose job security is at stake, salaries are meager especially in the upcoming schools and who may not be qualified teachers. These factors may bring differences on how teachers perceive the process of performance appraisal. (Cyril, 1993)

6 head teachers from the two categories of schools were involved together with the District QASO. The entire sampling matrix therefore yielded a total sample size of 68 for the study.

3.6 Types of Instruments

Two types of research instruments, questionnaires and interview schedule were used in data collection. Questionnaires were used because as Kiess and Bloom, 1985 observe, it offers considerable advantages in the administration: it presents an even stimulus potentially to large numbers of people simultaneously and provides the investigation with an easy accumulation of data. Gay (1992) maintains that questionnaires give respondents freedom to express their views or opinion and to make suggestions. On the other hand, interview schedule enabled the researcher to get more information from respondents since it was possible to probe further during face to face interview and seek clarifications, which would not be possible using a questionnaire.
3.6.1 Teacher’s Questionnaire

Open ended questionnaires were prepared for the teachers. Questionnaires are considered ideal for collecting data because the individuals record and interpret these instruments. Since they were open ended, teachers views were expressed unlike in structured questionnaires whereby the options given may not exhaust teacher’s opinions on staff appraisal. The questionnaire consisted of three sections. Section A covered the teacher’s background, section B covered the method used by QASO to appraise teachers and also sought to find out teacher’s feelings about the process used. The third and final section covered teacher’s perception towards the performance appraisal and also the weaknesses of the process and ways of improving the appraisal process.

3.6.2 Head teacher’s Questionnaire

The open ended questionnaires for the head teachers were used to collect data from on their perception to teacher’s performance appraisal. The questionnaire consisted of three sections. Section A covered the head teacher’s background, as well as school’s background. Section B covered the method used by QASO to appraise teachers and also sought to find out teacher’s feelings about the process used. The third and final section covered teacher’s perception towards the performance appraisal and also the weaknesses of the process and ways of improving the appraisal process.

3.6.3 QASO Interview Schedule

Structured interview schedule was developed for the quality assurance officer. During the interview, the researcher was able to capture the officer’s views on the staff performance appraisal and also sought immediate clarification that was required. The interview
schedule consisted of two sections. Section A covered QASO background. Section B covered the considerations put in place by QASO when appraising teachers and also sought to find out teacher’s feelings about the process used. It also sought to find out the weaknesses of the process and ways of improving the appraisal process.

3.7 Data Collection

The researcher obtained a research permit from the ministry of Education before conducting the research. The researcher identified research assistants who assisted in piloting of instruments and collecting data. Piloting of instruments was done in schools not to be included in the sample. The researcher visited the sampled schools having made prior arrangement with the principal. The researcher went through the questionnaires with respondents clarifying what was not clear. The principal researcher supervised the field work during data collection. The actual data collection was undertaken by a staff member or deputy from the selected school as research assistants. After data collection, the data was edited to improve the quality of the data for coding.

3.8 Data Analysis

Data collected from the field was coded and entered into the computer for analysis using the Statistical Package for Social Science. (SPSS). As Martin and Acuna, 2002 observe, SPSS is able to handle large amount of data, and given its wide spectrum of statistical procedures purposefully designed for social sciences, it is quite efficient.

Data collected was both qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative data was analyzed by arranging responses according to the research questions and objectives. Descriptive
statistics including percentages and frequency counts were used to analyze the quantitative data obtained. Bell, 1993 maintains that when making the results known to a variety of readers, simple descriptive statistics such as percentages have a considerable advantage over more complex statistics. Borg and Gall (1989) also hold that the most widely used and understood standard proportion is the percentage. The results of data analysis were presented in frequency tables, bar graphs and pie charts. Thereafter, conclusions and recommendations were drawn from the findings.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents results and discussion of the study findings. The general objective of the study was to find out the teachers perception of staff appraisal by QASO in public secondary schools in Igoji Division, Meru County. Presentation of the findings is based on the thematic areas stated below:

1. The method used by Quality Assurance and Standards Officer in teacher's performance appraisal.

2. Teacher's perception of performance appraisal by Quality Assurance and Standards Officer.

The demographic data of the respondents is given first, followed by the analysis and discussion of each of the research objectives.

4.2 Background data of the respondents

The study targeted 70 respondents, made up by 62 teachers, 7 head teachers and one quality assurance officer, 61 teachers, 6 head teachers and one quality assurance and standards officer responded. The findings were as shown in tables 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4.
Table 4.1 Gender background of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>QASO</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows that majority (73.8% teachers and 66.7% headteachers) of the respondents were male and female respondents constituted only 26.2% teachers and 33.3% headteachers.

Table 4.2 Background on age of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>QASO</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 shows that most of the teachers (60.7%) who responded were aged 25-30 years. A small percentage of 1.6% represented teachers aged 41-50 years and over 50 years. 50% of head teachers were aged 31-40 years and 50% 41-50 years.

Table 4.3 Background on years of experience of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>QASO</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 shows that the number of teachers with experience of more than 15 years was 11.4% and 60.7% had worked for less than 5 years. More than half the number of head teachers (66.7%) who responded had worked for 5-10 years.

Table 4.4 Teachers response on terms of employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms of Employment</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under BOG</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 above shows that 60.7% of the teachers were under permanent terms of employment and less than 13.1% of the respondents were on contract basis. The results were presented in Fig 4.1.

Fig 4.1: Teachers response regarding terms of employment
4.3 Background Data of Schools

Additionally, the teachers indicated the category of the school they taught. The results are shown in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5 Response on category of school by teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of the school</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed day</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 shows that the number of teachers in County Schools were 32.8% and Mixed Day Schools were 34.4%. The lowest number of respondents (6.6%) were from National Schools.

The results were presented in Fig 4.2

![Response on category of school by teachers](image-url)
4.4 Method Used to Appraise Teachers

Teacher's and head teacher's views were sought in order to find out the satisfaction towards the current appraisal method. Their views were presented in figures 4.3 and 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area on appraisal</th>
<th>Level of Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remarks and/or recommendation by the countersigning officer</td>
<td>Satisfied 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation by the head teacher/ teacher</td>
<td>Satisfied 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments by reporting officer</td>
<td>Satisfied 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals for performance improvement</td>
<td>Satisfied 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion potential</td>
<td>Satisfied 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment by the reporting officer</td>
<td>Satisfied 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Assessment</td>
<td>Satisfied 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 4.3 Response by head-teachers on current method of appraising teachers*
Figures 4.3 and 4.4 illustrate that most teachers (70%) were satisfied with self assessment and 20% were somewhat satisfied. Head teachers' views, however, differed with teachers' views on this area of appraisal as 66.7% were somewhat satisfied with self assessment. On the assessment by the reporting officer, 23.3% of teachers were satisfied and 21.7% were dissatisfied. 66.7% of the head teachers were satisfied on this area. On the other hand, 40.4% of teachers were somewhat satisfied and 26.3% were dissatisfied with promotion potential. Head teachers agreed with teachers on this area as indicated by
50% which was somehow satisfied. On the proposal for performance improvement, 50.9% of teachers who responded was somehow satisfied and 15.3% was dissatisfied. The head teacher's views were different from those of teachers as majority of head teachers (60%) were satisfied compared to 33.9% of teachers. The other area was comments by reporting officer where 61% were somehow satisfied. On the other hand, 50% of the head teachers was satisfied and the other 50% was somehow satisfied in this area. 43.1% of teachers were satisfied with confirmation by the head teacher/teacher. Head teachers views were in agreement with teachers views on this area. Lastly, only 5.2% of teachers and 16.7% of head teachers were dissatisfied with remarks and or recommendation by the countersigning officer, 66.7% of head teachers and 62.1% teachers were somehow satisfied.

4.4.1: Comparison of Teachers and Head teachers satisfaction towards methods of performance appraisal

Figure 4.5 illustrates percentages of satisfaction for both teachers and head teachers as compared from their views in figures 4.3 and 4.4.
From the figure 4.5 it is clear that there was a highly significant association between the designation and the extent of satisfaction of the current method of appraisal ($X^2 (6) = 90.667, P<0.001$)
4.5 Alternative methods that can be used to appraise teachers

Teachers were asked to indicate alternative methods that can be used to appraise them apart from filling the form provided by the employer. The following methods were suggested.

Regular visit to school especially by QASO to check on available facilities and resources. According to Keeping and Levy, 2000, much of the blame is placed on the teachers for failure to perform as per the job description but the system may be the problem. A situation may arise that hinders the teacher from performing in the best of his/her ability.

Another method suggested was observation in classroom especially by the head teacher. This ensures that the head teacher gets first hand information on what the teacher does in the main area that appraisal focuses on. This method will help as a way forward in the weakness noted by many as biasness. The head teacher will be in a position to judge the teacher without depending on any records or information from other people. Observation can also be extended to other areas where duties have been assigned to the teacher like games, clubs and also in boarding section.

Close supervision of teacher preparedness was also a major method many teachers felt should be used. This involves checking professional documents like schemes of work, lesson plans, records of work, students performance follow up records of work, student’s performance follow up records and any other document. Unlike observation and oral interview the records serves as future reference incase there is change in administration. This method was mostly preferred because it can be used by a number of appraisers which include head teachers, Head of Department and head of subject. For a wholistic
appraisal, the preparedness should also focus on commitment to duties assigned to the teacher and how well the teacher addresses issues that may arise in line of duty.

A major problem noted in appraisal process was that it focused on individual teachers and discouraged teamwork. Teachers therefore felt that to encourage teamwork, the appraisers should benchmark with other teachers in the department teaching the same subject. The head of subject and head of department should check the performance of all the teachers in the departments and make comparison. This helps mostly in ensuring the teamwork is embraced and all teachers are working towards a common goal. It also harmonizes students performance and syllabus coverage.

Some teachers also felt that sample essay method should be used by the head teacher. The head teacher being the immediate supervisor understands the teacher's weaknesses and strengths and is the best placed person to comment about the teacher. Teacher further suggested that the head teacher should discuss the content of the essay with the teacher. This will help one build on strengths and improve on the weaknesses noted.

4.6 Teachers Perception of Staff Appraisal

The main areas of staff appraisal were highlighted and the teachers were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with each of the areas. Table 4.6 shows the teachers responses.

Legend
SA- Strongly agree
A- Agree
D- Disagree
SD- Strongly disagree
### Table 4.6 Teachers views about staff appraisal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main areas of staff appraisal</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The appraisal process is aimed at helping the teacher develop professionally and it’s not a fault seeking exercise.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is adequately prepared for the process well in advance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is communicated to the teacher, discussed and agreement reached on the way forward</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appraiser gives correct information about the teacher without bias</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings in the appraisal form reflect teacher’s overall achievements and shortcomings.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths noted should be discussed immediately but not piled up awaiting annual appraisal.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self assessment should be given more weight than appraisal by QASO when deciding the outcome of performance appraisal.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appraiser does not intimidate the teacher by overlooking the strengths and paying more attention to the weaknesses.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.6, 55.7% of the teachers agreed that the appraisal process is aimed at helping the teacher develop professionally and it's not a fault seeking exercise and only 8.2% strongly disagreed. The other area was on preparedness for the process, where 42.6% of teachers who responded disagreed. 23.3% of teachers strongly agreed that feedback is communicated, discussed and agreement reached on way forward and a similar percentage of 23.3% strongly disagreed. 33.3% agreed on this area. 42.6% of teachers were of the opinion that the appraiser gives correct information without bias and only 13.1% strongly disagreed. Another area was rating and how they reflect teachers overall achievements and shortcomings where the highest number of teachers (41.7%) were in agreement. 67.2% of the teachers strongly agreed that strengths noted should not be piled up waiting annual appraisal, and only less than 10% disagreed. 50.8% of teachers strongly agreed that self assessment should be given more weight than appraisal by QASO when deciding the outcome of performance appraisal, and only 4.92% strongly disagreed. The last area stated that the appraiser does not intimidate the teacher by overlooking the strengths and paying more attention to the weaknesses, where 8.2% strongly disagreed and 39.3% of teachers strongly agreed.

4.7 Teachers Perception of the Appraiser

Teacher's perception was also noted to be greatly influenced by how confident they were with the appraiser standards. A number of appraiser attributes were rated on a scale of 1-4 in which 1-unsatisfactory, 2-satisfactory, 3-Good and 4-Very good. Teacher's responses were as shown in Table 4.7.
Table 4.7 Appraiser standards as rated by teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness for the process</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of content in teacher’s job description</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach towards the appraisal process</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating conducive environment for discussion</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to assist on building on strengths and working on weaknesses noted</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability to make follow up on deliberations made</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:

1- Unsatisfactory
2- Satisfactory
3- Good
4- Very good

Table 4.7 indicates most of the teachers (52.46%) were satisfied with the appraiser preparedness of the process, and only 4.9% of teachers felt it was very good. On the mastery of content of teacher’s job description, 40% of teachers felt the appraiser was good. 6.7% of teachers rated appraiser as very good on approach towards the process and 36.1% were unsatisfied. 23% felt that the appraiser standard in creating conducive environment for discussion was unsatisfactory, and the 37.7% felt the appraiser standard on this area was satisfactory. Another attribute was on assisting on building on strengths and working on weaknesses, where the ratings (31.2%) were highest on satisfied teachers and the least number of teachers (14.8%) rating the appraiser very good. Finally, 42.6% of teachers who responded rated the appraiser as unsatisfactory on availability to make follow up on deliberations made and less than 10% rated the appraiser very good.
4.8 Person Mostly Preferred by Teachers to Appraise Them

The teachers were asked to indicate the person they would mostly prefer to appraise them and their responses were as in Table 4.8.

**Table 4.8: Preferred appraiser by teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred appraiser</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QASO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Teacher</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.8, rank 1 was given to the person mostly preferred whereas rank 5 was given to the person least preferred. The findings show that the students had the highest percentages on the person mostly preferred the person least preferred, 35% ranked them 1 and 40% ranked them 5. Head of department was averagely ranked by most teachers with 43.3% and had the least percentage (5%) for rank 1. It was also noted that QASO had majority teachers ranking them 5 (36.7%) and 13.3% ranking them 1. Head teacher was ranked 1 by 23.3% and a similar percentage 23.3% ranked them 4. Head of subject was ranked second after the students with 28.3% and 11.7% ranked them 5.

4.9 Relevance of Appraisal to Teachers

Head teachers views on relevance of appraisals to teachers were sought and responses given were as in Table 4.9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>Always n</th>
<th>Occasionally n</th>
<th>Rarely n</th>
<th>Not at all n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers willingly participate in the process</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable improvement in teachers performance after appraisal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers take correction positively</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are promoted based on appraisal findings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are sacked or issued with warning letters</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The objectives set are achievable as per the job description</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process is characterized by misunderstandings and nothing much is achieved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up is made on deliberations made</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers request to be appraised regularly instead of waiting for the appraisal scheduled by the employer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.9, most head teachers (66.7%) felt that teachers occasionally participate in the appraisal process and there's no time teachers refused to participate. A small number of head teachers (16.7%) said there's always notable improvement after appraisal, and half of the respondents (50%) said there's almost no notable improvement after appraisal. On how teachers take correction, 50% of head teachers felt they occasionally take it positively and the other 50% said they rarely take correction positively. Promotions based on appraisal findings are rare as indicated by 50% of head teachers who responded. 83.3% of head teachers said teachers are not all sacked based on appraisal findings. Half the number (50%) of head teachers also said that objectives set are achievable. Another area was on misunderstanding during appraisal where 50% of head teachers felt the misunderstandings are occasional and 33.3% felt there's rarely any misunderstanding. 83.3% of head teachers said follow up is occasionally made on deliberations. It was also seen that teachers never request to be appraised as indicated by 88.3% of the head teachers.

4.10 Purpose of Teacher Appraisal

Views were sought from both teachers and head teachers on the purpose of appraisal. Views were ranked with 1 most important and 4 least important. Teacher's and head teachers responses were as in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10: Purpose of appraisal by teachers and head teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Headteacher</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve teacher performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To identify training needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To take corrective action</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 4.10, 40% of teachers said appraisal should be used to improve teachers’ performance, which is half the percentage of head teachers. These percentages were rank 1 in both cases. There was a clear indication of disparity of teachers and head teacher’s views on promoting teachers based on appraisal where many head teachers (66.7%) felt findings should not be used to promote teachers and a big percent of teachers (40.0%) felt findings should be used to promote them. Teachers and head teacher’s views were the same on use of appraisal findings to identify training needs where majority rank was 2. Teachers and head teachers however had different views on taking corrective action where 51.7% of teachers felt the findings were least important compared to 33.3% of head teachers who were of the same opinion.

4.11 Discussion on the Findings

4.11.1: Current Method of Appraisal

Most teachers were satisfied with self assessment. Self assessment is beneficial when appraiser seek to increase teacher’s involvement in the review process. At a minimum, this gets the teacher thinking about his/her strengths and weakness and may lead to discussions about barriers to effective performance. This approach works best when the appraiser and appraisee jointly establish future performance goals on teacher development plans. Critics of self assessment argue that self rates are more lenient than manager in the assessments and tend to present themselves in a highly favorable light. For this reason self assessment may be best for developmental purposes rather than for administrative decisions. Arthur and George, (1998)

Assessing the work of a teacher is difficult. There are no universally agreed criteria for good teaching and more fundamentally the relationship between the teaching and
learning is not direct. It may well be that assessing teacher’s performance let alone pupil learning may not be defensible in any research sense but if it is part of a management process, then the test to be applied to the appraisal is one of fitness for purpose” It is then important to decide on realistic standards of teachers performance appraisal for different categories of schools. Bruner, (1986). This contributed greatly to teacher’s reactions towards the method that should be used to appraise them therefore the need for an alternative method.

Judgmental evaluation appears to be a collection of methods, and as such, could be considered a methodology. A common approach to obtaining performance appraisal information is by means of raters. Because the raters are human, some error will always be present in the data. The most common types of error are leniency errors, central tendency errors, and errors resulting from the halo effect. Muchinsky, (2012). These errors arise predominantly from social cognition and the theory in that how we judge and evaluate other individuals in various contexts is associated with how we “acquire, process, and categorize information”.

Head teachers on the other hand were of a different opinion. This indicates that the appraiser and appraise did not agree on the current method of appraising teachers. This is a clear indication that appraisal may never be useful since the head teacher and teachers have different opinions. The head teacher should therefore strive to change the teacher’s perception in order to reach a common agreement. The head teacher’s role should be strictly supportive. The teacher is the only one who can actually change his or her own opinion.
However, through a systematic approach and with a real effort to understand the teacher's point of view, the head teacher can play a major role in bringing the teachers to the place where he or she can and will change.

From the study, it was also noted that many teachers preferred different people to appraise them. According to finding on person mostly preferred by teachers to appraise them, the student got the highest percentage (33.5%) for rank 1 as compared to head of subjects (28.33%), head teacher (23.33%), QASO (13.33%) and finally head of department (5%). It was also evident that many teachers ranked QASO 5 with a percentage of 36.67%. This indicates that most teachers are comfortable with being appraised by the person who directly gets first hand information (teaching) on the job description.

Quality Assurance Officers were least preferred as many felt their standards were below average. Muchinsky, 2012 notes that if the essential piece of the method is ratings, rater training is very essential. Rater training is the “process of educating raters to make more accurate assessments of performance, typically achieved by reducing the frequency of halo, leniency, and central-tendency errors”. According to Molleman, 2003 Rater training also helps the raters “develop a common frame of reference for evaluation” of individual performance. Many researchers and survey respondents support the ambition of effectual rater training. However, it is noted that such training is expensive, time consuming, and only truly functional for behavioral assessments.
4.11.2: Teachers’ Perception towards the Process

Majority of teachers agreed to a little extent with the process and were unsatisfactory with the appraiser. The negative attitude may be brought about by a number of factors which include suspicion on why they were being appraised, concern for fair appraisal, use of totally subjective measurements of performance, being appraised against personality traits rather than results, the assumption by the head teachers that the teachers are totally in control of their performance and very little happenings, if anything, as a result of being appraised.

Numerous researchers have reported that many employees are not satisfied with their performance appraisal (PA) systems. Studies have shown that subjectivity as well as appraiser bias is often a problem perceived by as many as half of teachers (Spinks, 2003). Appraiser bias, however, appears to be perceived as more of a problem in government and public sector. Also, according to some studies, employees wished to see changes in the PA system by making “the system more objective, improving the feedback process, and increasing the frequency of review.” In light of traditional performance appraisal operation defects, “schools are now increasingly incorporating practices that may improve the system. These changes are particularly concerned with areas such as elimination of subjectivity and bias, training of appraisers, improvement of the feedback process and the performance review discussion (Meche, 2009).

According to a meta-analysis of 27 field studies, general teacher participation in his/her own appraisal process was positively correlated with teacher reactions to the PA system.
More specifically, teacher participation in the appraisal process was most strongly related to teacher satisfaction with the PA system (Cawley, Keeping and Levy. 1998).

There was also clear difference in teachers and head teacher’s views on the purpose of appraisal. 30% of teachers felt that appraisal should be used to promote teachers whereas none of the head teachers was of the same feeling. This shows that the teachers want to confirm a positive image and to obtain organizational reward or promotion. A common standard should therefore be set to ensure that there is no disagreement between the teacher and the head teacher on the outcome of the process. This can be done by sensitization of the teacher about the importance of the appraisal process which main aim is identifying teacher’s weaknesses and strengths.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Introduction
This chapter represents a summary of the study and makes recommendations based on the findings of the study. The chapter also offers some suggestions for further studies that could be carried out in future to advance knowledge in the area of teacher appraisal.

5.2. Summary
The purpose of the study was to find out teachers' feelings about performance appraisal. It also sought the views of the teachers on what should be improved as well as the strengths of the process. The study utilized purposive sampling of schools. It was conducted in seven secondary schools in Igoji Division. Two of the schools were already established and five were upcoming schools. The research instruments included open-ended questionnaires for teachers and head teachers and interview schedule for the quality assurance officer. Data collected was analyzed on its own merit using tables and graphs depending on responses given.

Data of the study was collected from 61 teachers, 6 head teachers and 1 quality assurance officer. The data was therefore analyzed based on this number.
5.2.1 Summary of the Findings

a) Method used by QASO in performance appraisal

A high percentage of teachers preferred self assessment and was not comfortable with the current method used to appraise them. On the contrary, most head teachers were of a different opinion. The head teachers felt that the method of appraising teachers which involves rating teacher performance based on job description was up to standard and were satisfied with it. The teachers therefore suggested that there should be discussion of the process before hand to avoid misunderstandings during the process. This is a major cause of teachers not achieving much after the process and consequently not liking the method used by the appraiser.

b) Teachers perception of performance appraisal

The study established that most teachers have a negative perception about the appraisal process as well as towards the appraiser. The teachers did not have confidence in the appraiser as many were unsatisfied with the appraiser’s preparedness for the process, mastery of content in teachers job description, approach towards the appraisal process, creating conducive environment for discussion, willingness to assist on building strengths and working on weaknesses noted and availability to make follow up on deliberations made.

A weakness of teachers’ performance appraisal programs as indicated by the teachers is that managers and supervisors are not adequately trained for the appraisal task and provide little meaningful feedback to teachers. Because they lack precise standards for
appraising performance and have not developed the necessary observational and feedback skills, their appraisals often become non-directive and meaningless.

5.3. Conclusion

On basis of research questions the following conclusions were reached:-

Many teachers have negative perception of performance appraisal process. One of the main concerns of teachers was the fairness of the performance appraisal system, as the process is critical to many Human Resource Management decisions. Teachers who believe the system is unfair may consider the appraisal interview a waste of time and leave the interview with feelings of anxiety and frustrations. Also the teachers may view compliance with the performance appraisal system as perfunctory and thus play only a passive role during the interview process. By addressing teachers concerns during the planning stage of the appraisal process, the organization will help the appraisal program succeed in reaching its goals.

Teachers were not contented with the method used, they gave suggestions of alternative methods that could be used. These methods were regular visits to school by QASO, classroom observation by head teachers. Benchmarking with other teachers teaching the subject by head of departments and head of subjects, monitoring teacher preparation by head teacher, head of department and head of subject and also sample essay method by the head teacher.

Teachers felt that the appraiser rarely makes follow up on deliberations made and in most cases things goes on as usual without much improvement in weaknesses noted. Teachers also argued that performance appraisal discourages teamwork because it frequently
focuses on individual achievement and produces a self focus rather than a team focus. Others contended that appraisals are only useful at the extremes-highly effective or highly ineffective teachers and are not useful for the majority of teachers in the middle class schools. Teachers were not satisfied with performance appraisal being conducted only once a year. They argued that an important principle of Performance appraisal is that continual feedback and employee coaching must be a positive daily activity. The annual performance review should simply be a logical extension of the day-to-day supervision process. The push towards teamwork, continuous improvement, learning and the like has caused numerous organizations to rethink their approach to appraisal.

Teachers pointed out that appraisals focus on short term achievements rather than long-term improvement and learning. They are sometimes too subjective or inconsistent or autocratic in that they create a distance between appraiser and appraisee rather than creating a team environment. The schools should therefore modify their performance appraisals to better acknowledge the importance of teamwork, continuous improvement and quality.

5.4. Recommendations

Since many teachers were not happy with the method used, the study recommended alternative methods that could be used. These methods are:-

Regular visits to school by Quality Assurance and Standards Officer. Regular visit to school especially by QASO to check on available facilities and resources. This is because much of the blame is placed on the teachers for failure to perform as per the job description but the system may be the problem.
Classroom observation especially by the head teacher. This ensures that the head teacher gets first hand information on what the teacher does in the main area that appraisal focuses on. This method will help as a way forward in the weakness noted by many as biasness.

Monitoring teacher preparation by head teacher, head of department and head of subject. This involves checking professional documents like schemes of work, lesson plans, records of work, students performance follow up records of work, student's performance follow up records and any other document.

Benchmarking with other teachers in the department teaching the same subject. The head of subject and head of department should check the performance of all the teachers in the departments and make comparison. This helps mostly in ensuring the teamwork is embraced and all teachers are working towards a common goal. It also harmonizes students' performance and syllabus coverage.

Sample essay method which should be used by the head teacher. The head teacher being the immediate supervisor understands the teacher's weaknesses and strengths and is the best placed person to comment about the teacher. The contents of the essay should be discussed with the teacher.

Teachers were also noted to have a negative perception of appraisal process. The study recommended that performance appraisal should meet the following guidelines so that the teachers may view the appraisal process positively:-

1. Performance rating should be job-related, with performance standards developed through job analysis.
2. Employees should be given a written copy of their job standards in advance of appraisals.

3. Managers who conduct the appraisal should be able to observe standards with which to compare employee behavior.

4. Appraisers should be trained to use the appraisal form correctly. They should be instructed in how to apply appraisal standards when making judgments.

5. Appraisals should be discussed openly with teachers and counseling or corrective guidance offered to help poor performers improve their performance.

6. An appeals procedure should be established to enable teachers express disagreement with the appraisal.

5.4.1. Suggestions for further research

1. The study should also be carried out in other districts especially in hardship areas where teachers are not adequate and schools are less developed.

2. A study should be carried out on head teacher’s perception of the performance appraisal since they are the major people who carry out teacher’s appraisal.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Teachers Questionnaire

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I am a student at Kenyatta University undertaking a course in Masters of Education (Education Administration). This questionnaire is meant to obtain confidential information for use by the researcher on teacher’s perception regarding performance appraisal by Q.A.S.O. It will also seek your suggestion on how this process can be improved in order to lead to development of the individual teacher. The information obtained will be treated with a high degree of confidentiality.

The questionnaire consists of three sections. Section A covers the teacher’s background, section B covers the method used by QASO to appraise teachers and also seeks to find out teacher’s feelings about the process used. The third and final section covers teacher’s perception towards the performance appraisal and also the weaknesses of the process and ways of improving the appraisal process.

*Kindly answer all the questions to the best of your ability or tick where appropriate*

**PART A**

Teacher Background

Gender  Male  □  Female  □

Age (in years)  20-25  □  25-30  □  31-40  □  41-50  □  over 50  □

Terms of employment  permanent  □  Contract  □  under BOG  □
Years of experience as a teacher: Less than 5 □  5-10 □  10-15 □  More than 15 □

Which is the category of your school?

National □  County □  District □  Mixed Day □

PART B

1. To what extent are you satisfied with the current method of appraising teachers that focuses on the following attributes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>satisfied</th>
<th>Somehow satisfied</th>
<th>dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment by the reporting officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals for performance improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments by reporting officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation by the head teacher/ teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks and/or recommendation by the countersigning officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What method would you prefer to be used by the following to appraise teachers?

a) QASO...........................................................................................................
Why........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

b) Head teacher................................................................................................................................

Why........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

c) Head of Department................................................................................................................

Why........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

d) Subject Head..............................................................................................................................

Why........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

3. Rank the person you would most prefer to assess you in your performance (rank with 1
highest and 5 lowest)

QASO □

Head teacher □

HOD □

Head of subject □

Student □
4. What should the performance appraisal information be used for (rank in order of importance- 1 most important and 4 least important)

To improve teacher performance
To promote teachers
To identify training needs
To take corrective action

PART C

1. Kindly give your views about staff performance appraisal based on the following:

   KEY: Strongly Disagree (SD) Disagree (D) Agree (A) Strongly Agree (SA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The appraisal process is aimed at helping the teacher develop professionally and it's not a fault seeking exercise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher is adequately prepared for the process well in advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is communicated to the teacher, discussed and agreement reached on the way forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appraiser gives correct information about the teacher without bias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings in the appraisal form reflect teacher’s overall achievements and shortcomings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths noted should be discussed immediately but not piled up awaiting annual appraisal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self assessment should be given more weight than appraisal by QASO when deciding the outcome of performance appraisal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appraiser does not intimidate the teacher by overlooking the strengths and paying more attention to the weaknesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Using the following scale and statements below, indicate how you would rate the appraiser standards (circle the appropriate number at the end of each statement).

1= Unsatisfactory 2= Satisfactory 3= Good 4= Very good

Preparedness for the process  
Mastery of content in teacher’s job description  
Approach towards the appraisal process  
Creating conducive environment for discussion  
Willingness to assist on building on strengths and working on weaknesses noted  
Availability to make follow up on deliberations made

3. Give your opinion on the weaknesses of the process and state a way forward
Appendix 2: Head teachers Questionnaire

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I am a student at Kenyatta University undertaking a course in Masters of Education (Education Administration). This questionnaire is meant to obtain confidential information for use by the researcher on teacher’s perception regarding performance appraisal by Q.A.S.O. It will also seek your suggestion on how this process can be improved in order to lead to development of the individual teacher. The information obtained will be treated with a high degree of confidentiality.

The questionnaire consists of three sections. Section A covers the head teacher’s background, as well as school’s background. Section B covers the method used by QASO to appraise teachers and also seeks to find out teacher’s feelings about the process used. The third and final section covers teacher’s perception towards the performance appraisal and also the weaknesses of the process and ways of improving the appraisal process.

*Kindly answer all the questions to the best of your ability or tick where appropriate*

**PART A**

1. Head teacher Background

   Gender  Male  Female

   Age (in years)  20-25  25-30  31-40  41-50  over 50

   Years of experience as a head teacher: Less than 5  5-10  10-15  More than 15
2. School Background.

Category of your school?

- National [ ]
- County [ ]
- District [ ]
- Mixed Day [ ]

Student population Male ............... Female ...............

No of teachers Male ............... Female ...............

3. Are the teachers in your school adequate and trained to undertake their responsibilities?

PART B

1. What should the performance appraisal information be used for (rank in order of importance- 1 most important and 4 least important)

- To improve teacher performance [ ]
- To promote teachers [ ]
- To identify training needs [ ]
- To take corrective action [ ]
2. To what extent are you satisfied with the current method of appraising teachers that focuses on the following attributes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>satisfied</th>
<th>Somehow satisfied</th>
<th>dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment by the reporting officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals for performance improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments by reporting officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation by the head teacher/teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks and/or recommendation by the countersigning officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How often do you think appraisal should be carried out?

- Every term  
- Every 6 months  
- Annually  
- Any other period (specify and give a reason)
PART C

1. How relevant is teacher’s performance appraisal process to the teacher based on the following:-

**KEY: Always (A) Occasionally (O) Rarely (R) Not at all (N)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers willingly participate in the process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable improvement in teachers performance after appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers take correction positively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are promoted based on appraisal findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are sacked or issued with warning letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The objectives set are achievable as per the job description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process is characterized by misunderstandings and nothing much is achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up is made on deliberations made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers request to be appraised regularly instead of waiting for the appraisal scheduled by the employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give your opinion on the weaknesses of the process and state a way forward

Weaknesses

Way forward
Appendix 3: Q.A.S.O Interview Schedule

Dear sir/ madam

I am a student at Kenyatta University undertaking a course in Masters of Education (Education Administration). This questionnaire is meant to obtain confidential information for use by the researcher on teacher’s perception regarding performance appraisal by Q.A.S.O. It will also seek your suggestion on how this process can be improved in order to lead to development of the individual teacher. The information obtained will be treated with a high degree of confidentiality.

The interview consists of two sections. Section A covers QASO background. Section B covers the considerations put in place by QASO when appraising teachers and also seeks to find out teacher’s feelings about the process used. It also seeks to find out the weaknesses of the process and ways of improving it.

Kindly answer all the questions to the best of your ability or tick where appropriate

PART A

QASO Background

1. How long have you been serving as Quality Assurance Officer?
   - Less than 5 years ☐ 5-10 years ☐ More than 10 years ☐

2. Is there any relevant training offered in order to handle the task of performance appraisal?
   - If yes, please give details
PART B

Process of performance appraisal

1) Approximately how many schools are visited in the division for teachers’ appraisal per year?

2) Which criteria is used to choose the schools to visit for the purpose of teacher appraisal?

3) Are the teachers notified of the process or is it an impromptu exercise? (Give a brief procedure of the process followed)

4) Do you feel there should be a difference in appraisal forms for different categories of schools depending on the facilities and teachers available?

5) How often do you think teachers’ appraisal should be carried out?

6) What is your feeling about the ratings in the appraisal form? (Do they capture teachers all round achievements and weaknesses)

7) Are the teachers coerced to participate especially in discussing their weaknesses?

8) How do the teachers take the feedback given?

9) Is follow-up made on deliberations made during the performance appraisal process?

10) Give your opinion on the weaknesses of the process and state a way forward

Weaknesses

Way forward
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