

An Analysis of Performance Appraisal System in Shurugwi District Day Secondary Schools

E. Gudyanga¹, P. Shumba¹ and N. Wadesango²

¹*Midlands State University, Faculty of Education, Zimbabwe*

²*University of Fort Hare, East London Campus, South Africa*

KEYWORDS Appraisee. Principals. Educators. Bonus. Performance Management. Rural

ABSTRACT The study was designed to find out if there was a clear policy on the execution and implementation of performance appraisal system as well as a clear understanding of the use of the system and its proper implementation by both the appraiser and the appraisee. The study adopted a quantitative research approach. Systematic random sampling was used to come up with schools to be involved. Stratified sampling was also used to come up with the number of teachers and heads respondents. For data collection, questionnaires were used. Frequency table percentages pie chart was used. Results indicated that there is a policy on performance appraisal although it was not written down for all implementers. There is a fair understanding of the performance appraisal implementation and its uses. The study concluded that administrators and teachers did not know the model of performance appraisal. It was recommended that there be more effort by policy –decision makers to ensure that the policy on the performance appraisal system be available to all stations where the system is being used.

INTRODUCTION

History of Appraisal

A lot of educators but more specific the Rhodesia African Teachers' Association (R.A.T.A) had problems with the system of appraisal of educators. The appraisal system by then was user centered as it was a reflection of the different and authoritarian approaches used. The ratings were never shown to the teachers. According to Hersay et al. (1996), other reasons why the old or previous rating scales were not accepted are that they fostered uncertainty and mistrust because the final assessment in terms of a teacher's promo ability depended mainly on one person, usually, the school inspectors. The actual scores recorded were seldom revealed concerning the validation of the evaluation report as a result the teachers felt that their integrity was attacked and they were dehumanized which led to the eroding of their status as professionals. They were prescribed top down approaches which constrained self development collaborative discourse and self reflection. The new approach according to Emerson and Goddard (1993) advocated for teachers to play a central role in defining the principles process and procedures of a new system of evaluation. In

support, Mwangi (2014) recommended that staff development programs for teachers should be undertaken after a careful appraisal of their needs to determine specific discrepancy areas. However, Horne and Pierre (2013) argued that while schools have followed the letter of National Framework, embodied in Regulations, and introduced a system of appraisal broadly in line with its recommendations in terms of the components of the appraisal system, they have not yet followed the spirit of the recommendations in terms of linking appraisal, not only to the needs of the individuals, but also to the needs of the school. They further postulated that appraisal outcomes should lead to clearer identification of development and training needs.

The Purpose of Appraisal of Staff

Some of the reasons why appraisal is carried out include:

- ♦ The provision of valuable information to the individual educator on his/her strengths and weaknesses which will assist the educator to develop further.
- ♦ The system will provide information to the school as a whole which will enable teachers to assist each other and contribute to the school development.
- ♦ The system also provides information to various educators so that they can make sure that teacher development programs are tar-

Address for correspondence:
Prof. N. Wadesango
E-mail: nwadesango@ufh.ac.za

geted to address specific needs. This means that the appraisal instrument will serve as an ongoing needs analysis and ensures that the content of such programme is addressing the identified weakness among educators.

- ♦ Appraisal also helps to regulate and improve the job performance of educators as well as indentifying the potential of teachers for career development with the aim of helping teachers where possible, though, appropriate in-service training. This is done through identifying training needs by exposing inadequacies and deficiencies that could be remedied through training.
- ♦ The system could also be used to determine the placement transfer and promotion or even retrenchment of teachers. It, therefore, means that the system can improve standards and thus better performance.
- ♦ In one way or the other the system helps to promote effective communication in the school through ongoing interaction between teachers and management team.
- ♦ The system can be used to get rid of a system of favoritism and unfair practices as it may be used to link rewards and performance (Bengu 1998; Bartlett 2000; Robins 2007; Castetter 1992).

Kulno (2008) postulated that performance appraisal is a process aimed at determining employee's work results. Rather than just concentrating on the performance results and compensation aspect, it also looks at how to create good work conditions, find competent management teams and develop staff successfully, all of which enables us to guarantee a high level of motivation and work satisfaction amongst staff. In support, Daoanis (2012) believed that annual performance appraisals enable management gauge and monitor whether institutional standards, expectations and objectives and delegation of responsibility and tasks are achieved. Further, staff appraisals also establish individual training needs and enable organizations to identify training needs analysis and planning.

Requirements Necessary to Meet the Aims of Development Appraisal

According to Nigro and Nigro (1994), the following are the conditions:

- (A) Democratic organization climate- a democratic organizational climate implies that

the education leader must adopt a bottom up management approach instead of a top down approach. The teachers must have the opportunity to air their views and take part in the management of the school. If that happens they will feel part of the school and will be more inclined to follow instructions and take part in development appraisal.

- (B) Culture of learning at institutions- according to UNICEF (1994) it is a known fact that in some schools a culture of learning does not exist. Teachers come and go as they like do not prepare lessons or control written work have no ethics in maintaining a certain academic standard and have no respect for authority figures such as the school head. In such an environment development appraisal is almost impossible.
- (C) Commitment of educators to education-if teachers are not committed to development they will not improve which will not be conducive to the teaching and learning process.
- (D) Teachers have to stay abreast in their specific fields of specialization to make valuable contribution to the education of the children. A lack of commitment among teachers leads to stagnation, not just regarding their own development but also the development of our children and the country as a whole.
- (E) Openness and trust- the professional development of teachers to enhance the teaching and learning process will not be possible if there is no openness and trust among the staff members' management team representatives or other advisors who will be part of the appraisal. There should be no hidden agendas and the integrity of all taking part in development appraisal should not be in question. Only then is a certain amount of objective appraisal possible.

In addition to the above broad requirements relevant academic and management staff should always be involved in the process of appraisal. It is important that all educators be informed of the different aspects of appraisal process so that they know what to do to realize their educational objectives and develop them.

According to Machingambi et al. (2013), the immediate feedback in an oral and written format

to those who are being appraised should be one of the cornerstones of appraisal. The appraisee should have access to the assessment report and the right to respond to it. Again, the instrument used for formal appraisals should have appropriate criteria to measure the nature and the value and level of work performed. The assessment should be balanced and accountable, therefore, the opportunity for the moderation of results especially for the purpose of appeals and service awards should be provided for. It could be concluded that the whole process of appraisal should be open and transparent. In essence, the appraisal of educators is development approach which depends on continuous support. It is designed and intended to entrench strengths develop potential and eliminate weaknesses (Sallis 2002; Machingambi et al. 2013).

General Problems Related to Staff Development and Appraisal

According to Odden and Bannerjee (1997), there are problems caused by the system of appraisal as follows:

The appraisal system can be poorly designed which causes operational problems. This implies that the criteria used for appraisal are poorly constructed or vague or that it looks good on study but difficult to implement. The appraisal system may also lose its value if its criteria are based on activities rather than on output results or on personality characteristics rather on performance.

Problems can be caused by the evaluators or appraiser if the evaluators or appraisers do not implement the appraisal system or instruments properly due to lack of training it can cause numerous problems of which the following are examples:

Lack of Objectivity: It has been noted by Frase (1992) that the appraisal of professional staff like teachers has always been criticized because of lack of objectivity. The measuring instruments and the persons who implement them are seen as subjective, because quality is appraised by persons with different perceptions.

Clarity of Appraised Standards: The evaluator or appraiser must have the same interpretation of words when people are appraised. If the concepts are not clearly defined subjective appraisal is increased because words like good adequate excellent can be interpreted differently.

The Halo Effect: This happens when an evaluator bases his/her appraisal on an overall impression which can be positive or negative. If for instance an appraiser believes that a teacher who is always late has no respect for authority he/she will be subjectively inclined to appraise other teachers who arrive late at school negatively as well.

Appraisal Based on Insufficient Information: An objective appraisal is not possible if sufficient information is not available. If for instance a teacher is appraised without considering the results of the questionnaire completed by the learners he/she might be appraised on one two outstanding incidents. This may cause a teacher to be rated high or lower than he/she really deserves.

The Central Tendency Error: Evaluators tend to avoid high and low appraisals and opt for the average on a scale because extreme low or high ratings must normally be explained or strictness or leniency errors- appraiser can be too strict or too lenient in the appraisal of staff members. This normally happens if an appraiser judges or appraises other staff members according to his/her own values and norms.

Influence of the Job: It sometimes happens that staff members are evaluated according to the position they hold. A deputy head of a school will for instance get a higher rating than a level one teacher who is in a lower position. This implies that the position instead of the work performance is evaluated.

Difference among Evaluators: An appraiser's values and norms can play a role when he/she appraises other staff members. If the same person appraises several other teachers the results will be more or less acceptable.

Professional Capacities of Evaluators: The appraisal panels of the development appraisal system must have close contact with classroom practice the latest teaching and assessment methods outcomes based education so as to be able to evaluate a teacher properly (Sibanda et al. 2011; Wadesango et al. 2013)

Weaknesses of Performance Appraisals

According to Sergiovanni and Starrat (1981), there are eight weaknesses in performance appraisals. These are as follows: Very often appraisals tend to focus on the person rather than expected behavior; appraisal tools that are in

use usually lack validity; the rater more often than not tends to be biased and influenced by the organization; the results are mainly used to assist individuals; appraisals are often unjust when used for salary increases promotions and dismissals; where appraisals focus on outputs there are often problems of accurate measurement; it has been noted in some research work that appraisers are often influenced by halo effect stereotyping and sometimes over emphasize the negative aspects and finally inconsistencies often arise with some of the appraisers being too lenient while others tend to be too strict.

Types of Performance Appraisal

Generally, there are two types, namely informal and formal appraisals. In informal appraisal we have trait oriented result oriented and process oriented appraisal types (Sergiovanni and Starrat 1981).

Trait Oriented Performance Appraisal: Here appraisals focus on personal qualities of the appraisee. A number of assumptions about the appraiser's performance are based on the individual's traits for example a confident employee could be seen as an effective employee. Other qualities that can influence the appraiser could include leadership skill: cooperativeness, boastfulness, eagerness and humility.

Result Oriented Performance Appraisals: Appraisals in this category focus on outputs by the appraisee. In other words the end justifies the means.

Job Behavior Oriented or Process Oriented Performance Appraisal: This type is concerned with how an individual goes about his/her work. It considers such questions as what does an effective performer do, and how does he/she do it. In other words, the process determines the quality of the final product.

Models and Strategies of Performance Appraisals

According to Spangenberg (1994) there are five major models of appraisal these are:

Common Law Model: This model relies heavily on the use of rating scales to evaluate teacher characteristics. The common law stresses high supervisor involvement and focuses more on summative evaluation and standardized criteria.

It relies heavily on comparing appraisals and tends to use the same procedures for all appraisals.

Goal-setting Models: This consists of six interrelated and independent phases. It emphasizes performance targets and there is provision for appraisee self-evaluation. Both appraiser and appraisee have to set performance targets and hold meetings periodically to monitor progress towards performance goals.

Product Models: Such models emphasize results or outcomes. There is focus on results of test change in pupil's behavior, growth in skills, the knowledge of subject content or tests attitudes.

Clinical Supervision Model: Unlike other models which fail to win supervisee sympathy and cooperation this model stresses collegiality between appraisee and appraiser. It also emphasizes supervision more than evaluation. Its major disadvantage lies in trying to portray a rosy picture of life. Life generally is not all about support; it's not rosy but conflict ridden.

Artistic Model: Such models are influenced by the view that teaching has unpredictability. It is an art. In fact a lot that happens is intuitive. A lot depends on being sensitive and perceptive to minute details that occur during the teaching act. This calls for appreciation of what happens in a lesson.

In conclusion, it is important to note that an effective appraisal system depends upon a number of contingencies. An effective appraiser has to determine the appropriate mix in a given environment or circumstances. No model is self-sufficient but rather a mix of models. It has been noted that some effective models are preferred because they have been long established. In this respect, changing people and encouraging them to adopt a different model has to be done cautiously.

Appraisal Strategies

According to David et al. (1981), use of strategies enhance chances of coming up with a solution. They outline five of these strategies as follows:

Use of Job Description: In order to appraise properly it is necessary to study job descriptions in order to identify and agree on standard performance. It may be necessary to set the time scale and expected levels of competence.

Use of Committees: At times it is important to use a group which identifies a list of critical attributes or outcomes against which appraisee

have to be appraised. Where someone is appointed by one person it is necessary for the committee to cross- validate to ensure the appraisee is dealt with fairly. On the other hand, while group appraisals may be considered more impartial teams may not necessarily have adequate knowledge on certain jobs whereby the job holders may be the subject experts.

In-depth Interviews: These require jobholders to indicate parts of the job that take up most of their time or occur most frequently. Common elements are then isolated to identify the range of activities and elements involved. Effective employees should possess a minimum of skills to perform a range of those activities.

Critical Incident Technique: This calls for the need for a sample of employees to identify the most difficult problems they once dealt with. They specify what happened and with what consequences. Criteria for success are converted into checklist which is then used when appraising employees.

Document Analysis: This method depends upon examining reports and other documents to determine the effectiveness of the appraisee. One could inspect the teachers' plan books, record books, action plans or inspection reports.

METHODOLOGY

The survey research design was adopted in this study. It must be noted that the survey design was chosen from among many other designs that could have been used. This design was chosen since it was found to be relatively simple and convenient to conduct if one considers the limited financial, human and time resources available to researchers. The survey design used was the descriptive survey. Borg and Gall (1989) pointed out that descriptive research is concerned with the production of statistical information on educational aspects that interest policymakers and educators. The major instrument used to collect data was the self-administered questionnaire. Shurugwi District has a total of 25 rural day secondary schools. It was in these schools that the sample for this study was extracted. First through systematic random sampling names of the 25 schools were written on small pieces of paper and then numbered one to 25. The small pieces of paper were put in a small chalk box and picked at random. A deci-

sion was made to make all the odd numbers part of the sample. Secondly, the actual size of the respondents was obtained by stratified sampling as shown below:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total number of school heads} &= \frac{13 \times 100}{25} \\ &= 52\% \\ \text{Total number of heads participating} &= 0.52 \times \text{No of teachers} \\ &= 0.52 \times 375 \\ &= 195 \text{ questionnaires} \end{aligned}$$

Data Analysis

The responses given from each school were grouped and exposed to a number of statistical analyses. The responses with greater emphasis came on their own and those with least on their own. Different statistical packages were used to try and prove the initial answers brought out by another package.

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

In this section of the study, the sub-problems were outlined against the findings. Again, it is the findings which will give an answer to the posed problem. Using statistical data the raw scores were subjected to closer analysis to give us a clear picture of the responses. Having subjected the data to statistical analysis interpretation was then made at the end of this section.

Sub-problem 1: Is there a clear policy on the performance appraisal system?

The compiled data on whether or not there existed a clear cut policy on the appraisal system was categorized as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Presence or absence of a policy on performance appraisal system

Category of respondents	Positive responses	Negative responses
Heads teachers	514	68
Total	14	14

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total respondents} &= 33 \\ \text{Positive respondents as a percentage} &= \frac{19 \times 100}{33} \\ &= 57.6\% \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Negative respondents as a percentage} = \frac{14 \times 100}{33} = 42.4\%$$

Table 1 displayed that 57.6% of the respondents confirmed that there were policies on performance appraisal systems in their schools whilst 42.4 refuted it.

Sub-problem 2: *Is the instrument clearly understood by appraisers and appraisees?*

An investigation was carried out to collect data on whether the appraisers and appraisees understood clearly the instrument used in the performance appraisal systems. The findings are tabled in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2: Understanding of the instruments by appraisers

Category of respondents	Positive responses	Negative responses
Heads	17	16
Total respondents	= 33	
Percentages not understanding the instruments	$\frac{16 \times 100}{33} = 48.5\%$	
Percentage understanding the instruments	$\frac{17 \times 100}{33} = 51.5\%$	

It emerged that 48.5% of the heads did not understand clearly the performance appraisal instrument according to Table 2 and only 51.5% understood the instrument.

Table 3: Understanding of the instruments by the appraisees

Category of respondents	Positive responses	Negative responses
Heads	13	6
Teachers	14	8
Percentage of the teachers not understanding the instrument:	$\frac{8 \times 100}{22} = 36.4\%$	

Table 4: Computation of Pearson's correlation co-efficiency on the understanding/ not understanding of appraisal forms

Questions	Positive responses	Rank order	Negative responses	Rank order	D2
4	14	1	6	2	1
6	8	3	15	1	2
8	13	2	4	3	1
10	6	4	3	4	0D ² =4

$$\text{Percentage of the teachers understanding the instrument:} = \frac{14 \times 100}{22} = 63.6\%$$

Table 3 indicates that 63.6% of teachers understood the performance appraisal instrument whilst 36.4 % did not understand the instrument.

Data triangulation on whether the difference in understanding the performance appraisal forms used was carried out by way of computing a correlation co-efficient to establish the significance of such differences.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Computation of Pearson's correlation co-efficient} \quad R &= 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{N(N^2 - 1)} \\ &= 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{4(16-1)} \\ &= 1 - \frac{24}{60} \\ &= 3/5 \\ &= 0.6 \end{aligned}$$

The computation of Pearson's correlation co-efficient according to Table 4 resulted in 0.6.

Sub-problem 3: *Are ethical considerations respected in implementing the system?*

The other area investigated was on the issue of ethics during the implementation of the appraisal system. The responses obtained were tabulated as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Ethical considerations during the implementation of performance appraisal system

Poorly considered (score)	Averagely considered (score)	Excellently considered (scores)
25	15	45

Table 5 shows that 25% of the respondents indicated that ethical issues were poorly considered during the implementation of performance appraisal system. 15% indicated that issues of ethics were averagely considered while only 45% of the respondents agreed that issues of ethics were considered.

Sub- problem 4: *Are the appraiser and the appraisees aware of performance appraisal models?*

In an effort to establish whether or not users of performance appraisal system had knowledge of the theoretical framework of the system the respondents were investigated on their awareness of appraisal systems models. The tabulated data in Table 6 indicate findings:

Table 6: Knowledge of the performance appraisal's models

Category	Positive responses	Negative responses
Heads Teachers	24	820

Table 6 indicates that 28 respondents did not have adequate knowledge of the performance appraisals models which are supposed to be used, while only 6 confirmed knowledge of the performance appraisals models.

Triangulation of data on failure to understand the instrument and not being aware of models was done. This was done through investigating by inspection of the variance/ spread of these two variables to establish their impact on the implementation and their influence on the final appraisees.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Variance} &= \frac{\sum (x-x)^2}{N} \\ &= \frac{46.08}{4} \\ &= 11.5 \end{aligned}$$

Table 7: Comparison of variance

Question	Frequency	Mean	X-X	(X- X)2
	14	10.3	3.7	13.69
	8	10.3	-2.3	5.29
	13	10.3	27	7.298
	6	10.3	4.7	20.21
				$\Sigma(X - X)^2 = 46.48$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Variance} &= \frac{\sum(d-d)^2}{n} \\ &= \frac{46.48}{4} \\ &= 11.6 \end{aligned}$$

According to Table 7 the mean spread for not understanding the instrument was 10.3. The spread variance of 11.6 indicates a deviation from the mean by 11.6- 10.3 = 1.3. The variance is small and therefore insignificant to influence effective implementation of the performance ap-

praisal system. It could be inferred that lack of knowledge on the models has minimum drawbacks effects on the implementation of the appraisal system.

Despite this statistical treatment of this problem, it was generally found out that 20% of teachers compared to 80% did not have knowledge of performance appraisal models and that 25% of school heads knew the models compared 75% who did not have the conceptual framework of the system.

Sub-problem 5: What are the common uses of the outcomes of the performance appraisal system.

An investigation into the uses to which outcomes of performance appraisal systems are put was also carried out. Tabulated in Table 8 were responses on the various uses.

Table 8: Common uses of performance appraisal system

Bonus	Promotion	Staff development	dis-charge
7	12	21	1

Table 8 shows that the common uses of performance appraisal systems are as follows: Bonus=6. Promotion=12. Staff Development=21 and Discharge=1

Sub-problem 6: Are the uses justified?

To make a judgment on whether the uses to which outcomes were put were justified, as cross triangulation of data from other sub-problems had to be done.

Uses of Outcomes Justified

Understanding of performance appraisal systems at 63.3%

Conflict level at 60%

Training of appraisers at 57.5%

Ethical considerations at 28.3%

Sub-problem 7: Are the appraisers and appraisees adequately trained before implementation?

To obtain data on the background training for appraisers and appraisees an investigation was carried out. Findings were tabulated in Table 9.

Table 9: Training background of appraisers and appraisees

Categories	Trained	Untrained
Headteachers	710	313

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Total heads who responded} &= 10 \\
 \text{Percentage of trained heads} &= \frac{7 \times 100}{10} = 70\% \\
 \text{Percentage of untrained heads} &= \frac{3 \times 100}{10} = 30\% \\
 \text{Total number of teacher who responded} &= 23 \\
 &= \frac{13 \times 100}{23} = 45\% \\
 \text{Percentage of untrained teachers} &= \frac{13 \times 100}{23} = 55\%
 \end{aligned}$$

Table 9 indicates that 45 % of the heads were not trained to implement this system and in the same vein 55% of the teachers were also not trained

Also glued to the training backgrounds of the stakeholders was the variable of the systems' applicability to the education scenario. Responses obtained were tabulated as in Table 10.

Table 10: Level of the systems applicability

<i>Poorly applied</i>	<i>Fairly applied</i>	<i>Very suitable</i>
10	13	6

It is clear from Table 10 that poorly trained level of the system applicability scored 10, fairly applied scored 13 and very suitable scored 6

Attached to the concept of applicability were the levels of conflict generated by the implementation of performance appraisal system. Research findings were tabulated in Table 11.

Table 11: Levels of conflict due to the application of the performance appraisal system

<i>Very thin</i>	<i>wide</i>	<i>Very wide</i>	<i>No conflicts</i>
220%	1=10%	4=40%	3=30%

It emerged that 20% thought the level of conflict was thin, 10% said wide, 40% said very wide while 30% said there were no conflicts at all.

DISCUSSION

It has come up clear that there is a policy on performance appraisal system as 57.6% of responses acknowledged the existence of the policy as compared to 42.4% on the negative side. The stage reached so far confirms the assertion by Castetter (1992) that performance appraisal

has been in use for a very long time but has changed modes with the passage of time. It seems much more is to be done for both appraisers and appraisees to understand the appraisal forms. Those who did not understand the form were 48.5% as compared to those who understood the forms who were 51.5%. However, further analysis proved that the difference between those who understood and those who did not was not very great to influence the implementation of the program. Performance appraisal is potentially a key tool for organizations to make the most of their human resources and the use of appraisal is widespread (Prowse and Prowse 2009). According to Hacket (1989), a system has to be guided by a set of value which guides the conduct of members. The appraisal system is to promote a climate that promotes the dignity of both the appraiser and the appraisee. In addition, Kulno (2008) asserted that performance appraisal activities enable us to determine whether the employees' performance is in accordance with the established objectives. Three key functions of higher educational institutions are teaching, research and advising. The challenge to the universities is to produce employees who meet the requirements of employers. The data obtained showed clearly that ethical considerations were being taken care of as most respondents confirmed that ethical considerations were being respected.

The questionnaire which was designed to find out whether the implementers are aware of the models being used at face value it may seem clear that a number of implementers do not know the models being used, however, further subsection of the data to statistical analysis proved that the variance is insignificant to bring about any outstanding differences in the implementation of the performance appraisal. The questionnaire which sought the uses of performance appraisal results had mixed reaction, however the maximum number of respondents settled on staff development as the main purpose of performance appraisal system. In order to justify the uses a cross triangulation of data from other sub-problems was done which showed that conflict level is high at 60% while understanding of performance appraisal forms was set at 63.3% that of training of appraisal was at 57.5% and the ethical considerations was low at 28.3%, therefore, staff development becomes the main purpose of performance appraisal. It is impor-

tant for staff to be well versed with the rationale behind performance appraisals as alluded to by Price (2013) "Annual appraisals are part of performance management and are designed to motivate, develop and support employees in performing their roles to the highest possible standard. They provide an opportunity for constructive discussion of performance, identification of areas for development and agreement of approaches by which employees needs could be met" Mwangu (2014) concurs with Price as he asserted that staff appraisal should be used for identification of training needs of teachers for the purposes of staff development programs. Further, appraisal reports should be used for rewards, sanctions, and deployment of teachers

CONCLUSION

The research findings indicated that much is to be done in the Zimbabwean schools if performance appraisals system has to pay dividends. There is a need to make an available to all implementation strategies are left to be the responsibility of each station head of department. Further, despite the above shortcomings, there appeared a positive future for the performance appraisal system in Zimbabwean school, since the focus is now on who does what and at what time. Given enough time, the performance appraisal system has room to improve the handling of the school curriculum by both teachers and administrators.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of a comprehensive analysis and interpretation of the research findings on this study, the following recommendations were made that:

- ♦ There be more effect by policy makers to ensure that the policy on the performance appraisal system be available in all stations where the systems is being implemented to ensure a more comprehensive understanding of the systems implementation. This recommendation stems from the fact that research findings did reveal that 42.4% of the respondents in this study were not aware of the existence of such a policy.
- ♦ Nora seminars at school level are held on the performance appraisal forms as an assessment tool and or that this appraisal

system be part of the teacher- training curriculum at college so graduate. This has been revealed by the different levels of understanding of the instrument displayed in this study.

- ♦ A flatter assessment structure at all levels be adopted in which assessment of organizational member are not rated by the head of department only. Decentralized implementation of the systems recues conflicts and increase transparency in which more aspects of ethical considerations will be catered for.
- ♦ To improve organizational efficiency and proficiency it is recommended that results of the systems be used for developing the staff whose verso training needs will have been identified through the systems.
- ♦ If rating has to have financial implications more comprehensive form be used which does not only dwell on the quantitative analysis of the accomplished key result are. For instance, the fact that one given and marked twenty tests or exercises give one side of the story. The systems should be able to spell out the length of the test or excises conditions under which these were given the quality of making and the relevance of such tests to the learners goals the need the of the society.

REFERENCES

- Bartlett S 2000. The development of teacher appraisal: A recent history. *British Journal of Education Studies*, 3(48): 24-37.
- Borg WR, Gall MD 1989. *Educational Research*. New York: Longman.
- Castetter W 1992. *The Personnel Function in Educational Administration*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Daoanis LE 2012. Performance appraisal system. *International Journal of Economics and Management Sciences*, 2(3): 55-62.
- Emerson C, Goddard I 1993. *Managing Staff in Schools*. Melbourne: Heinemann.
- Frase L 1992. *Teacher Compensation and Motivation*. Lancaster: Technomic Publishers.
- Hacket P 1989. *Success in Personnel Management*. London: John Murray Publishers.
- Hersay P, Blanchard KH, Johnson DE 1996. *Managing of Organisational Behaviour*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Horne H, Pierce A 2013. A Practical Guide to Staff Development and Appraisal in Schools. From <<http://books.google.co.za/books?hl=en and lr=fvo>> (Retrieved on 12 November 2014).

- Kulno T 2008. Performance appraisal and the compensation of academic staff in the University of Tartu. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 3(1): 40-54.
- Machingambi S, Maphosa C, Ndofirepi A, Mutekwe E, Wadesango N 2013. Perceived challenges of implementing the performance management system in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 35(3): 263-271.
- Mwangu SJ 2014. *The Role of Teacher Appraisal in Staff Development in Kenya: A Case of Secondary Schools in North Nandi District*. Kenya: Moi University.
- Nigro LG, Nigro FA 1994. *The New Public Personnel Administration*. Ittasa: Peacock Publishers.
- Odden A, Bannerjee AM 1997. *Pay Teachers For What They Know and Do*. London: Sage Publishers
- Price B 2013. *Preparing for Your Annual Staff Appraisal*. Milton: The Open University.
- Prowse P, Prowse J 2009. The dilemma of performance appraisal. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 13(4): 69-77.
- Robins SP 2007. *Organizational Behaviour: Global and Southern African Perspectives*. Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa.
- Sallis E 2002. *Total Quality Management in Education*. London: Kegan Paul.
- Sergiovanni T, Starrat R 1981. *Supervision: A Redefinition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sibanda J, Mutopa S, Maphosa C 2011. Teachers' perceptions of lesson observations by school heads in Zimbabwean Primary Schools. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 28(1): 21-28.
- Spangenberg H 1994. *Understanding and Implementing Performance Management*. New York: Wyven Publications.
- UNICEF 1994. *Performance Appraisal*. Harare: Ministry of Education.
- Wadesango N, Nduna D, Kurebwa M 2013. An investigation into teachers' attitudes towards performance management in schools. *The Anthropologist*, 15(2): 157-165.