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THE ABSTRACT

The research study was undertaken to examine the effects of the Performance Appraisal system on Science Teachers’ execution of duty in Cluster ‘A’ schools of the Chivi South Education District of Masvingo Province in Zimbabwe. The population comprised all 14 secondary schools in the cluster, 130 science teachers and 14 school-heads. Purposive sampling of science teachers was done after which stratified random sampling was done to come up with a relatively smaller sample. Six schools, 5 teachers per school and the 6 school heads were selected to participate in this research study. School-heads were included because they were directly responsible for the implementation and supervision of the performance appraisals in schools. Questionnaires for school heads and teachers, focus group discussions and direct observations were used to collect data within a Descriptive Survey research design. The data was analysed through Chi-square statistical determinations for the quantitative data while narratives were used for the qualitative data. Data collected revealed that; both school heads and teachers lacked adequate training and commitment to the performance appraisal system. The system was seen by some as manipulating workers without rewarding them. The research findings show that some school-heads and teachers had mixed feelings regarding the system in terms of whether it assisted in improving service delivery or not. Some teachers said that the system put much more pressure on them since they were already overwhelmed by paperwork. However, the public examination results collected from the study area were analysed and showed that, to some extent the use of performance appraisals had been improving learners’ results, although in some cases the improvements were insignificant. The findings show that there were also too many factors leading to improved learner outcomes, both learner and teacher based. However, there were no monetary rewards to motivate teachers to perform better but the performance appraisal system had been useful to the teachers who were due for promotions. There was need to provide enough funds for training in performance appraisal and for rewarding better performance. The study finally revealed some areas of further study to determine if the performance appraisal tool could be modified to suit the heterogeneous nature of schools, that colleges of education could study to see if performance management should be included in their curriculum and there is need to explore teachers’ experiences of the performance appraisal implementation on a much larger scale.
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1.1. INTRODUCTION

Laundy, Zedeck and Cleveland (1983) cited in Alvi, Surani and Hiran (2013) assert that performance appraisals have been conducted since the times of Aristotle. The earliest formal performance appraisal programmes originated in the United States of America’s army shortly after the US got independence from Britain.

In the case of Zimbabwe the performance appraisal system can be traced back to the Great Munhumutapa era of civilisations with the construction of Great Zimbabwe monuments and other smaller monuments dotted around the country. This evidence gives a viable performance appraisal system that existed.

1.2. HISTORY OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEMS IN ZIMBABWE

Performance appraisal systems in Zimbabwe are not a new practice. They were there even before independence. Traces of performance appraisal can be seen in ED57, ED58 and ED94 which sought to supervise teacher performance through inspections. Inspection teams would come to schools from the district, provincial or head office. Their major goal was to fault find teachers’ weaknesses. After identifying the weaknesses, the inspectors would then go back to their offices and produce reports of supervision at a later date. Basure (2006:2) said that:

> before the introduction of the modern appraisals (Key Result Areas) supervision of teachers was largely through inspection. In inspection the inspectors had the prerogative to invade schools and inspect teachers and then at a later date write a report. The contents of the reports were never discussed, so there was no feedback to improve quality of delivery.

The Public Service Commission Circular No. 7 (2002;3) states that the performance appraisal system should be implemented according to plan without fail. The appraisal system was designed to control and monitor the performance of public servants, teachers included.

The 1989 Presidential Public Services Review Commission had these as its findings, low productivity, lack of targets and lack of standards as problems affecting the Public Service. To this end, the commission wanted to get ways and methods of redressing such anomalies so that there is improved service delivery. Hence in 1995, the Public Service Commission introduced the performance appraisal system as a reform programme to improve service delivery in the civil service sector.
It was more open in style. Thus, it was a rating tool that required teachers to be rated on the basis of their key result areas was prepared. This rating tool was further revised by the SIDA funded project of 1998 on performance appraisal. The Public Service Bulletin Volume 2 of (1998) cited by Gomba (2005:05) says that,

the major thrust of the vision of reform focused on promotion and implementation of greater efficiency, effectiveness and service delivery to the public. It goes further to say that, it was highlighted that in the process of implementing the reforms, efficient management systems were paramount.

This appears to have driven the government into appointing District Inspectors throughout the country to help civil servants perform to government expectations.

Schools and all other government departments were made to produce Mission Statements and Clients’ Charters to guide them perform to expectations. So civil servants are expected to strive to work within the mission statements’ requirements for efficient service delivery (Gomba, 2005:07).

The performance appraisal system was to link remuneration to performance. The then secretary to the public service commission, Masoka (1998:11) in Public Service Newsletter says that,

the aim of the new system is to create a servant that is result-oriented and responsive to the needs of the public.

Thus the appraisal system was geared to develop a modern, efficient and effective civil service. But how has the appraisal system gone towards developing teachers who are efficient, effective and responsive to the needs of the learners and the communities they are serving?

What needed to be answered are such questions on whether teachers’ performance appraisal system is able to improve teachers’ and learners’ performance and make teachers meet the respective subject requirements. Gone are the yesteryears of the once popular ED57, ED58, and ED94 forms that were used as monitoring and evaluation tools because the present performance appraisal system allowed teachers to choose their own goals.

It was the teacher who chose his/ her own targets and discussed the modalities with the supervisor. This went a long way in assuring the teacher that what he/ she wanted to achieve was his/ her own goal. Thus the system left the employer and the employee in agreement.

(Gomba, 2005:12).
The issue that needed to be investigated was whether teachers were accepting the instrument or were just using it because it had come in as government policy and that it was not suitable in the school system? The appraisal system was not a monster, it was a tool that encouraged better communication and understanding of work expectations between the subordinates and their supervisors. Having such a scenario, it was seen fit to carry out a study on analysing the effects of the performance appraisal system on science teachers’ execution of classroom duties in cluster ‘A’ schools in Chivi South Education District, Masvingo.

1.3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Since independence in 1980, the Zimbabwean government has been introducing various forms of performance appraisal systems to enhance service delivery in the public sector including schools. The performance appraisal system became a matter of policy, that is, no longer debatable by the implementers; the civil servants. Not much research has been conducted regarding the implementation and supervision of the policy in schools, in particular. Theoretical and practical frameworks to guide the implementation and supervision of the performance appraisal system had been lacking. The effectiveness of the performance appraisal system had been debated by many teachers, but little is known about the system’s true impact on science teachers’ execution of their classroom duties. It had been generally assumed that the system did not improve service delivery. It has also been assumed that the implementation of the system in the service sector was problematic and far from being practical as services could not be easily quantifiable. It is against this background that the current research study sought to investigate and analyse the effects of the performance appraisal system on science teachers’ execution of classroom duties in order to dispute or confirm the above matter.

1.4. AIMS OF THE STUDY

The study aimed to determine the effects of the performance appraisal system on science teachers’ execution of classroom duties.

1.5. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The major purpose of the study was to analyse the effects of the performance appraisal system on science teachers’ execution of classroom duties with special reference to examining the rationale for the conducting of performance appraisal system in education, finding out if the appraisals had been making teachers work harder, establishing the
The study also sought to find out the problems that came about in the conducting of the appraisals and investigating the methods of improving the appraisal system.

**1.6. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The study specifically sought to;

1. Establish science teachers’ and school-heads’ attitude towards the performance appraisal system.
2. Evaluate the effects of the performance appraisals on science teachers’ execution of classroom duties.
3. Gather and present evidence to show if better results were being produced.
4. Establish the challenges associated with the performance appraisals implementation process.
5. Investigate methods of improving the whole appraisal system process.

**1.7. RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The following research questions were addressed;

1. What are science teachers’ and school-heads’ attitudes towards the performance appraisal system?
2. How do science teachers’ execution of classroom duties affected by the performance appraisal system?
3. Is there evidence to show that better results are being produced as a result of the performance appraisal?
4. What are some of the challenges associated with the administration of performance appraisals on science teachers?
5. What should be done to improve the whole process of the performance appraisal system administration?

**1.8. ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY**

Assumptions that led the researcher to embark on this study are hinged on the belief that;

1. Implementation of the performance appraisals could have been affecting science teachers negatively.
2. School heads and teachers had mixed feelings towards the performance appraisal system.

3. There was enough evidence in schools which showed learners’ outcomes after using the appraisal system.

4. There were bound to be problems associated with the administration of the performance appraisals on science teacher performance.

1.9. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study might be considered important in that;

It might assist science teachers to understand the dictates and technicalities of the performance appraisal system, thereby improving teacher performance in schools. It might foster on the importance of setting own targets at one’s work place. It might bring out the strengths and limitations of the appraisal system as it had been implemented in schools. The findings were seen to be of importance for the Chivi District Education office in order to understand the dynamics and challenges of the appraisal processes. The study was also deemed to contribute knowledge to the field of staff appraisals.

1.10. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study faced some limitations due to the effects of generalisation, sample size and unwillingness to co-operate.

1.10.1. Generalisation

The study was carried out in six clusters ‘A’ secondary schools in Chivi South Education District. Because of the smaller sample size, the findings might not be generalised to all Education Districts of Zimbabwe.

1.10.2. Sample size

The sample which was used, as compared to the population was smaller due to time and financial constraints. As a result the findings might not auger well with other scholars.

1.10.3. Unwillingness to co-operate

The researcher encountered the problem of some teachers who failed to answer all sections of the questionnaire, that is, some left some blank spaces.
1.11. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was confined to six secondary schools in Chivi South Education District. It excluded all the other schools in Chivi District and other Districts and Provinces of Zimbabwe where performance appraisals were conducted. The reason for the choice of this area was that the researcher was working in Chivi South Education District; hence it was be convenient and cost effective to conduct the research in the area than anywhere else.

1.12. DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Effectiveness

Putting much effort in one’s work in order to produce better or outstanding results.

Performance Management

Directing and supporting subordinates to work as effectively as possible in line with the needs of the department, the school and the responsible ministry. It aims to align individual goals to the goals of the department, the school and the responsible ministry. Performance management also aims to manage performance against agreed objectives and accountabilities.

Triangulation

Seeking convergence and corroboration of results from different methods and designs studying the same phenomenon. The research issue is observed from at least two different points. Thus cross checking of data using different multiple data sources or using two or more data collection methods.

Complementarity

Seeking elaboration and clarification of results from one method with results from the other method.

ED57: is a supervision instrument.

ED97: is a supervision instrument.

Supervisors: include heads of department and school heads.

Subordinates: teachers.
Science Teachers:

Educators who teach one or two of the following curriculum subjects; Integrated Science, Biology, Physical Science, Chemistry, Geography, physics and Mathematics.

1.13. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

P.A – Performance Appraisal

P.M – Performance Management

KRAs- Key Result Areas

PED – Provincial Education Director

DEO- District Education Officer

HOD – Head of Department

PTA – Parents Teachers Association

BUSE – Bindura University of Science Education

ESAP- Economic Structural Adjustment Programme

1.14 SUMMARY

The foregoing chapter presented the background to the study, statement of the problem, aims of the study, objectives of the study, purpose of the study and the assumptions of the study. In addition, the chapter also highlighted the delimitations of the study and limitations of the study. The subsequent chapter reviewed literature related to the study
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2. 1. INTRODUCTION

The chapter basically looked at related literature from books, journals, theses (unpublished or published) and internet that shed light on the concept performance appraisal with a view to establishing its effectiveness on science teacher performance. The chapter unfolded by having a global view of the performance appraisals scaling down to Zimbabwe’s science teachers.

2. 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Since performance appraisal is a monitoring and evaluation tool of the subordinates by the supervisors, the Motivation Theory, from theories of human management, employed by the researcher in investigating the effects of the performance appraisal system on science teachers’ execution of classroom duties in Chivi South Education District.

McGregor’s Motivation theory X and Y

This is a motivation theory presented in the 1960s by the psychologist, McGregor. Here, motivation is viewed as the drive that workers have for work. Simpson and Farquharson (2010) say that McGregor identified two distinct management approaches to the workforce and he called these theory X and theory Y. Theory X managers view their workers as lazy, disliking work and unprepared to accept responsibility, needing to be controlled and made to work. Gwandure and Matanda (2002) say that workers in this category must be motivated by external incentives and they need control to keep them in line. Supervisors with this view are likely to adopt an autocratic style of leadership. On the other hand, supervisors who hold Theory Y believe that workers enjoy work and that they find it as natural as rest or play. They are prepared to accept responsibility, are creative and they are ready to take an active part in contributing to ideas and solutions to work-related problems. Gwandure et al (2002) say that workers who belong to this theory are intrinsically motivated to perform their duties with little or no supervision and that these workers are proud to identify themselves with the company and supervisors trust the workers.

The general view of this theory is that employees behave in a particular way as a result of the supervisors’ or managers’ attitudes towards them. For instance, if the school-head believes that the teachers behave in a Theory X way, there will be control, close supervision and no
delegation of authority. The teachers, as a result will not enjoy their work and they may try as much as possible to avoid the work. The exact opposite could be the case for teachers who behave in a theory Y style. This research study tried to find out whether there were teachers who were intrinsically driven to perform their duties in order to achieve set targets.

2.3. THE TERM ‘PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL’

Bruce (2003) defines performance appraisal as a process whereby an individual’s performance is reviewed against previously agreed goals and where new goals are agreed on, that will develop the individual and improve performance over the forthcoming review period. Alvi, Surani and Hiran (2013) see performance appraisal as a structured and formal interaction between a subordinate and a supervisor that usually takes form of a periodic interview in which the work performance of the subordinate is examined and discussed with a view to identify strengths and weaknesses as well as opportunities for improvement and skills development.

Drawing from the above definitions performance appraisal can therefore be understood as a process that seeks to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of organisational members through a collaborative approach in decision-making, execution of tasks and evaluation of operational strategies and procedures. It is an activity between a supervisor and an employee.

2.4. TYPES OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEMS

2.4.1. Job behaviour/Process-oriented Performance Appraisal System

According to Madziyire (2000) this type of appraisal is concerned with how an individual goes about his or her work. Questions to answer include; what does an effective performer do? How does he or she do his or her work? Thus a good performer is distinguished from a poor performer by looking at the way he or she does his or her work. For example, an employee who displays his or her work neatly may be rated highly on the basis of this attribute.

2.4.2. Trait-oriented performance appraisal system

This type of performance appraisal focuses on personal qualities of the appraisee (Madziyire 2000). Thus, employees who display confidence may be rated highly. They are regarded as affective on the basis of the positive qualities that they display to the supervisor.
2. 4. 3. Results-Oriented Performance Appraisal

Madziyire (2000) says that appraisals in this category focus on outputs by the appraisee, that is, the processes are not looked into. What this means is that a teacher whose students score highly in both internal and public, examinations is rated highly on the basis of the students’ performance. Similarly, teachers whose students perform poorly in internal and public examinations are rated lowly.

The modern performance appraisal system falls under this category of this performance appraisal system, that is, it is results-oriented.

2.5. EXPERIENCES FROM OTHER COUNTRIES

The modern approach to performance appraisal, that is, the results-oriented, had now been adopted by many countries as a proven and acceptable approach for improved public service accountability, efficiency and effectiveness.

2.5.1. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN UK, CANADA AND NEW ZEALAND

Performance management is seen by Armstrong (2006) as a continuous, much wide, more natural process of performance appraisal that clarifies mutual expectations, emphasises the supportive role of managers who are expected to act as coaches rather than judges and focus on the future. Thus supervisors play a leading role of guiding the subordinates to work towards the attainment of individual and organisation’s goals.

According to Australian Council for Research document 0310, performance management is mandated by the central governments to improve performance of teachers and the schools in UK, Canada and New Zealand. The central focus of performance management was professional development for the improvement of practice. Thus performance management is both retrospective and prospective, that is, reviewing past performance with a view to improve that performance and planning for the future respectively.

The school heads had been delegated the responsibility to carry out the performance management processes. There had been improvement in training programmes for teachers who were found wanting in New Zealand and UK schools, performance management ratings were linked to salaries. Better performers had been rewarded more than average performers. So these countries’ performance appraisal results had been used to train and develop teachers and to reward better performers.
2.5.2. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT IN AUSTRALIA


Performance management was closely linked to school developmental goals. Thus the key results areas (KRAs) were derived from the school’s development plans. Teachers were actively involved in the design of the performance programmes. Teachers were at liberty to choose five key Result Areas for the one calendar year, three priority areas were dictated by the school, one priority area was dictated by the respective school departments and one individual professional goal. These all summed up to five goals. There were five meetings between the school head and the teacher through-out the course of the year. One at goal-setting, three review meetings and the final one being a summative session. Teacher feedback was valued and followed up. In Victorian state schools teachers who perform well had been awarded annual salary increments and promotions to senior teacher positions. Independent schools offered bonuses to high performers. This resulted in improved student results.

According to the same Educational Research document the Cowan University in Western Australia conducted a survey of 3500 teachers in 2007 on their views about performance management. The survey came up with the observations that there was a high level teacher engagement and the view of the way it was working showed that the process is accepted by teachers. It also showed that 78% of teachers surveyed believe that performance management process allows them to demonstrate their progress with identified outcomes.

The above advantages of using performance management are upheld by Mackay (2002) cited in Madhekeni (2012:123);

Australia, as one of the pioneers of results-based management had some advantages of using this approach, viz; a strong human, institutional and management capacity sector; a public sector known for integrity, honesty and professionalism, well-developed budgetary and accounting systems, a tradition of accountability and transparency.

2.5.3. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN GHANA

Adofo (2011:36) gives the following objectives of the performance appraisal system in the Ghana’s education system;
Identifying employee strengths and weaknesses, potentials and training needs through performance appraisal feedback. Correction of work deficiencies, employee motivation through pay raises and promotions. Linking employee activities with educational department’s strategic goals.

Supervisors, that is, school heads informed the teachers about their progress, discussed what areas they needed to develop and identify developmental plans. When it came to the implementation of the appraisal system, the school heads were not involved in the development of the appraisal system which they were delegated to conduct in their schools. This accounted for low levels of commitment in its conduct.

Most school heads normally came for reviews without prior noticing the teachers of the impending exercise. This hampered commitment as some teachers saw the exercise as a punitive exercise rather than corrective exercise. The same author went on to say that:

Due to financial constraints the performance appraisal system has been seen useful only by teachers who are due for promotions, as there are no monetary rewards [Ibid].

This made senior teachers who were due for promotions work harder than expected. On the other side, junior teachers who were not satisfied by the appraisal system worked below normal effort- thus leading to low commitment by some teachers. These teachers were tempted to work only to meet the minimum job requirements.

2.5.4. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN TANZANIA

In Tanzania the appraisal system came by the year 2000 after the government launched the Public Service Reform Programme. The first phase involved performance management systems in all government departments. According to Bana (2009) in implementing the performance management system the Open Performance Review and Appraisal (OPRAS) was introduced in 2004. The same author goes on to describe the OPRAS system;

It is open, formal and a systematic procedure designed to assist employers in planning, managing, evaluating and realising performance improvement in the service with the aim of achieving organisational goals.

The objectives of OPRAS hinge on evaluative effects thus, work output; - measures achievements by an employee in a given year with the main emphasis on quantity, quality and use of resources. Attribute of good performance. Improve performance feedback, rewards- (i) salary progression, that is, salary increment. (ii) Non- salary rewards- bonus and non- financial rewards to outstanding performance.

(Bana, 2004:13, OPRS Guidelines)
The duties of the supervisors (Bana 2009) are thus, coaching, mentoring and, counseling of subordinates, ensuring objectives are set within the context of developmental plans, ensuring resource/ inputs availability for carrying out the objectives, involving employees in review processes and completing end of year assessments for all subordinates. The same author goes on to spell out the employee benefits as; the workers were motivated to perform effectively, employees were informed of skill gaps and measures for improvement and employees knew what was expected of them.

2.5.5. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN SOUTH AFRICA

During the apartheid era, there was no proper performance appraisal system in black South African schools. The demise of apartheid saw the ushering in of the Integrated Quality Management Systems (IQMS), the performance appraisal system which was introduced as a framework for radical changes in education. This appraisal system was introduced as a framework for radical charges in education. This appraisal system was introduced in 2005.

The student achievement were unsatisfactory, so the performance appraisal and teacher evaluation system was seen critical to improve teaching- learning in schools (Portfolio Committee Report, 2006). The main aim of the IQMS was for professional growth towards common goals and supports a learning community in which teachers were encouraged to improve and share insight in the profession (Mpungose and Ngwenya, 2014). The objectives of the IQMS were to;

- Bring quality teaching and learning,
- Measuring and reward good or excellent performance, that is, performance pay bonus or move up the next level of the pay scale.
- Enable school Principals to improve working conditions and programmes.

(Mpungose and Ngwenya, 2014:76)

Mpungose, et al (2014) however, say that the implementation of the IQMS performance appraisal system has never been completed in schools because there has been no proper consultation during its formulation and no proper training of school principals and teachers before implementation. So school principals lacked co-ordination, trust and clarity due to poor training. This led to hostility, negativity and resistance by teachers. The same authors went on to cite unprofessional behaviours, as most teachers wanted high scores, as high
scores were linked to pay. The appraisal reviews and summative sessions were normally done once a year, so teachers wanted to perform best during the approach of the appraisal session.

In many educational provinces the implementation of the IQMS by school principals had been poor and slow resulting to poor performance by teachers and unsatisfactory learner achievement. To counter these, Khumalo (2008) cited in Mpungose et al (2014) says that the most appropriate and effective performance appraisal system is that which ensures the democratic involvement and participation of relevant individuals in the development process.

2.5.6. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN ZIMBABWE

Performance Appraisal systems have been in use in Zimbabwe’s civil service since the 1980’s with ED57, ED58 and ED94 and the 1990’s saw the introduction of the improved performance appraisal system [with use of Key Result Areas (KRAs)]. These changes in the appraisal systems were a result of the general public’s complaints about poor service delivery by civil servants.

(Gomba, 2005:05)

The same author said that unlike the ED57, ED58 and ED94, the new performance appraisal system gave the subordinates freedom to choose his or her five Key Result Areas, from a given pool, to work on during the course of year. The employee would then sit down with the supervisor to discuss the areas and agree on work plans. This approach involved formulating and agreeing with the supervisor on objects.

These performance appraisal systems had some flaws since they had been in use in Zimbabwe; it lacked the aspect of cost in terms of time and resources, planning and monitoring and evaluation as cited by (Madhekeni, 2012). As a result, the Zimbabwean government introduced the results-oriented approach to performance appraisal system in 2005 to improve public sector accountability, efficiency and effectiveness. The new performance appraisal system, that is, the results-based management system is seen by Emmant (2006) as the management approach that focused on timely achievement of set objectives through planning implementation, monitoring and reporting. The same author goes on to qualify this system as a life cycle approach to performance management that integrates the people, strategy, resources, processes and management to improve decision making and accountability. The new performance appraisal system focused on timely achievement of objectives. It measured the teacher against the following;


Quantitative measure; how much of what are going to be achieved, quality; quality standards are normally prescribed, timeliness, time taken to achieve a task and cost, how much does it cost to get the desired output/desired results.

(Zvavahera 2013:04)

This new approach to performance appraisal system was implemented in 2012 by all government ministries. It was adopted because it covers the following critical areas;

Planning- done collectively with all parties concerned. Result Based Budgeting- looks at financial aspects. Personnel Performance System- evaluates the actual performance of all members against set targets. Monitoring and evaluation- is continuous and looks at the performance off all the above aspects.

(Madhkeni, 2012:122)

2.6. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL CRITERIA OFTEN USED BY SUPERVISORS

Supervisors made use of inputs (lesson preparation) interventions (lesson presentation and learner activities) in order to realise better student outcomes. The ICRC Handbook on RBM (2008) sees inputs as human efforts put towards achievement of results, interventions are done in order to achieve the expected goals. Heysek, Roos and Middlewood (2005) say that performance management revolves around inputs and outputs and the related remuneration.

Madhekeni (2012) says that the results-based management appraisal approach which was now in use in Zimbabwe measured the teacher against the following:

- Quantity measure: how much of what is going to be achieved.
- Quality: quality standards are normally prescribed.
- Timeliness: time taken to achieve a task.
- Cost: How much it costs to get the output/desired results.

Bana (2009) sees performance appraisal as hinges on the following evaluative effects:

Work Output: measures achievements by an employee in a given year with the main emphasis on quantity, quality and use of resources.

Attributes of good performance.

Improve performance.

Feedback.

Rewards.
2.7. TRAINING/ORIENTATION OF SCHOOL-HEADS TO CONDUCT PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS

Heystek et al (2005, quoted in Machingambi, 2013) say that the success of performance appraisal is predicted on a number of factors, one of them being the level of staff training on performance appraisal and whether schools and clusters conduct staff development workshops on performance appraisals. The same author went on to say that performance management among teachers in Mali revealed that training was at the core of success of most performance management programmes.

Monyatsi, Tudies and Kampera (2006) cited in ICRC Handbook (2008) cite lack of pre-service and in-service training on performance management by teachers as a major obstacle to the effectiveness of the teachers’ performance appraisal system in Botswana. Mpungose and Ngwenya (2004) uphold that there was no proper training of principals before implementation of the performance appraisal systems and as a result some principals lack coordination, trust and clarity. The same authors went on say that this had led to a lot of hostility, negativity and resistance by teachers. In South African schools this had resulted in slow and poor implementation of the performance appraisal system.

Nir (2005) carried out a research in twenty-eight Israeli schools where school-based management system was introduced in 1992. To make sure that the system worked, the school-heads received one year training in school-based performance management. The Israeli schools gained greater control and autonomy over their budgets, education goals and processes, curriculum and personnel evaluation.

2.8. PERFORMANCE REVIEWS ON TEACHERS

In Australian schools there were five meetings between the school-head and the teacher throughout the course of the year; one at goal setting, three review meetings and the final one being a summative session (acer.edu.au/news/0310). According to Adofo (2011) the school-heads held three review sessions with individual teachers during which they discussed needy areas and identify developmental plans. Bana (2011) says that the supervisor’s duty is to coach, mentor and counsel subordinates in review processes. In such cases, workers are motivated to perform effectively as they are informed of skill gaps and measures for improvement. In Zimbabwe’s schools, three review sessions per teacher per year were held.
(Gomba 2005) during which the employee sat down with the supervisor to discuss the areas that needed attention.

2.9. SETTING OF KEY RESULT AREAS FOR TEACHERS

In Australian schools (acer.edu.au/enews/0310.Retrieved 15 July 2015) the Key Result Areas were derived from the individual schools’ developmental plans. Teachers were asked to work on five KRAs for one calendar year. Three KRAs were dictated by the school, one dictated by the respective school departments and the teacher had one individual professional goal. In Ghana (Adofo, 2011) the Key Result Areas came from the country’s Education Department; The Ghana Education Service.

According to Bana (2009) the Tanzanian government’s open Performance Review and Appraisal System (OPRAS) came up with a wide range of work plans from which employees in the public service departments chose their KRAs. The OPRAS guidelines guided employers and employees in planning, managing and evaluating performance with the aim of meeting organisational goals.

Gomba (2005) says that the performance appraisal system gave the subordinates freedom to choose his or her five KRAs from a given pool, to work on during the course of the year. He went on to say that the employee would then sit down with the supervisor to discuss areas and agree on work plans; thus formulating and agreeing with the supervisor on objectives. Jan, Israr, Haq, Tariq and Jehangir (2014) assert that it is the management system that sets the expectations for teachers’ performance and motivates teachers through feedback to work hard in order to meet organisational goals.

2.10. THE PERSON(S) WHO APPRAISE THE TEACHERS

In UK, Canada, New Zealand and Australia (acer.edu.au/enews/0310) the school- heads have been delegated the responsibility to appraise the teachers. Teachers found wanting received in-service training to improve performance. The school-heads were also delegated to conduct performance appraisals in their schools (Adofo 2011, Bana 2009, Mpungose and Ngwenya 2014 and Madheleni 2012).

2.11. PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON SCIENCE TEACHERS’ EXECUTION OF CLASSROOM DUTIES
Nir (2005) says that the use of school-based management has been making the Israeli government heavily sponsoring schools in form of grants to purchase teaching and learning materials. This has resulted in an increased workload and amount of paperwork that teachers must process. This meant that teachers have been made to increase their efforts—thus better learner results were bound to be realised.

Armstrong (2006) asserts that through performance appraisals teachers themselves can monitor progressive change as they work, that is, looking at whether and how they are making a difference to the situation. In this way, they continue with assurance or corrective action as needed. Jan et al (2014) are of the view that through performance appraisal everyone would know the expectations of the organisation and teachers’ performance would be tightly related to schools’ performances. Alvi, Surani and Hirani (2013) say that when done properly, performance evaluation provides important feedback to employees. The feedback should be developmental rather than judgmental and in this case teachers would strive to improve performance.

According to (acer.edu.au/enews/0310), in Australia’s Victorian state schools, performance appraisal helped teachers to improve performance in order to be awarded annual salary increments and/or promotions to senior teacher positions while some independent schools offered bonuses to better performers. This resulted in a high level teacher engagement and acceptance of the performance appraisal system. This is upheld by Mgijima (2014) when he says that constructive feedback increases commitment and motivation among the appraised because it makes them feel like valuable members of the organisation.

In Sciences, children learn by guided discovery through manipulation of tools/materials. Heystek et al (2005) cited in Machingambi (2014) note that time factor was very critical in performance management. They went on to say that the core-business of teachers in schools was teaching and given the time-consuming nature of performance appraisals, teachers hardly had ample time to participate in the appraisal process. Nir (2000) asserts that the performance appraisal threw a larger workload as teachers had to process large amounts of paperwork.

However, the developing countries had no enough financial resources to award performance-related pay increments. So the better performers were only promoted to the next senior grades in Ghana (Adofo 2011), Tanzania (Bana 2009), South Africa (Mpungose et al 2014) and Zimbabwe (Madhekeni 2012). This had made senior teachers who were due for promotions
work harder and junior teachers who were not yet due for promotions work below normal effort (Adofo 2011).

2.12. SCHOOL-HEADS BIAS ISSUES WHEN RATING TEACHERS

Erbasi, Arat and Pekci (2010) say that some supervisors tend to keep giving the same appraisal results each and every year. If one does well they will continue to do well and if one does poorly they will continue to perform poorly. They went on to say that in such cases, no matter how hard a teacher strives, their past appraisal records will prejudice their future attempts to improve. Alvi et al (2013) support that the Mathew Effect tends to make employees keeps receiving the same appraisal results year in year out.

Erbasi et al (2010) went on to say that some supervisors tend to use the position of the individual to be appraised, that is, higher points for individuals working at higher positions and lower points for those on lower positions within the same organisation. Alvi et al(2013) uphold this when they said that in-groupers enjoy a high degree of trust and if they perform poorly supervisors tend to overlook the failures while an out-grouper’s good performance is rarely recognised.

Mashavira and Chidoko (2013) assert that most supervisors avoid extreme scores of 1 and 5 when rating subordinates as they give average points for the performance of most employees, these supervisors do not trust their ability to make a judgment as they avoid reactions. Nir (2005) says that some supervisors tend to focus much on the employees’ recent performance than on earlier events, thus leading to inaccurate and unfair assessments of the employees, instead of keeping track of the teachers’ performance at regular intervals throughout the year.

2.13. SCIENCE TEACHERS’ SCHOOL-HEADS’ ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE AND PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

According to Buchner (2007) in Zvavahera (2013), most employees had a negative feeling about performance management; employees felt that the system manipulates employees without rewarding their efforts. Mavhiki et al (2013) also observe this saying that there were mixed feelings on the appraisal system in the negative and positive by stakeholders with those who resented the appraisal system labeling it as an ‘animal’ particularly those at lower organisational levels. They went on to say that this feeling might have been caused by the complexity of the system and also by the fact that the performance appraisal systems had been imposed by the West. Jazyky (2004) researched on performance appraisal systems and
revealed that some workers saw the performance appraisal systems as evil and useless as they never improved performance, but done to document poor performance- a step in the firing process. He went on to say that the best performance appraisal was one that is done every day.

Mosage and Pilane (2014) say that most teachers displayed a negative attitude towards the performance appraisal system when they were implementing it at first time. They went on to say that, in some South African schools, some teachers sometimes became personal in expressing their negative attitudes; often they subjected supervisors to verbal abuse. Some teachers saw it as a form of slavery, and as witch-hunting processes. As a result, some teachers reacted by not submitting their records, not attending meetings and not carrying out the work agreed upon in their personal growth plans.

If the supervisor does not talk to the staff during the year and he/she ‘saves up’ everything messed up, the employee rated might feel uncomfortable when he/she saw the mistakes made during the year (Jazyky, 2004). He went on to say that; if feedback is provided, commitment to improve performance would be enhanced. During performance review sessions destructive criticism which is vague, ill-informed or harshly presented could lead to problems such as anger, resentment and/or work conflict. It has been common everywhere that if performance is rated as less than average or less than best, the supervisor could be viewed as punitive and this normally resulted in disagreements and could create a conflict ridden situation that could fester for months.

Most teachers attributed the poverty they were under to such foreign-driven policies; these included ESAP, hence viewing the performance appraisal system in the same negative light (Mavhiki et al, 2013). They went on to say that there had not been performance related pay rises or bonuses in Zimbabwe, thus the policy-makers did not pay attention to the demands of the appraisal system, as a result, employees were adhering to the’ business as usual’ approach to work.

Pazvakavambwa and Steyn (2014) say that the supervisor might not be fully acquainted with the performance appraisal system and therefore failed to value its usefulness. Mpungose et al (2014) uphold that the Integrated Quality Management in South African schools, had never been completed because there had been no proper consultation during its formulation and no proper training of principals and teachers and this had made them see the appraisals as just formalities.
Mosage et al (2014) note that during performance review sessions, individual recognition could lead to higher job satisfaction and reduce absenteeism and turnover rates. Jazyky (2004) supports this view saying that employees felt more satisfied with their appraisal results if they had a chance to talk freely and discuss their performance.

Some sections of the civil service in Zimbabwe welcomed the results-oriented appraisal system, as it was said to promote transparency, accountability, demonstration of results and fairness in performance measurement resulting in employees seeing it as a good management system compared to previous management systems (Mavhiki et al 2013).

2.14. PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM AND IMPROVEMENT OF ‘O’ AND ‘A’ LEVEL RESULTS

Jan et al (2014) say that the performance appraisal system should integrate with other characteristics that would go toward enhancing the outputs of an organisation. They went on to say that the performance management should help schools to ensure that teachers are working hard to contribute to achieving the school’s mission and objectives. Some of these said outputs and objectives are learners’ results at the end of each learning cycle.

Madhekeni (2012) views the results-based management as it focused on tangible results to be delivered from usage of limited resources available in organizations. Nir (2005) carried out a research study in twenty eight Israeli schools and found out that teachers put more emphasis on learner’s outputs and the school-heads carried out intensive monitoring and assessments of teachers. The same author went on to say that the Israeli government had been heavily sponsoring schools in form of grants to purchase teaching-learning materials; hence better learners’ outputs were bound to improve.

According to (acer.edu.au/enews/3010), one of the main objectives of the performance management in Australia was to improve learning outcomes of students. As a result teachers who performed well were awarded annual salary increments and/or promotions to senior teacher positions. This improved teacher performance was seen to improve student results as well.

Mpungose et al (2014) argue that one of the main objectives of the performance appraisal system in South Africa was to bring quality teaching and learning in schools. This quality learning-teaching would result in improved learner outputs. The Portfolio Committee Report on education of 2006 quoted by Mpungose et al (2014) cited unsatisfactory student
achievements and declared that performance appraisal and teacher evaluation system was critical to improve teaching-learning in schools.

Zvavahera (2013) sees the ‘results’ of a given programme as the main focus of the performance appraisal system, not the processes and these results can only be realised if there is employee motivation and retention. The author went on to say that there was need to improve communication between the supervisor and the workers so that ownership of the programme is inculcated in the employees so as to improve service delivery.

2.15. USE OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL RESULTS

Alvi et al (2013) say that performance appraisal results can be used either directly or indirectly to help determine reward outcomes. Griffin (1992) in Nir (2000) concurs with the above view as he says that in many organizations performance appraisal results are linked to remuneration, that is, better performing employees get pay increases, bonuses, promotions, while poor performers might get some counseling or in extreme cases, demotion or dismissal. The author went on to say that appraisals helped supervisors to do a better coaching job, that is, motivate employees by providing feedback data for management decisions such as incentives, training, transfers or dismissals.

According to (acer.edu.au/enews/3010), performance appraisal results in UK, New Zealand and Australia were used to reward better performers and to train and develop needy teachers. In Ghana, (Adofo, 2011), the results were intended to be used to identify employee training needs, employee motivation through pay rises and promotions. In Tanzania, (Bana, 2009), the appraisal results were to be used to analyse the quality of employee outputs and to reward outstanding workers through salary increments and bonuses. The same applied to South Africa (Mgijima, 2014) and Zimbabwe (Gomba, 2005).

Jan et al (2014) say that performance appraisal data can be used to monitor the organisation’s recruitment and induction practices, for example, how well are the employees performing who were hired in the past year, past two years and so on. The same author says that the performance appraisal data could also be used to monitor the effectiveness of changes in recruitment strategies.

2.16. OBJECTIVITY OF THE APPRAISAL PROCESS AND FAIRNESS OF APPRAISAL REPORTS
In Australian schools (acer.edu.au/enews/3010) the individual teacher sat down with the school-head at goal setting, at three review meetings and the final one being a summative session and teacher feed was valued and followed.

Jan et al (2014) say that if individual employees are evaluated objectively, performance appraisal provides them with recognition for their work efforts, that is, performance appraisal indicates to an employee that the organisation is genuinely interested in their performance. Akers (2000) advises employees on objectivity and fairness of the appraisals telling them to establish ongoing quarterly evaluation processes so that workers get feedback on how well they are meeting the expectations and that the feedback must not be limited to formal assessments. Nir (2000) says that objectivity of the performance appraisal processes can be compromised when a supervisor writes a good performance report for the in-grouper because he likes him/her and a nasty report to an out-grouper because he/she dislikes the teacher.

Mavhiki, Nyamwanza and Dhoro (2013) say that the failures by the employers to come up with clear performance indicators or criteria have proved problematic in performance appraisals. For instance, using learners’ pass rates only as performance measures for teachers’ work was seen to be unfair as learners’ results are affected by several variables. Erbasi et al (2010) support this when they say that some supervisors use only one performance indicator or criterion when rating subordinates and this normally results in conflicts as some employees are not happy with the appraisal report.

Mpungose et al (2014) say that in some South African schools there have been cases of unprofessional behaviour as some teachers wanted high scores and they tended to confront the principals to revisit the performance appraisal reports and revise them. The author went on to say that in some provinces, school principals were incompetent in the conducting of the performance appraisals and this made them carry out only one review session and make reports that did not match the employees’ performance.

2.17. CHALLENGES ASSOCIATED WITH THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS ON SCIENCE TEACHERS’ PERFORMANCE

The system was introduced from the top to the bottom without consulting important stakeholders on the ground, that is, school-heads and teachers and lack of consultation resulted in the perspective that the system is ‘theirs’, not ‘ours’ (Gomba, 2005). The same author went on to say that because of this, teachers dreaded the system and this went a long
way in denting their performance in the classrooms and this had been affecting learners’ performance as well. Machingambi (2013) concurs that the imposition of the system by the government had undesirable effect in that there was no ownership of the system by those who were supposed to implement it, namely school-heads and teachers. Adofo (2011) also notes that when it came to implementation of the appraisal system, the school-heads were not involved in the development of the appraisal system which they were delegated to conduct in their schools.

Pazvakavambwa and Steyn (2014) uphold that supervisors might not be fully acquainted with the system and therefore fail to value its usefulness. According to Heystek et al (2005) cited in Machingambi (2013) the performance appraisal system was inherited from business and industry where performance could be linked to monetary compensation. The same authors went on to say that in education, unlike in business and industry, it was not always possible to link performance appraisal to financial rewards as doing so might discourage staff from participating in the process. Thus, it was more difficult to determine what constituted high standards in a school than it might be in business and industry.

In business, performance management revolves around the issues of inputs and output and the related remuneration, while in education, it is very difficult to compare inputs and outputs as these differ within a school and from school to school (Gerber, Nel and Van Dyke, 1998, quoted in Machingambi, 2013: 03).

Armstrong (1997) says that some terms used were too academic in appearance and vague in meaning and therefore hard to interpret, for example, ‘resources, inputs, outputs, outcomes, impact and impact assessment’. The terms, in practice meant different for different organizations. Gwata (2013) says that training workshops were held but not enough was done to train the workers in lower ranks, that is, the users, hence supervisors might be rigid when rating teachers and this might cause conflicts She went on to say that the performance appraisal tool used was complex, that is, it was long and cumbersome and its complexity was that there were no improvements on the form to continuously transform it to a responsive instrument that reflected the changing environment.

Mpungose et al (2014) say that the integrated quality management system in South African schools had never been completed because there had been no consultation during its formulation and no proper training of principals and teachers before implementation. Machingambi (2013) concurs that most teachers were not trained on performance management; serve for a few teachers who received a once-off training, thus lack of training
in performance management gave an impression that there was no shared understanding amongst teachers on how they should relate to the performance management system.

A study by Musingafi (2007) revealed that the appraisal system did not consider environmental forces; it was uniform for the whole of Zimbabwe. He went on to say that management approaches should be matched to their environmental forces, as simple imposition could lead to problems/failure.

Shortage of resources had negatively affected performance appraisal implementation, that is, vast resources were needed if performance appraisal implementation was to be successful according to Mavhiki, Nyamwanza and Dhoró (2013). Newcomer and Wright (1997) in Gwata (2013) also revealed that there were no provisions of resources (funds) to ensure effective implementation. Resources needed include computers, laboratory apparatus and materials. Mavhiki, et al (2013) say that in developing countries the funding had been done through donor agencies in partnerships with local governments and the donor funds had since been used up.

Siddique (2010) in Mavhiki et al (2013) notes that experiences of governments such as Canada, Malaysia and Thailand showed that changing the culture of public servants had been difficult in order to accommodate the performance appraisal philosophy. This view was upheld by Madhekeni (2012) saying that Zimbabwe’s civil service culture had been described as ‘business as usual’ where the workers were not moved by any sense of urgency, neither were they willing to change their way of operation to suit the new system. Gwata (2013) concurs with Madhekeni (2012) as she also reveals that the ‘business as usual’ culture was still in people.

A study by Mashavira et al (2013) revealed that most supervisors did not discuss the section on training needs with their subordinates, this section was usually treated as a mere formality and no follow-ups were done on the part of supervisors to meet the training needs of employees.

Lack of commitment by supervisors was cited by Gwata (2013) as another challenge in implementing the appraisal system. The author said that there was no sitting down with subordinates to set goals, and there were no performance reviews held during the performance year. Pazvakavambwa et al (2014) also say that there was lack of monitoring and moderation by the ministry officials.
In developed countries, to enable the smooth implementation of the performance appraisal system, incentives were introduced in terms of performance related pay (Siddique, 2010) and performance bonuses (Marie et al., 2006, cited in Mavhiki 2013). The government of Zimbabwe cannot afford to set aside financial resources for incentives (Mavhiki et al. 2013).

Some argued that the performance appraisal system in Zimbabwe was not serving its purpose as civil servants’ salary was far below industry market rate (Musingafi, 2007) leading to lack of commitment. The above author went on to note that there was resistance and sabotage by older experienced workers when young men/women got substantive posts ahead of the experienced, non-graduate personnel; the older experience teachers were not happy and they contributed to weaken the appraisal system.

In Ghana, Adofo (2011) notes that due to financial constraints, the government had been failing to award good performance through pay rises; the performance appraisal system had been also useful only to teachers who were due for promotions. This had been making senior teachers, who were due for promotions to work harder and on the other side junior teachers worked below normal effort.

2.18. RATING OF SCHOOLS ON THE BASIS OF PERFORMANCE IN PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS

The rating of schools onto top one hundred’s national list and top ten’s provincial list after ZIMSEC ‘O’ and ‘A’ Level results had been done year in year out. There is no literature yet to affirm or dispute the ranking of schools.

2.19. EVIDENCE TO SHOW WHETHER BETTER RESULTS WERE BEING PRODUCED

*The evidence was presented in chapter 3

2.20. SUGGESTIONS ON IMPROVEMENT OF THE WHOLE PROCESS OF PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL ADMINISTRATION

To policy-makers, that is, the public service, Mashavira et al (2013) encourage them to respond to appraisals immediately as this could keep the process achieve its intended purpose. They went on saying that supervisors should be subjected to more training workshops which focus on how reviews, ratings and training needs identification should be
done. Musingafi (2007:11) also encourages the Public Service Commission to ensure that all members were continuously trained in performance management. He went on to say that;

*Such training should not be haphazard, but should be a well- planned and implemented formal training programme. Members should be trained in performance management at least once every year, especially at the beginning of the year when they come up with performance targets. The Public Service Commission should abide by the dictates of the performance management for it to be taken seriously.*

*Ibid: 11*

A study by Zvavahera (2013) also reveals that thorough training and workshops at all levels of employees was critical so that the performance appraisal system could be understood and appreciated by the employees. He also encouraged the employers to adhere to the tenets of the performance appraisal system as this could go a long way in addressing some of performance issues raised by employees. So the study sought to discover if training is needed for all teachers.

Akers (2000:123) says that the employers should share their company’s vision with employees (need for transparency). The author continued saying that;

*Teachers should have a clear picture of your mission and vision; the expectations you help them set will make sense to them. They will be more likely to buy into and achieve the intended outcomes.*

Gwata (2013:44) advises the employers to go back to basics and ask themselves the following;

*What is it that we want to achieve? What is the expected result? What is the benefit of this whole results-based management?*

A study by Mavhiki et al (2013) recommended the government to mobilise resources to make implementation of the appraisal system fruitful. That is, resources needed to train supervisors, teachers and to avail incentives to the poorly paid teachers to instill motivation, as performance-related rewards could be useful in changing attitudes of teachers towards work. To this end, the study wanted to find out if there was dire need to provide financial resources for training, learning materials and incentives.

To policy- implementers, that is, Provincial Education Directors (PEDs), District Education Officers (DEOs) and School heads(Mashavira et al 2013:09) say that the performance
appraisal should be carried out in line with policy. They go on advise these policy implementers that;

Bias on ratings tends to frustrate outstanding performance if they are bunched together with underperformance. Training needs identification; being the ultimate to the appraisal process, need to be taken seriously in training workshops to bridge the gap between actual and desired performance among the appraisees.

The cumbersome and complexity form, the appraisal tool/ form should be simplified in order to facilitate understanding as well as making the system more user- friendly (Mavhiki et al 2013, Gwata, 2013). Mavhiki et al (2013) suggest that this could be done through further pilot testing of the appraisal form to enable codification of the form to suit the various categories in the public sector. It needed to be tailor- made to suit various departments and job categories as opposed to the current one- size fit all category- based form.

Akers (2004:130) encouraged supervisors to give both formal and ‘real time’ feedback often. He went on to say that;

Establish ongoing (recommended quarterly) evaluation process so people can get feedback on how well they are meeting the expectations- but feedback must not be limited to formal assessments. Tell staff in ‘real time’ what they are doing wrong/ right so they can correct it.

SUMMARY

This chapter looked at literature related to the study. However there had been a limited number of studies on performance appraisal that specifically dealt with effectiveness of the performance appraisal on science teaching- learning. Therefore to fill this research gap, the research study was conducted to contribute to the current literature by linking performance appraisals to effectiveness in science teaching- learning.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. INTRODUCTION

Chapter three focused on research methodology. Research paradigm, research design, population, sampling and sample, data collection tools and data analysis procedures were highlighted in this chapter.

3.2. RESEARCH PARADIGM

Mixed Methods research design, according to Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) is where the quantitative and qualitative research techniques are combined in a single study. The same authors see the approach as the third research paradigm. It aims to draw strengths and minimise the weaknesses of both the quantitative and qualitative techniques in a single research study. It also attempts to make use of many approaches in answering research questions.

In this study the data was collected using different strategies. Thus the use of many approaches in answering research questions rejects dogmatism. It is an expansive and creative form of research. The main reason for using this paradigm was for triangulation and complementarity.

3.3. RESEARCH DESIGN

A research design is a frame of work used as a guide in collecting and analysing data. Best and Khan (2007) say that there are three basic types of research designs which are explanatory, descriptive and causal. The same authors go on to say that, the method of research which concerns itself with the present phenomena in terms of conditions, practices, beliefs, process, relationships or trends is what is termed the descriptive survey study which was used in this study. According to Shastri (2008) a descriptive survey design, which is also known as statistical research, describes data and characteristics about population of phenomena being studied. Its name suggests the description of events and situations which appeared in relation to the analysis of the effects of the performance appraisal system on science teachers.
A survey was used because it would allow the acquisition of information from many people about their opinions, attitudes and/or previous experiences in order to generalise the findings as noted by Jackson (2009). Thus the above explanations show that this type of research design fitted well with the demands of the study which sought to solicit information about the effects of the performance appraisal system on science teachers’ execution of classroom duties. However, the drawback of having a sample with the same distribution of characters as the population could have affected this study in a way since there could be room for misunderstanding and misinterpretation of questions by the respondents.

In this study, these inadequacies of the descriptive survey design were controlled by triangulation of designs. The selected design was also quite useful in this study because it assisted in unveiling the past trends of the performance appraisal system and enabled the comparison of the past and the present ways of conducting the performance appraisals.

3.4. TARGET POPULATION, SAMPLING STRATEGIES AND THE SAMPLE

According to Best and Khan (2007) a population is any group of individuals who have one or more characteristics in common that are of interest to the researcher. In this study a population could be said to be a collection of all science teachers in the study area, that is, in Chivi South Education District. Chivi South Education District had fourteen secondary schools, about a hundred and sixty Science Teachers and fourteen School-heads. The target population comprised male and female Science Teachers and the School-heads.

The sample of individuals from the target population who participated in the study was selected as recommended by Fraenkel and Wallen (2006) so that it could represent the entire population under study. In this study the researcher purposively sampled teachers and school-heads from the six schools on the basis of their science teaching and involvement in performance appraisal administration respectively. Thus purposive sampling was done. The subjects were therefore selected on the basis of being science teachers in the six secondary schools in the education district. The six schools altogether had sixty-two Science Teachers (Integrated Science, Physical Science, Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Geography and Mathematics).

Secondly, stratified random sampling was used in coming up with a relatively smaller sample by dividing a population into different groups called strata so that the element of the population belongs to one stratum as recommended by Best and Khan (2007). Stratified
random sampling enabled the division of the population into subgroups and the random selecting of participants from these subgroups as observed by Shastri (2008).

In this study, there were basically two strata, that is, males and females in the six schools. Five teachers per school and the school-head were selected to participate in the study. In this case, a sample slightly above 30% of the population was made use of. However, for Focus Group Conferencing, only four schools were randomly selected and it was the same teachers who responded to the questionnaires who participated in the Focus Group Conferencing. Therefore twenty teachers were treated to this data collection tool.

3.5. DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

The data collection instruments that were used in this research study are those which are commonly used in descriptive surveys and these included questionnaires, focus group discussions, observations and document analysis.

3.5.1. The questionnaire

The questionnaire in this study consisted of question items that solicited information from subjects which was suitable for research analysis as recommended by Mhlanga and Ncube (2003). In this study two questionnaires were used to solicit information from School-heads and Science Teachers. The questionnaires comprised both closed and open-ended questions and were self-administered by the researcher to ensure a 100% return rate after completion.

The questionnaire was chosen for this study because it enabled the asking of all respondents exactly the same questions at the same time. There was improved reliability as the written questions were asked in the same way to each respondent. The questionnaire was quick in terms of getting respondents’ opinions and it saved time and expenses. It allowed the respondents’ anonymity and that in turn got rid of bias that is often associated with interviews, for example. The closed questions helped to keep out data impurity that might come with waffling. The open-ended parts of the questionnaire allowed room for the respondents to say anything within the scope of the questions.

The questionnaire, however, gave no room for the researcher to probe further than what was asked. Some respondents failed to complete all the parts of the questionnaire, especially the open-ended sections. At one station the respondents were encouraged to take their time to attempt all questions. Despite the fact that questionnaires might present the above short-
comings, they were still used in this study because they gather factual information. The reason why focus group discussions, observations and document analysis were also used was because of the need for data triangulation.

3.5.2 Focus Group Discussions

Focus group conferencing was another technique of data gathering that was used in this study. The focus groups comprised individuals who had something in common, that is, the group had some common characteristics in terms of topic at hand. In this study, four schools were chosen randomly for the focus group interviews for in-depth understanding of their experiences and perceptions in performance appraisals. A group of five Science Teachers per school were made to participate in discussing the subject and exchanged views. There was a moderator who directed the discussions and asked questions to collect data as recommended by Shastri (2008).

In this research, focus group discussions had several advantages. The outcomes were quickly known by the researcher and cost less in terms of planning and conducting than large surveys and personal interviews as noted by Shastri (2008). The flexible atmosphere created by the researcher allowed him to probe for more in-depth responses through asking participants to elaborate on their responses. Data gathering through focus group discussions was also carried out relatively quicker and it was less expensive as realised by Maree (2007). Focus group discussions helped the participants to complement each other’s ideas and experiences.

Though focus group discussions could have these merits, the discussions were dominated by the more articulate, loud and talkative members, but still this was controlled by the moderator.

3.5.3. Observations

Participant observations were used in this study as well because the researcher was a science teacher. He only observed teachers at his school as this data collection method demanded that the researcher worked with colleagues for some days. In the observation strategy, there were a set of instructions for the observer to follow on precisely where and what to observe and how the data should be recorded. Participant observation required the observer to be part of the observed group as realised by Gwimbi and Dirwai (2003). In this study the researcher became a member of the observed group as a science teacher working with colleagues, and observed them without them noticing that they were being observed. It also involved physical
presence of the researcher and sharing of life experiences amongst the subjects and the researcher. The researcher observed the experiences at each particular point and recorded and interpreted the observed experiences. The participant observation is typically a qualitative data collection method.

The participants’ behaviour was recorded as it occurred, thus the story remained the same according to Chikoko and Mhloyi (1995), and this is unlike relying on reports of what a person thinks happened during the occasion. The researcher, being the observer saw things which other involved participants might took for granted. Some research participants were not able to give verbal reports, so these were observed and interpreted during participant observation. So participant observations enabled the researcher to observe non-linguistic aspects of human behavior and managed to overcome the issue of some participants’ struggling to express themselves.

However observations were time-consuming as the observer had to be where the participants were. Some participants’ actions, during some instances, went on simultaneously, thus preventing the observer from seeing all that was going on as upheld by Gwimbi et al (2003).

3.5.4. Document Analysis

Document analysis was used in this research study for collecting data as well. The following documents were analysed; a number of the performance appraisal reports (forms) and ZIMSEC’s ‘O’ and ‘A’ Level results analysis sheets for the six schools since 2012 when the present approach to performance appraisal system was introduced. The present approach; the Results-based management puts emphasis on results. These documents helped to shed light on the effectiveness of the performance appraisal system and improvement of learners’ outcomes.

Data collection was made easy as the documents were easily located in the work places and the researcher was able to get access to data that could have been difficult in any other way. For instance, in focus group discussions some participants might not be willing to talk. Analysing documents also helped to eliminate the effect the researcher could have on the subjects or situation as upheld by Gomba (2005). The documents were useful in tracking changes over time, thus allowing the analysis of the existing trends. As documents are not designed with research in mind, in some cases the information recorded was incomplete. For
example, some of the performance appraisal forms were not fully completed and some data in some appraisal forms were no longer useful as time went by.

3.6. Data Collection Procedures

Permission to conduct the study was sought from the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education’s Provincial Education Director.

The data collection for this research was done using questionnaires and focus group discussions whereby the researcher went personally to administer these data collection tools himself on the sampled respondents from the selected six secondary schools in Chivi South Education District. Some data were collected as the researcher was interacting with science teachers. Data was obtained from both primary and secondary sources, that is, from participant observations, questionnaires, focus group discussions and document analysis.

3.7. Data Analysis Procedures

Harper (1991) cited in Mhlanga et al (2003) says that descriptive statistics deals with the method of describing large masses of numbers. Hence, data reduction was attained in descriptive statistics. In this study quantitative data was analysed through frequency distributions where percentages were allocated to frequencies of a type of responses under different categories as noted by Maree (2007). So figures were put into various assigned entities where they made sense and/or meaning. Some quantitative data were analysed through Chi-Square statistical calculations. The chi-square tests were carried out to determine the correlation between performance appraisal use and improvements in learners’ results. The present appraisal approach focuses on improvement of learners’ outcomes, which in turn, result from improved worker input. The chi-square tests for all schools in the study area are shown in the appendices section. Qualitative data was analysed using descriptive narrative analysis.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

The issue of ethical considerations also came in handy, especially that this study involved more of debates and attitudinal provocations. Ethics, according to Fraenkel and Wallen (2006) refer to questions of right or wrong. Ethical considerations with regards to the rights of participants which were applied during data collection in this study included non-coercion of participants to take part in this study. The respondents’ rights to privacy, anonymity,
confidentiality and informed consent were also observed in this research study as supported by Lawrence and Kurpius (2000) when they say that informed consent must be given voluntarily with sufficient knowledge of the treatment and its consequences and the person must be competent to give it. In the study, informed consent was given by participants after the researcher spelt out the purpose of the study, the respondents were asked not to write their names on the questionnaires and they were assured that the information they would give would not be used for public consumption.

SUMMARY

The Chapter attempted to describe the research methodology that was employed to collect data that could provide answers to the research questions. The chapter focused on research design, population, sample and sampling methods, data collection tools and ethical considerations. The population comprised fourteen secondary schools and the sample comprised six schools randomly selected. Research instruments used were the questionnaire, focus group discussions, participant observations and document analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the results obtained from the empirical study done in Chivi South Education District’s cluster ‘A’ secondary schools are presented, analysed, interpreted and discussed. Tables and graphs were used to present data. Chi-Square statistical calculations to determine the relationship between duration of performance appraisal system’s use and pass rates were also used. Data were presented in form of tables and graphs.

4.2. Distribution of Respondents by gender

![Distribution of respondents by gender](image)

Fig.1. Distribution of respondents by gender

The distribution of respondents by gender shows that 61% of the Science Teachers were males and 22% were females. Male school-heads constituted 14% and female school-heads constituted 3%.

4.3. Distribution of Respondents by age
The distribution of respondents by age shows that the majority of teachers, that is, 77% (23) were in the age range 31-35+ years of age. This implied that most respondents were mature in terms of age and they were expected to display a higher degree of professionalism in their work. The same applied to school-heads.

4.4. Distribution of Respondents by professional Qualification

Table 4.1. Science Teachers’ qualification
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>CE/Dip. Ed</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information in Table 4.1 above shows that 37% (11) of the respondents were professional teachers who were holders of a Certificate/Diploma in Education while 63% (19) of respondents were holders of either a Bachelor of Science degree or a Bachelor of Education degree. So this pool of respondents therefore had better qualifications to be able to implement the performance appraisals, and contribute meaningfully to this research.

4.5. Distribution of Respondents by work experience

Figure 4.4 Shows that 37% (11) and 27% (9) of the respondents had Science teaching experience of between 6-15 years. This was important in this study because it reflected how long teachers had been using the performance appraisal system and these might be able to implement the system, probably due to experience or the number of workshops attended.
Fig. 4.5. Distribution of school-heads by supervisory experience

Figure 4.5 show that the School-heads in the schools under study had fewer years in the schools as heads. However, these school-heads had been Acting School-heads for many years. To this end, they had been actually managing these or other schools. As a result, their long standing supervisory experience helped to determine the impact that the performance appraisal system had on teacher performance.

4.6. Performance appraisal criteria often used by supervisors

Table 4.2. Responses from teachers on performance criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested responses</th>
<th>Responses chosen</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) lesson planning/preparation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) lesson presentation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) mastery of subject matter</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) learners’ activities/written work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) learners’ results</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) punctuality and attendance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) co-curricular activities</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) others</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above responses show that many teachers were aware that supervisors looked at learners’ abilities after instruction and/or at the end of a given learning stage (28%) and that inputs, that is, lesson planning/ preparation (17%) were made use of during the intervention, that is, lesson presentation, (14%) and learners’ activities (13%) in order to get the targeted results.

From the participant observation’s findings, the teachers’ overall performance was mostly measured against the final learners’ pass rates as all the interventions were carried out in a bid to improve the pass rates. The ICRC handbook (2008) sees inputs as human efforts put towards achievement of results with interventions done in order to achieve the expected goals.

4.7. Training or orientation of School-heads to conduct the performance appraisals

Eighty-three percent of the school-heads attended short training workshops on the conducting of the performance appraisal system. The one (17%) who answered ‘No’ had been away (probably on leave) when the training sessions were held or mighty had been not appointed school-head or acting school-head yet. One focus group said on training of school-heads;

_The training was not enough to ensure effective implementation of the innovation, it was not adequate. The training workshops were very short. The training workshops had no resources for use for proper training._

From the participant observer’s experience, the training workshops for both school-heads and teachers were too short to enable the participants to grasp all that was required in the performance appraisal processes. Donor funds were used to fund the workshops and sometimes the funds were inadequate to run the training workshops.

4.8. Performance Reviews on teachers
Table 4.3. Teachers’ performance reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested responses</th>
<th>Teachers’ responses %</th>
<th>Heads’ responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once every term</td>
<td>20 67</td>
<td>05 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a term</td>
<td>Nil 00</td>
<td>Nil 00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three times a term</td>
<td>Nil 00</td>
<td>Nil 00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>10 33</td>
<td>01 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As and when it is necessary to do</td>
<td>Nil 00</td>
<td>Nil 00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30 100</td>
<td>06 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty three percent (5 heads) of the school-heads had been holding appraisal reviews once every term during the course of the year. These were adhering to the policy of the ministry as it required three review sessions during the year. The one school-head who had been holding one review session, probably the one that determines the teachers’ final rating, can be said to be amongst the managers who lacked commitment (Gwata, 2013) as these normally did not sit down with the teachers to set goals, and therefore no reviews were held. Mgijima (2014) said that this lack of monitoring and moderation makes employees work as ‘business as usual’. This ‘business as usual’ approach made the performance appraisals a ‘formality’.

As a participant observer, I noted that at the said one school where sessions had not been held, the school-head seemed to lack expertise in the performance appraisal system and had a negative attitude towards the system. This is upheld by Pazvakavambwa, et al (2014) who said that this negative attitude towards results-based management may emanate from the fact that due to lack of adequate training, supervisors might not be fully acquainted with the system and therefore fail to value its usefulness. From document analysis it was found out that some appraisal forms had nothing written by supervisors; meaning to say that there were no performance reviews carried out during the course of the year.

4.9. Setting of Key Result Areas (KRAs) for teachers

Eighty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that it was the Provincial Education Director who set the targets for his/her area and the teachers had to choose the three KRAs
which suit their working areas. Twelve percent of the respondents indicated that it was the individual teacher who came up with his or her KRAs from the guidelines given by the Provincial Education Director.

From the participant observer’s experience, the KRAs were set by the Provincial Education Director as the Head of the ministry’s department. He or she derived his/her KRAs from the national curriculum. The teachers derived the three KRAs from the guidelines laid down by the Provincial Education Director. The same applied to Australian teachers who derived their four KRAs from the schools’ developmental goals and one individual professional goal (acer.edu.au/enews/0310, 2008).

4.10. The person(s) who appraised the teachers

On the question of who did the appraisal, 80% of the science teachers said that the school-head was the one who appraised performance. This system also applied in South Africa where the school principals did the appraisals (Mpungose et al, 2014). In Tanzania teachers were appraised by the school-heads (Bana, 2009) and in Ghana (Adofo, 2011) as well. Twenty percent of the respondents indicated that it was the schools’ Heads of Departments who did the appraisals. The researcher, as the participant observer, also experienced the decentralisation of the appraisal business to the respective Heads of Departments.

In the study area some school-heads, especially big schools, tasked the heads of departments to appraise the teachers since they were the ones much closer to the teachers than school-heads, that is, the heads of departments were seen as line managers here. The school-heads were the ones who supervised the deputy-heads, senior masters, senior mistresses and heads of departments. The school-heads were officially responsible for appraising all teachers. The heads of departments did the appraisal of teachers on behalf of the school-heads. The school-heads did the decentralisation of the appraisals to ease off the paperwork that went hand-in-glove with the performance appraisal business. The decentralisation of the appraisals to heads of departments was seen as effective in performance appraisal administration by some teachers as the heads of departments did thorough work with the teachers from goal-setting to review sessions and finally to performance ratings.


Table 4.4. Teachers’ responses on appraisals and their effects on performance
The responses given above show that many teachers and school-heads were involved in the performance appraisals just to meet the job requirements (50% of the respondents). Thirty-two percent of the respondents were of the view that as teachers worked harder to meet the goals, learners produce better results.

During focus group discussions, one group of respondents said that;

*Service delivery has been improving but the results of the improved service deliver are yet to be realised. Even if people say that service delivery has improved to the public, in education, this is seen in public examinations’ results and the results are not yet satisfactory.*

The views above were upheld by Madhekeni (2012) when he said that the new performance appraisal system focused on tangible results to be delivered from usage of the limited resources employees had. In this case, tangible results, by the end of the year, were better learners’ results. The other focus group came up with a fascinating observation;

*Some teachers’ work had become exam- oriented, as some teachers tend to drill learners to attack exam questions at the expense of imparting concepts and skills. Some of these students cannot apply concepts/skills acquired in new situations.*

From the participant observer’s experience, performance appraisals made teachers meet the minimum job requirements and as they worked to meet the requirements, the teaching-learning process results in learners’ improved results at the end of the year. Those teachers who seemed to be lazy, that is, who could not work under minimum supervision, were compelled by the performance appraisal system to work hard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested responses</th>
<th>Chosen responses</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)makes one work harder</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)makes learners produce better results</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)makes me work to meet minimum job requirements</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) others</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.12. Teachers’ and School-heads’ attitude towards the performance appraisal system

On this question, 20% of the respondents said that teachers had a positive attitude toward the appraisal system and 80% had a negative attitude towards the system. During interactions with the subjects, it was observed that quite a number of teachers were not comfortable with the appraisal system as they argued against increased clerical work. Some argued that the results of the appraisals were not used for salary bonuses, so the issue was seen as useless. But analysis of ‘O’ and ‘A’ Level results in the study area since 2012 showed some improvements in learners’ results although in some cases the improvements were insignificant. Chi-square statistical computations carried out on results of four out of six schools showed a positive relationship between use of performance appraisals and improvement of learners’ results, while the computations for only two schools showed a negative relationship between the two variables. Thus, to some extend, performance management drove teachers to improve performance and this resulted in improved learners’ outputs.

Some explanations written on spaces provided in the questionnaire showed that many teachers viewed the appraisal system negatively;

\[ It \text{ consumes teaching time since the performance preparations/reviews are not on the timetable. The system is subjective as it is used by some school-heads to settle their differences with teachers. The system is not ideal when learners are streamed, that is, in below-average classes, it might be difficult for teachers to meet the targets. } \]

The focus group discussions participants had no kind words on the performance appraisal system, viz;

\[ It \text{ has brought extra paperwork and 'headaches' to employees. It was introduced just to compare its impacts with the developed countries where it is a success story. As long as monetary rewards are not attached to the system, employees will not take it seriously. } \]

Many teachers viewed the system negatively as there were no monetary rewards for better performers. According to Zvavahera (2013), a research study carried out by Buncher (2007) showed that most employees had a negative feeling about performance appraisal; they said that the system manipulated employees without rewarding their efforts.

Some supervisors sat down with teachers to set the targets and to review performance progress; these viewed the system with a positive eye. This was upheld by Jazyky (2014) who
said that employees feel more satisfied with their appraisal results if they have a chance to talk freely and discuss their performance. In such cases, supervisors give constructive feedback and offer guidance to teachers. Sixty-seven percent of school-heads said that the performance appraisal system had been making their work much easier although it had brought some paperwork. They said that teachers had to work to meet targets set thereby improving learners’ outputs. One school-head had this to say:

*My teachers strive to surpass previous years’ performance ratings and learners’ pass rates. This has seen them working hard, even during odd hours.*

Contrary to this, one school-head had this to say:

*Performance management has brought ‘headaches’ in schools because; we have been made to increase the supervision visits to teachers.*

### 4.13. School-heads bias issues when rating teachers

One focus group said that the most common bias that had been affecting many school-heads was ‘central tendency’. They said that most, if not all, school-heads avoided extreme ratings of 1, 2 and 6, thus giving teachers middle-mark rankings. One school-head readily agreed to this when he said:

*To avoid arguments and quarrels, I apply the Central Tendency technique in final ratings.*

The other group said that:

*At our school the issue of bias is thwarted as we have a team of teachers who does the appraisal and the teachers are rated after discussions with the team.*

The third group had this to say:

*Let’s say, one writes that he/ she wants to improve his / her class’ pass rate by 1%. By the end of the year he/ she fails to meet this target because he/ she teaches demanding subjects like Maths or Sciences, while those teaching non-sciences achieve this target and the supervisor sees you as an underperformer.*

From participant observations, it was also seen that many supervisors tended to avoid very low marks and very high marks. They said that, these outlier ratings could call for external reviewers to come; they would look for many more issues, not KRAs only.
4.14. Performance Appraisal system and improvement of ‘O’ Level and ‘A’ Level results

The graph shows that 48% of the respondents said that performance appraisals helped to improve the Ordinary and Advanced Level pass rates in public examinations. Thirty-six percent of the respondents disagreed with this assertion and 8% strongly disagreed. So 44% of the respondents said that there is no link between learners’ results and performance appraisals. Eight percent of the respondents chose to be neutral. From focus group discussions the issue was met with mixed feelings. One group was of the main view that;

To some extend the passes in sciences have improved, but there is still the problem of inadequate apparatus and materials in our science kits.

The other group said;
The pass rates have been fluctuating as there are many factors that come into play, such as the nature of learners, teaching styles and the learning environments. But generally, pass rates at ‘O’ Level Integrated Science and Geography have been improving since, the implementation of the new appraisal system.

Some of the respondents said that the results had not changed since the inception of the new approach to performance appraisal system in 2012 as this had increased paperwork on teachers. Some said that, the classes were too large to be managed by one teacher. Mosage et al (2014) concur with this saying that over-crowding of classes was one of the greatest challenges which hampered performance and made it impossible to carry out the duties of performance management. And Nir (2005) also said that in most schools, teachers have large amounts of paperwork to process, these have huge impacts on learners’ outcomes.

One group from focus group discussions said that;

\[
\text{The teacher-pupil ratio in Science classes is abnormal; the classes are too big for effective discovery learning through manipulation of apparatus. Most classes at our school have pupils which range from 45-50 pupils. If a Science class is too big, it presents difficulties when using tools and materials as well as catering for individual needs.}
\]

Results analysis sheets( in 4.18 below) from the study area from 2012 to 2014 and most of the Chi-square computations for the learners’ results proved a positive association between continued use of results-oriented performance appraisal system and improvement of work efforts which resulted in improved learners’ outputs.

4.15. Use of performance appraisal results

Seventy-five percent of the respondents (school-heads) said that the results of the performance appraisals were used for promotion of teachers to the next grade, 25% said that the results were used for training and development of teachers. When one applied for posts, such as that of a deputy-head, school-head and so on, the results of the previous years’ performance appraisals were a requisite in the education sector. The government did not have enough financial resources to reward better performers in form of bonuses or salary increments. The same applied to Ghana where Adofo (2011) says that the results of performance appraisals were used for promotional purposes only as the government had no funds to reward outstanding performance. In Australia in Victorian State schools, teachers who performed well were awarded annual salary increments and/or promotion to senior teacher’s position (acer.edu.au/enews/, 2008).
4.16. Objectivity of the appraisal process

Seventy-seven percent of the respondents said that the appraisal processes were not objective while 23% said that the processes were objective. Some respondents gave the following explanations:

- *It’s objective because teachers get what they deserve.*
- *A lot of bias is involved.*
- *The rating is not determined by one’s performance, so it’s not objective.*
- *Work plans are agreed upon between the appraiser and appraisee; it’s objective.*
- *No resources, no review sessions, just final mark, so it’s not objective.*

The majority of teachers were of the view that the performance appraisal processes were not objective as some supervisors might have biases which included central tendency scoring, stereotyping and favouritism. Erbasi, *et al* (2010) say that some managers give average points for the performance of most employees despite the fact that some teachers might have put in greater effort than the others and achieve excellent results. In some cases, the supervisor could either favour a particular teacher because he/she liked him or because he/she was extra harsh if he/she disliked the teacher (*Ibid*). The same authors went on to say that some supervisors tended to generalise members of a certain group and stereotyped each individual based on the perceived characteristics of the group—this might not provide an accurate assessment of the appraises.

In document analysis it was discovered that in most of the forms seen, supervisors tended to employ the Central Tendency technique; they just played it safe by giving final ratings of between 4.0 and 4.3. This was one of the factors that led some teachers to see performance management as a mere formality. The School-heads should take their time to work with the subordinates throughout the performance year as Erbasi *et al* (2010) upheld this saying that the problem could be minimised if the supervisor would make sure that each teacher should be appraised on the basis of his/her individual merit and performance. Jan *et al* (2014) concurred with the above views when they said that:

*To avoid the central tendency error, managers who supervise a large group of subordinates should keep track of individual teachers’ performance at regular intervals throughout the year and not wait until the annual review to start evaluating the employees.*

4.17. Level of fairness of performance appraisal reports
On this issue, 70% of the respondents revealed that the reports were not fair as they were done just to meet the job requirements. 30% of the respondents, who answered ‘No’, cited biases in the appraisal processes. Erbasi, et al (2010) say that some supervisors use position of the person, that is, higher points for persons who work at higher positions and lower points, and usually nasty reports for those who work at lower positions within the same company.

From the participant observer’s experience, most reports and final ratings given to teachers had not been fair. There had been good reports and ratings for underperformers. For instance many teachers were given ratings of between 4.0. and 4.3, but, the results of their classes were not pleasing at all, and a few with ratings of above 4.5 held senior posts in the school administration. This could be due to stereotyping according to Jan et al (2014) in which some supervisors tend to generalise members of a certain group and view each individual basing on the perceived characteristics of the group. This might not provide an accurate assessment of the appraisees. This was earlier on seen by Alvi et al (2013) when they said that when an ingrouper performs poorly, supervisors tend to overlook the failure or attribute it to bad timing or bad luck. To resolve this, Jan et al (2014) said that supervisors should not base their judgments on who the employee hangs around with and the performance system should focus on performance variables as opposed to personal traits.

4.18. Evidence of ‘O’ Level and ‘A’ Level ZIMSEC results since the implementation of the improved performance appraisal system from 2012-14
The graph above shows that there has been an improvement in passes in Sciences, most notable in Integrated Science. Passes in Geography and Mathematics were fluctuating. There were some variables that could come into play when it came to results according to Jan et al (2014), viz; teaching strategies, teacher’s personality, the nature of learners and the performance management system. During observations and document analysis it was noted that lack of teaching-learning resources, large science classes and too much paperwork in performance management affected teachers in executing their duties. The summary table below for Chi-Square Statistical calculations for the results of this school shows that there were no close association between performance appraisal use and improved learners’ results.

**NB. The lengthy Chi-Square test calculations are summarised by the summary tables given herein.**

**Table 4.5. Statistical analysis for school A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>X calculated</th>
<th>X 0,05 table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α 0,05</td>
<td>3,33</td>
<td>9,484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rejection criteria: testing at α 0,05, we reject Ho if x calculated > x 0,05 table. Conclusion: since x calculated (3.33) < x 0,05 table (9.484) we adopt Ho and conclude that at 0.05 level of significance there is no association between the duration of performance appraisal use and pass rates in Sciences. This could be a result of some of the factors mentioned above that affected the teaching-learning process. Although the calculations showed no close association between performance appraisal system and improved learners’ outputs, the system enabled the supervisors to measure teachers against quantity measure, that is, how much of what are going to achieved and time taken to achieve the tasks(Madhekeni,2012). So in performance...
appraisal system there is extensive monitoring and assessments to ensure improved learners’ outputs. Hence, in a bigger or smaller way, performance appraisals could help improve teachers’ effectiveness and this could be seen in improved learners’ outputs.
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**Figure 4.7.2012 to 14 ZIMSEC ‘O’ Level percentage pass rates for sciences School B**

**Shindi**

**KEY:**
- Geography
- Mathematics
- Integrated Science

Although there were fluctuations in the percentage pass rates so far at school B, the Chi-square tests made (shown in the appendices section) showed that there was a positive relationship between continued appraisal use and increased pass rates in Sciences.

**Table 4.6. Statistical analysis for school B**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>X calculated</th>
<th>X0,05 table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\propto 0.05$</td>
<td>30.428</td>
<td>9.484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rejection criteria: testing at $\propto 0.05$, we reject Ho if $x$ calculated $> x_{0.05}$ table. Conclusion: since $x$ calculated $> x_{0.05}$ table we reject Ho and conclude that there is an association between continue use of performance appraisals and pass rates in Sciences The Geography percentage pass rate fell in 2013 from 2012’s 54, 5% to 14% and then rose to 46% in 2014, while for Mathematics, it rose from 2012’s 18,4% to 27,5% in 2013, then fell to 19% in 2014. But for Integrated Science the pass rate had been spiraling down. There were many variables that affected the quality of results according to Jan, et al (2014), *viz*: teaching strategies, teacher’s personality, the nature of learners and performance management system.
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**Figure 4.8. The 2012 to 14 ‘O’ Level ZIMSEC results for school C Neruvanga**

**KEY:**

- **Geography**
- **Mathematics**
- **Integrated Science**
There were fluctuations in pass rates in Geography and Mathematics since 2012. That is, higher pass rates in 2012, lower pass rates in 2013 and in 2014 the pass rates rose again, serve for Integrated Science passes which had been going down. The Integrated Science teachers at this school cited large classes and inadequate materials and apparatus for use during teaching-learning of the subject. This problem is supported by Mosage et al. (2014) who said that the greatest challenge in performance management was over-crowding of classes which hampered performance. They went on to say that resource shortage was another challenge as there were no computers and apparatus. If one could carry out a longitudinal study in this area, the fluctuations in outputs could have other dimensions to base them.

**Table 4.7(a) ‘O’ Level Statistical analysis for school C.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>X calculated</th>
<th>X0.05 table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≈ 0.05</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>9.484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rejection criteria: testing ≈ 0.05, we reject Ho if x calculated > x0.05 table.

Conclusion: since x calculated > x0.05 table we reject Ho and conclude that there is an association between continued performance appraisal use and pass rates in Sciences. The Chi-square tests carried out on results of this school showed that there was a positive relationship between continued use of performance appraisals and increased pass rates in Sciences. This is so as performance appraisals clarify for teachers what they need to concentrate on as posited by Zvavahera (2013) who said that employees come up with clear goals and objectives and would work to achieve them.
The A-Level passes had been spiraling down since 2012. The teachers concerned revealed that the school administration had been selecting potential Advanced Level students with laxity. As a result entrants with weaker Ordinary Level passes had been enrolled to pursue Advanced Level Science subjects. This was a lame excuse because there were a variety of teaching strategies and approaches which could be made use of to ensure skill and concept acquisition.

**Table 4.7(b) ‘A’ Level Statistical analysis for school C.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>X calculated</th>
<th>X0.05 table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$ 0.05</td>
<td>46.781</td>
<td>5.991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rejection criteria: testing $\alpha$ 0.05, we reject Ho if x calculated > x0.05 table.
Conclusion: since $x_{\text{calculated}} (46,781) > x_{\text{table}} (5,991)$ we reject $H_0$ and conclude that there is an association between continued performance appraisal use and pass rates in Sciences.
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**Figure 4.10. The 2012 to 14 percentage pass rates for school D Kushinga**

- Blue: Geography
- Red: Mathematics
- Green: Integrated Science

**Table 4.8. Statistical analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>$X_{\text{calculated}}$</th>
<th>$X_{0.05 \text{table}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &lt; 0.05$</td>
<td>22.607</td>
<td>9.484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rejection criteria: testing at $\alpha < 0.05$, we reject $H_0$ if $x_{\text{calculated}} > x_{0.05 \text{table}}$. Conclusion: since $x_{\text{calculated}} > x_{0.05}$ table we reject $H_0$ and conclude that there is an association between continued performance appraisal use and improved pass rates in Sciences. The learners’ performance had been fluctuating since 2012, but with outputs not less than 20%.
Generally, this performance is not bad given the many variables that affect teaching-learning. The use of performance appraisals is asserted here by Akers (2000) when he said that employees become more productive by putting systems in place to measure productivity and what should be measured must be done. However, this put some pressure on the teacher.

**Figure 4.11. The 2012 to 14 percentage pass rates for School E Chamanhanzva**

**KEY:**
- Geography
- Mathematics
- Integrated Science

The pass rates for school E had been fluctuating. There could be a number of factors which had been into play, rather than the use of performance appraisal system. This evidence refuted claims by some teachers who said that the performance appraisals did not improve pass rates. Again the summary table (4.13b) for chi-square tests below showed that there was a positive relationship between increased pass rates and continued used of the performance appraisal system.
Table 4.9. Statistical analysis for school E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of significant</th>
<th>X calculation</th>
<th>X 0.05 table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha) 0.05</td>
<td>14.169</td>
<td>9.484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rejection criteria: testing at \(\alpha\) 0.05, we reject Ho if \(x\) calculated > \(x\) 0.05 table Conclusion: since \(x\) calculation >0.05 table we reject Ho and conclude that there is positive a relationship between continued performance appraisal use and improved pass rates in Sciences.

Figure 4.12. 2012 to 14 ‘O’ Level Results for School F Ngundu

KEY:

- Geography
- Mathematics
- Integrated Science
- Biology

The pass rates for school F had been fluctuating as well. The Geography, Mathematics and Science teachers felt that they had large classes and therefore no time for individual attention.
as time allocated to the respective subjects was very limited. The Integrated Science and Biology teachers mentioned lack of apparatus and limited Science rooms as obstacles to their performance. The Chi-square computations of the results of this school showed no close association between performance appraisals’ use and improved learners’ outcomes although performance appraisals made teachers to work hard in order to meet the targets set. There were many variables which made this happen, for example, the nature of learners and teaching strategies.

Table 4.10 (a) ‘O’ Level Statistical analysis for school F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>X calculated</th>
<th>X0.05 table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>∝ 0.05</td>
<td>11.473</td>
<td>9.484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rejection criteria: testing at ∝0.05, we reject Ho if x calculated > x0.05 table. Conclusion: since x calculated > x0.05 table we reject Ho and conclude that there is an association between continued performance appraisal use and improved results.

Rejection criteria: testing at ∝0.05, we reject Ho if x calculated > x0.05 table. Conclusion: since x calculated > x0.05 table we reject Ho and conclude that there is an association between continued performance appraisal use and improved results.
The Advanced Level teachers felt that they were given ‘weak entrants’ to work with. The teachers said that these were best results for them as they were working extra hard to make the students pass. The school-heads were required by government policy to enroll all potential advanced level students despite the fact that some applicants had weak ordinary level passes or had less than five ordinary level passes. During observations, it was discovered that some teachers were working hard to make learners realize better results. Although in some cases teachers were seen to be working hard to meet targets set in Performance Appraisals, some were just working hard to ensure syllabi coverage and this in turn would contribute to improved learners’ outputs.

**Table 4.10 (b) ‘A’ Level Statistical analysis for school F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of significance</th>
<th>X calculated</th>
<th>X0.05 table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\propto$ 0.05</td>
<td>43.848</td>
<td>5.991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.19. **Challenges associated with the administration of the performance appraisal system.**

Thirty-six percent of the respondents said that low commitment towards the appraisal system was the challenge while 18% of the respondents cited low management accountability as one of the challenges to the performance appraisal system. Forty-six percent of the respondents cited absence of salary increases and bonuses as the biggest challenge to the performance appraisal system.

This showed that the appraisal processes could have been taken as ‘formalities’, since teachers and school-heads were yet to realise the rewards. Teachers and school-heads did not take performance appraisals seriously, as they were not involved in its formulation. This is asserted by Machingambi (2013) saying that most teachers were not trained on the performance appraisal and this gives the impression that there was no shared understanding.
amongst the teachers and school-heads on how they should relate to the appraisal system. One respondent said that;

Due to lack of adequate training on the appraisal processes, no-one is an expert in the area, even school-heads do not understand the system, the system was just imposed by the government and little training was done.

Mavhiki et al (2013) say that the performance management is not linked to incentives as the country cannot afford to pay those incentives. That was why the predecessor for results-based management was allegedly thought to have failed.

During participant observation, it was seen that some school-heads and/or heads of departments had been falling prey to the central tendency error, the final rankings awarded ranged between 4.0- 4.3 for almost all the teachers at a station. Nobody queried as there were no monetary rewards. Mavhiki et al (2013) posit that Zimbabwe is in financial limbo; performance incentives are not forthcoming, also the predecessor of the present results-based management was allegedly thought to have failed due to rewards. So this made even the supervisors to play it safe by giving almost everyone middle marks to avoid the higher offices to come for further monitoring and moderation. Thus some school-heads and teachers saw the appraisal system as a formality; this made them lack commitment. Mashavira et al (2013) advised policy makers to respond to appraisals immediately as this would help the process achieve its intended purposes. This could mean responding to performance results in terms of salary rewards, promotions and advancements.

4.20. Rating of schools on the basis of performance in public examinations

The question was met with mixed feelings, and this was seen through non-verbal communication that some teachers were not comfortable with the ranking of schools. One focus group had this to say;

Rating of schools basing on public examinations’ performance is not fair in that pupils have different learning environments. Urban schools and boarding schools have well-developed infrastructure in forms of well-equipped laboratories, computer laboratories, Geography laboratories and many others. So where do we place poorly-equipped rural-day secondary schools?

The other group also said that;

It is fair to rate schools on the basis of Ordinary and Advanced level results because it motivates other schools to work harder in order to
Most focus groups said that the ranking was not fair as most elite and boarding schools enrolled the gifted learners from Grade Seven and their classes were relatively small while rural-day schools had their doors open to all learners regardless of ability, hence their classes were big. Teachers in these schools had two imperatives to confront; teaching large classes of average and below average learners and working with very limited teaching-learning resources. Parents and guardians usually want to send their children to well-ranked schools. For instance, many parents liked highly ranked schools such as St. Faith’s High School and St Ignatius College.

4.21. Suggestions for effective administration of the Performance Appraisal system

4.11. Factors that help to improve administration of the performance appraisal Table system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested responses</th>
<th>Choices</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) strict supervision</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) clear job specifications</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) teacher motivation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) positive attitude to work</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Training and development</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) improved conditions of work</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that 37% of the respondents saw the improvement of working conditions as a recipe to improve the administration of performance appraisals. Twenty-five
percent of the respondents viewed teacher motivation and 21% saw training and development of teachers as a way of improving performance.

One respondent had this to elaborate on the spaces provided on the questionnaire;

There is need to motivate teachers to work harder in the form of varying percentages of performance awards at the end of the year. The teacher who gets, say, 10% performance award this year, may strive to work harder to get, say, 15% performance award next year.

The other respondent said on improved conditions of work;

If the government has no enough money for incentives, they can opt for manpower development leave, free medication and education for teachers, their spouses and children.

The majority of respondents was of the view that to improve the administration of the performance appraisal system there should be teacher motivation, training and development of teachers and improved conditions of work. Zvavahera (2013) concurs with this saying that thorough training and workshops for all levels of employees is critical so that the performance appraisal system could be understood and appreciated by employees. He went on to say that, in this way, there was bound to be adherence to the tenets of the appraisal system. Jan et al (2014) support this saying that teachers must be supported in their personal matter or professional growth and in this way they would be more motivated and would perform whole heartedly. It is necessary for the management to recognise and reward excellent performance of the teachers (Ibid). Hence the welfare of teachers and recognising better performance took centre stage as these could help improve worker performance.

The outstanding recommendations noted by some respondents were thus;

- Allocate time for performance appraisal training sessions in schools before agreed work plans are set.
- Motivate teachers by awarding salary bonuses and/or salary increments based on performance.
- There should be constant training of school-heads and teachers on performance appraisal administration.
- The appraisal instrument (the form) should not be uniform in all schools, instead localise it to school level.
- The appraisal form is cumbersome, simplify it; make it shorter.
- The performance review sessions should be conducted by a team comprising, one head of department, senior master, senior mistress and the school-head for fairness’ sake.
The school-heads should delegate the appraisal of teachers to heads of department and or senior masters and mistresses.

The respondents’ sentiments above ‘dictated’ that the performance appraisal system should be given due weight and should be considered as the potential factor contributing towards improved teacher performance.

Lower (2003) quoted by Jan, et al (2014) says that supervisors must give continuous feedback, change the workers’ behaviour, set goals for them and give proper training to them. Zvavahera (2013) asserts that employees’ benefits should be tied to performance and the system has to be regarded as fair and just by the employees. But the Zimbabwe government presently has no enough financial resources to pay for performance management training and performance-related salaries. Mavhiki et al (2013) pointed out that the Zimbabwe government has no enough money for performance rewards. Adofo (2011) also noted that Ghana government also could not pay its workers the performance rewards due to inadequate funds and the Tanzanian government (Bana, 2009) could not afford the performance-related salaries as well. This shows that, unlike the Western World, the developing African countries cannot afford to rise extra revenue to pay their workers salary incentives.

4.22. General concerns about the whole Performance Appraisal system

Some of the notable respondents’ concerns were as follows;

- Since the performance appraisal system focuses on results, teachers are now working to meet the work quantities agreed upon at the expense of quality.
- Teachers are tempted to ‘drill’ learners to pass the exams so that they get higher numeral ratings.
- The system makes workers meet minimum job requirements and rewards better performers.
- Final numerical ratings given do not tally with work done.
- The system puts more emphasis on records and results than on actual teaching.
- The school-heads should show commitment first towards the appraisal system.
- The system burdens teachers as there are no monetary rewards.
- Paying teachers according to performance is the best performance appraisal system.
- The performance appraisal system should be shelved if there are no financial resources to reward workers.
- The ratings are not fair as almost all teachers get almost same final marks- thus making the appraisal system a useless project.
The sentiments above presented negativity towards the performance appraisal system. This negativity normally had its roots at school level as some school-heads did not commit themselves to the appraisal processes. The negativity was worsened by the government’s inability to offer monetary rewards to better or outstanding performers. Mashavira et al (2013) say that most school-heads avoided extreme scores of 1 and 5, so teachers had a negative attitude towards the appraisal system. Jazyky (2014) says that during performance review sessions, destructive criticism, which could be harshly presented normally led to problems such as resentment and resistance to improvement.

However, some sentiments showed that performance appraisals ‘forced’ teachers work to meet targets- thus they worked to realise results. The Chi-square statistical calculations done on results collected from four out of six schools in the study area from 2012 to 2014 showed that there was a positive correlation between continued use of performance appraisals and improved learner performance.

**SUMMARY**

In this chapter, data was presented, interpreted and analysed on the effectiveness of the performance appraisal system on science teachers’ execution of duty. The findings showed that the performance appraisal system had been meant to improve teachers’ efficiency and effectiveness in achieving set targets using limited resources. There were mixed feelings towards the appraisal system; negative feelings dominating and teachers and school-heads felt that the system was highly demanding in terms of workloads. On the other side, there had been no monetary incentives associated with the use of the appraisal system, so teachers felt that they were made to work the extra mile for no gains. That was why the educators were not committed to its full realisation.

The findings also indicated that the performance appraisal innovation was not well marketed before its introduction in schools, and the training that was given to school-heads and teachers was inadequate. This had been making the appraisal processes viewed as ‘useless’ and time-consuming exercises. It also emerged that lack of resources had been badly affecting the effective implementation of the performance appraisal system. However, most of the public examinations results (four out of six schools) collected from the six schools in the study area showed a positive relationship between continued performance appraisal use and pass rates in Sciences.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a summary of the whole research study. The research proceedings, conclusions and recommendations will be presented in this chapter.

5.2. SUMMARY OF THE WHOLE RESEARCH STUDY

The study sought to analyse the performance appraisal system on science teachers’ execution of duties in their classrooms. The history of the performance appraisal system was traced
back to the Rhodesian government when teacher appraisals were largely done through intermittent inspections by the School Inspectors who were not resident at the schools.

The present performance appraisal system was designed to improve efficiency, effectiveness and service delivery to the public. In education, the appraisal system was geared to develop teachers who are efficient, effective and responsive to the needs of learners. The KRAs for school-heads and teachers were derived from the Provincial Education Director’s guidelines for schools under his/her jurisdiction. The PED’s guidelines originated from the national curriculum. The school-heads were the ones who appraised teachers, in big schools the school-heads had to decentralise the administration of the appraisals to their deputies, senior masters/mistresses and heads of departments, and these were in turn supervised by the school-heads. The system was made to link remuneration to performance among other rewards. It was made a policy; it was to be implemented by all civil servants.

The research problem arose from some sections of educators who have been complaining that the performance appraisal system was useless as it did not seem to improve service delivery and that it was difficult to quantify services. It was against this background that I embarked on a study to analyse performance appraisals on teacher performance. The rationale was to influence policy changes in the administration of the performance appraisal system after an analysis on its effects on science teachers’ performance. The objectives of the study were to analyse in order to document teachers’ attitude towards the system, how the system affected teachers, evidence that showed the nature of learners’ outputs as a result of the performance appraisal system, challenges and ways of improving the administration of the appraisal system. This was then followed by consulting some relevant international, regional and local literature sources to help further define the problem. These were presented in relation to the research questions.

The subjects were purposively sampled, then followed by random sampling to come up with a relatively smaller sample. The research used the Mixed-methods research paradigm and the descriptive survey design. Questionnaires, focus group discussions, participant observations and document analysis were used to gather data. During data collection, some ethical considerations were observed. People who were asked to take part in the study were informed of the purpose of the study and were assured of the confidentiality with which the information they gave would be treated. Both quantitative data and qualitative data were presented and analysed following a thematic approach.
The research study came up with some major findings, thus; the performance appraisal system was seen as a top-down programme in which school-heads and teachers, as implementers of the system, were not consulted in its formulation. This made the school-heads and teachers lack commitment in working with the appraisals. Some supervisors tended to by-pass performance review sessions, in-house training for needy teachers and resource provision for use during teaching-learning. School-heads and teachers had received training which was not adequate enough to enable them to implement the system with the newly qualified teachers only shown how to complete the appraisal form. The system had no monetary incentives for better performance because the government could not afford to raise extra funds to award better performance. It was useful to those teachers who were due for promotion as the previous years’ performance ratings were a prerequisite. The system made teachers to work hard in order to meet targets set and this resulted in improvement of learners’ outputs. Some Chi-square tests carried out on ZIMSEC results showed a positive relationship between appraisals use and improved learner performance. Some school-heads hailed the performance appraisal system as it made teachers improve performance, which in turn would result in learners’ improved outputs. On the other hand, some teachers complained that most supervisors were not fair in performance ratings as they fall prey to biases such as Central Tendency rating.

5. 3. CONCLUSIONS

Most school-heads and teachers viewed the appraisal system as ‘theirs’ and not ‘ours’ as the system was introduced without consultations with the end-users. As a result, they lacked commitment to it. In some cases appraisal forms were completed at the beginning of the year and they were forgotten until when those in higher offices reminded the school-heads to ensure the reviews were done. In this case, they were then worked out in a hurry just to meet the deadlines for the reviews. That was why in some schools almost all teachers were given average final ratings of ‘4’.

The current performance appraisal system is results-oriented. Teachers who had been producing better results in terms of improved learners’ pass rates had not been rewarded by the employer. Only those who were due for promotion enjoyed the final ratings although the learners’ results proved otherwise. This had made the system seen as a formality, and on the other hand seen to be manipulating teachers without rewarding them. The system overloaded teachers with paperwork. Most teachers had a negative attitude towards the system.
It also emerged that both school-heads and teachers received inadequate training on the administration of the performance appraisal system, with school-heads getting three-day workshops and teachers one day workshops. It emerged, as well, that lack of financial resources to finance workshops and purchase of apparatus and materials have had negative impacts on the effective implementation of the appraisal system. The study also uncovered that the performance appraisal system had been bearing fruits in some schools as it improved service delivery as observed in improved learners’ outputs.

On the whole it emerged that more still needed to be done in financing the training and development of school-heads and teachers, rewarding better performance in form of bonuses or salary increments and provide resources to be used by programme implementers. The supervisors needed to be professional in execution of appraisals in order to curb errors.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

Some gaps still existed in the manner in which the appraisal system was being conducted in schools and further research should be carried out. The shop-floor workers, that is, the teachers should be thoroughly trained on the demands and benefits of the performance appraisal system. Funds should be sourced to train teachers through workshops at school level, or at cluster level so that all teachers have a fair grasp of its demands. Both school-heads and teachers should be trained simultaneously so that they approach the process with a common understanding. Thorough training and workshops at all levels of employees are critical so that the performance appraisal system could be understood and appreciated by the employees.

The current appraisal form is a ‘fit-all-sizes shoe’; it should be revised in order that it takes into consideration the heterogeneous nature of schools. The current form should be simplified and made shorter as well; this could make it user-friendly as this will reduce ambiguity and too much writing. This could be done through further pilot testing to enable modification of the form to suit the various categories in the public sector.

The diploma and degree courses offered by colleges of education and universities should be encouraged to consider ways of incorporating courses with a bias towards the performance management system.
The PSC, as the employer of civil servants should make an effort to see to it that performance appraisal results are used to award bonuses or salary increments. This would motivate school-heads and teachers to improve performance.

Lack of resources was hampering effective implementation of the performance appraisal system. There had been shortages of laboratory equipment and materials in most of our rural-day schools. It is recommended that the government as well as schools’ PTAs should source funds to purchase the much needed resources.

Each ranking should be entitled to a salary bonus, for example, final ratings of, say, 3 to be awarded a 5% salary bonus, a rating of 4 to get 10%, that of 5 to get 15% and that of 6 to get 20%. There should be close supervisions by the ministry officials and school-heads in the conduct of the performance appraisal processes.

More studies should be carried out on the effectiveness of the performance appraisal system on science teacher performance and how best the performance appraisals can be used to improve learners’ performance in Sciences.

**SUMMARY**

This chapter focused on summary and conclusions of the research findings. It seemed the general feeling in most teachers was that the better performers should be rewarded and the system be restricted to suit the local work places and that financial resources be availed for training of teachers and procurement of equipment and materials. Finally the chapter focused on the recommendations and the need for further research studies in the area.
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QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SCIENCE TEACHERS

Dear Respondent

The researcher is conducting a research on the Analysis of the effects of the Performance Appraisal system on Science Teachers’ execution of classroom duties in Chivi South Education District’s Cluster ‘A’ schools.

The researcher is a Master of Science in Education student at Bindura University of Science Education. This research study is being conducted for academic purposes and you are assured of confidentiality and anonymity of the information you provide.

Please tick □ where applicable and supply details where required.

1. Sex: Male □ Female □
   31-35 □ 36-40 □
   41-45 □ 46+ □
3. Highest Professional Qualification:
   CE/Dip. Ed □ Bachelors’ Degree □
   Masters Degree □
   Others (Please Specify) ..............................................................
   ..........................................................................................
   ..........................................................................................
   ..........................................................................................
   ..........................................................................................
   ........
4. How long have you been teaching Science?
   <1yr □ 1-5yrs □ 6-10yrs □
   11-15yrs □ 16-20yrs □ 21+ yrs □

5. Which of the following Performance Appraisal criteria do your supervisors often use? (You can tick more than one option)
   (a) lesson planning/ preparation □
   (b) lesson presentation
(c) mastery of subject matter
(d) learner’s activities/ written work
(e) education of Learner ability
(f) punctuality and attendance
(g) co-curricular activities
(h) other (please specify)

6. How often are you appraised?
(a) once every term
(b) twice a term
(c) three times a term
(d) once in the academic year
(e) as and when it is necessary to do so

7. Who sets the Key Result Areas (KRAs) for Teachers?
(a) Provincial Education Director
(b) District Education Officers
(c) School heads
(d) Heads of Departments
(e) Individual teachers
(f) Others (please specify)

8. Who does the appraisal?
(a) Provincial Education Director
(b) District Education Officers
(c) School-heads
(d) Heads of Departments
9. (a) Teachers have a positive attitude towards the performance appraisal system.

Agree
Strongly Agree □
Neutral □
Disagree □
Strongly Disagree □

(b) Explain your response above………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
…………

10. Performance Appraisals have helped my school to improve ‘O’ and ‘A’ Level pass rates.

a. Agree □

b. Strongly Agree □

c. Neutral □

d. Disagree □

e. Strongly Disagree □

f. Explain your response above

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

11. On a rating scale of 1 to 5, how do you rate the level of objectivity of the Performance Appraisal Process?
(a) Not objective  
(b) Fairly objective  
(c) Objective  
(d) Very objective  
(ii) Explain your answer above

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

12(a) Do you receive a fair Performance Appraisal report?

Yes  
No  
(b) Explain your response above

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

13. What are some of the challenges associated with Performance Appraisals? (Please tick as many as relevant)

a) Low commitment  
b) Low management accountability  
c) Performance appraisal not directly linked to pay rises/salary bonuses  
d) Other (please specify)

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

14. Which of these factors below can best help to improve Performance Appraisals in Education? (Please tick as many as are relevant)
(a) teacher motivation
(b) positive attitude to work
(c) training and development in their area of work
(d) improved conditions of work
(e) clear job specifications
(f) strict supervision
(g) other (please specify)

15. What suggestions can you give for effective administration of performance appraisals?

16. What are your personal concerns about the whole Performance Appraisal system?
**Questionnaire for School-heads**

Dear Respondent

The researcher is conducting a research on the Analysis of the effects of the performance appraisal system on Science Teacher’s execution of classroom duties in Chivi South Education District’s cluster ‘A’ schools.

The researcher is a Master of Science Education student at Bindura University of Science Education. This research study is being conducted for academic purposes and you are assured of confidentiality and anonymity of the information you provide.

Please tick where applicable and supply details where required.

1. Sex: Male ☐ Female ☐

2. Age: 30-35- ☐ 36-40 ☐ 41-45 ☐ 46-50 ☐ 51+ ☐

3. How long have you been heading the school?
   < 1yr ☐ 1-5yrs ☐ 6-10yrs ☐ 11yrs and above ☐

4. Are you trained and /or oriented to conduct the performance appraisals?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

5. How often do you appraise teachers?
   (a) Once in a term ☐
   (b) Twice a term ☐
   (c) Once in the academic year ☐
   (d) As and when it is necessary ☐

6. Who sets the Key Result Areas [KRAs] for teachers?
   (a) Provincial Education Director(PED) ☐
   (b) District Education Officers (DEOs) ☐
   (c) School heads ☐
   (d) Heads of Department ☐
   (e) Individual Teachers ☐
   (f) Other (Please specify) ☐
7. How does the performance appraisal system affect teachers’ performance?
(a) Makes them give off their best
(b) Makes students come up with better results
(c) Makes them work to meet minimum job expectations
(d) Other (please specify)

8. (a) School-heads’ and teachers’ have a positive attitude towards the performance appraisal system.
   Agree
   Strongly Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree
   (b) Explain your response above

9. (a) Performance Appraisal has helped my school to improve ‘O’ and ‘A’ Level pass rates.
   Agree
   Strongly agree
   Neutral
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree
(b) Explain your response above

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

10. What do you use the results of the performance appraisal for? (Please tick as many as are relevant)
(a) For salary bonuses
(b) To retain hardworking Science teachers
(c) For promotion of teachers
(d) For training and development
(e) Other (Please specify)
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

11. What are the challenges associated with the performance appraisal process (Please tick as many as are relevant)
(a) Low commitment
(b) Low management accountability
(c) Performance appraisals not directly linked to pay rises / salary bonuses
(e) Other (Please specify)
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
12. Which of these factors below can best help improve performance of your teachers? (Please tick as many as are relevant)

(a) Teachers’ motivation  
(b) Positive attitude to work  
(c) Training and development in their area of work  
(d) Improve conditions of work  
(e) Clear job specifications  
(f) Strict supervision  
(g) Other (Please specify)

13. What suggestions can you suggest to help improve the performance appraisal system in education?

14. What are your personal concerns about the whole performance appraisal system?
Focus Group Discussion Interview Guide for Science Teachers

1. How do performance appraisals influence pass rates in Sciences?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Do you see performance appraisals improving service delivery in schools?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

3. What is your opinion regarding the rating (by the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education) of schools on the basis of performance in public examinations?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

4. Comment on the teachers’ opinions regarding bias by the school heads when ratings are done at your school?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

5. What is the attitude of teachers at your school towards performance appraisals?
6. There is an argument that during assessments in schools, that those teachers who are too vocal and ‘challenge’ the school-heads normally in staff meetings are often rated lowly. What is your opinion regarding this claim? Explain.

7. How do you see the current teacher-pupil ratio in Science classes in relation to effective teaching-learning?

8. Do you see the training that was given to teachers and school-heads on Performance Appraisal adequate enough to ensure effective implementation of the innovation? Explain.