THE PRACTICE OF PRINCIPALS' PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF METEKEL ZONE

By

Berhie Yigzaw

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

November, 2013

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

THE PRACTICE OF PRINCIPALS' PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF METEKEL ZONE

BY

Berhie Yigzaw

ADVISOR: DESELEGN BEYENE (MA)

CO-ADVISOR: TADESSE ABERA (MA)

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT, INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES OF JIMMA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

SEPTEMBER, 2013

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

LETTER OF APPROVAL

The thesis titled: "The practices and challenges of implementation of principals' Performance Appraisal in Secondary Schools of Metekel Zone" by Berehie Yigzaw has been approved for the degree of "Master of Arts in Educational Leadership."

Board of   Examiners

_____   _____   _____

Chairperson   Signature   Date

_____   _____   _____

 Main-Advisors   Signature   Date

_____   _____   _____

Co-Advisor   Signature   Date

_____   _____   _____

External examiner   Signature   Date

_____   _____   _____

 Internal   examiner   Signature   Date

_____   _____   _____

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all sources of the materials used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: Berhie Yigzaw

Signature _____

Date _____

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as advisor

Main- advisor: Ato Dessalegn Beyene

Signature   _____

Co- advisor: Ato Tadesse Abera

Signature   _____

Date of approved _____

Acknowledgement

First, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my advisors, Ato Dessalgn Beyene and Tadesse Abera, for their unreserved, critical and constructive comments. For sure, this thesis would have not been a reality had it not been for their encouragement and critical comments. Moreover, my profound thanks go to my family especially my beloved wife w/or, Yeshiwork Beyene, whose love, support and encouragement have been source of inspiration throughout my graduate study. Finally, I thank w/or Behabtwa Wondimu who had sacrificed her precious time in meticulously typing the thesis.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acronyms and abbreviations

CPD: Continuous Professional Development

EEOC: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

GEQIP: General Education Quality Improvement Package

MOE: Ministry of Education

PTA: Parent-Teacher-Association

PPA: Principal Performance Appraisal

SIP: School Improvement Program

Abstract

The major purpose of this research was to assess the practice of principals' performance appraisal in secondary schools of Metekel Zone and identify the major challenging problems. Performance appraisal is a critical task area of any organization including educational institutions. Ineffective performance appraisal can extremely harm both the organization and individuals. Despite considerable research on performance appraisal, there is dearth of research in the area in Metekel Zone, in particular, and Benishangule Gumuz National Regional State, in general. The research employed mixed design and used a survey method. Out of twelve secondary schools ten was selected by simple random sampling technique. Data for the study were collected though questionnaire, interview, focus group discussion and document analysis. Hundred questionnaires (20 for woreda supervisors and 80 for school department heads) were distributed. Questionnaires (18) distributed to woreda supervisors were returned whereas it is 77 questionnaires from the department heads. The result indicated that the appraisers were not satisfied with current principal performance appraisal instrument; there was no clear principal performance appraisal management system; appraisers had no adequate knowledge about principal performance appraisal; principal's performance appraisal is not only improperly practiced but also is ineffective. *Based on the result, it is, thus, recommended if :(1) the instruments of principal performance appraisal are changed and aligned with SIP and CPD;(2)the appraisal result is used for career structure, professional growth and competence instead of mere filling. (3) a 360^{0}-appraisal system is used for appraising principals; (4)appraisers give feedback after appraising secondary school principals; (5)need based training is given to principals; and (6)principals can actually participate in the teaching- learning process.*

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM AND ITS APPROACH

This part of the study deals with background of the study, statement of the problem, general and specific objectives, significance of the study, scope of the study, organization of the study, ethical consideration and operational definitions of key terms.

1.1 Background of the study

Social organizations are established to provide some kinds of services or products. In order to accomplish their mission, organizations require human and non-human resources among which the human ones are regarded as the most important because it is the people who manipulate all other resources.

Though people are the most important assets of an organization, the attainment of organization goals and objectives would not materialize unless organizations have the right sorts of people. While emphasizing this point, Schermerhorn (1989:255) writes, "Without proper human resources, even the best designed organization guided by well-made plans cannot achieve its true performance potential". This implies that organizations need to employ a variety of mechanisms to identify those individuals with better potential and performance and to ensure the attainment of their predetermined goals and objectives.

School systems, as social organizations, are made to exist to meet the political, economic and social needs of the society they serve. In this respect, principals are regarded, by many educationists as having the central and leading role in the successful operation of the teaching learning process. To mention some, Fiddler and Cooper (1992, p: 48) note that the principal is of critical importance to the school culture. Similarly, Healy (1994, p: 68) says, "Head teachers play a crucial role in creating the factors which affect the organizational heath of the school".

In supporting this Hattersely (1992, p: 1) further records "The quality of the principal's leadership is the most important single determinant of the success of a school…"

According to the aforementioned authorities, school principal play a pivotal role in the effective implementation of the schools' programs. Moreover, they are one of the influential persons in determining the quality of the instructional process of a given school. In general, principals are the most important figures in the success or failure of the overall school outcomes.

If the principals are to campout their responsibilities successfully, they need to be well motivated and understand what is expected of them. Besides, they need to be assisted, encouraged and inspired to bring about desired changes in their performance. For this to be effective, their performance evaluation ought to be explored and their strength and weakness be identified.

However, due to the principals' role multiplicity and the absence of clear methods of, appraising the performance of principals' is found to be the most difficult, sensitive, and challenging task (Fiddler, 1992, 134; Hattersely, 1992, p: 1 and Healy, 1994, p: 67).

A performance management system consists of the process used to identify, encourage, measure, evaluate, improve and reward principals' performance at work.

The term 'performance appraisal' has different definitions in different publications. The meaning and understanding of this term varies with the purpose it intended to serve, and the knowledge and understanding of individuals. Thus, for the sake of common understanding, some selected definitions of performance appraisal have been presented hereunder.

According to Prasad and Bannerjee (1985, p: 118), performance appraisal is "a systematic evaluation of an employee by some other qualified person who is familiar with the employee's performance." This implies that, for a performance appraisal system to be effective, it should be carried out by trained individuals who are knowledgeable about the nature of the work and the performance level of the appraisee.

In the words of Graham and Bennett (1990, p: 203), performance appraisal is "the judgment of an employee's performance in his job, based on considerations other than productivity alone." This definition indicates that the process of performance appraisal involves not measuring output but also considering the factors contributed to the performance of the employee.

Szilagyi (1981, p: 561) also defines the term as "the process of identifying, measuring, and developing human performance in organizations." This definition stresses the developmental aspect of performance appraisal.

Performance is the process of evaluating how well employees perform their jobs when compared to sets of standards and, then, commutating that information to those employees. Such appraisal also has been called employee rating, employee evaluation, performance review, performance evaluation and results appraisal.

As Aguinis (2007) defines, performance management is "a continuous process of identifying, measuring and developing the performance of individuals" He adds that this continuous capacity building needs clear objectives, observing and measuring performance and regular feedback. Performance management primarily focuses on its employees to develop their capabilities. It does not only do capacity building but also helps managers to sense earlier and respond more quickly to uncertain changes (Cokins, 2004). Performance management is neither a technique nor a single process, it can be considered as a set of process, or a concept, a holistic philosophy that includes motivation of employees to perform well, employees knowledge about what their managers expect of them, development of employees, monitoring and measuring performance in order to know what areas are to be improved (Wilson, 2005).

Bascal (1999) explains the essence of performance management an ongoing partnership between employee and supervisor with regard to major job functions, employees involvement in goals generation and discussion as to how both can work together to accomplish these goals. It also deals with performance measurement procedures, how the constraints can be solved in achieving organizational goals and how performance will be removed.

As to Armstrong (2005), "Performance management is a strategy which relates to every activity of an organization and its implementation depends on organizational context and can vary from organization to organization as well as from place to place". This indicates that organizations can practice either of many approaches in managing their performance based on their specific contexts. The major ones include:

1. Graphic rating scales which consists of leadership skills, communication, dependability, loyalty and creativity. Generally, this approach focuses on assessing employees' traits. The drawback of this system is it's ordinarily focus on personal characteristics of employees as indicator of job; traits are difficult to define and lead to different interpretations and it does not assess behavior and may not help in "developmental counseling" (Greer, 2001).

2. Another practice is Annual Confidential Report which is a comprehensive report written once in a year about the employee by his/her senior or supervisor for his or her responsible duties and performance in these duties. Audiences of these reports are not the employees but the senior management because on this report decisions are made whether the person should be promoted or not. This practice has such drawbacks as lack of employee participation of employee; absence of feedback about employee's performance which means no learning, no development. Also communication gap and personal biases could occur in this type of assessment (Stafylarakis, 2002).

3. On the other hand, organizations can use management by objective which focuses on manger's performance as a means of performance management. It is a way of continuous review of strategic goals of organization, allows clarifications of goals for managers that what to do, offers manager's involvement in job improvement plan, systematic review and measurement of performance and increasing the managers motivation by salary and succession plans. Critics say that MBO focuses on what is accomplished at the end but fail to notice the job behavior. Writers like Greer (2001), and Stafylarakis(2002) argue that the performance indicator, for how much hours training has been delivered by a trainer, gives no information about quality and effectiveness of training. It is not appropriate in situations where we need to know how the results are achieved.

4. The modern approach in managing employee performance is performance management system. Performance management system aims to create a high performance culture in which all members, managers or employee, takes responsibility for continuous improvement of business processes. It is a planned management process consisting of communication among all working groups, task agreement, cooperative work design, output assessment, feedback and positive reinforcement (Armstrong, 2006).

Performance management system approach believes that there are many other factors coupled with performance outcome. In this approach, managers can make, what they actually want dear from their staff or each individual so that autocratic style of management changes into democratic (Wilson, 2004).

Performance appriasal is much talked- about issue and a very much-dreaded things many managers and employees alike yet organations can not do with out it. Reseachers and experts in performance appriasal have suggested two broad uses of appriasal in organizations (Mc Gregor ,1997 ;Wexley,19991). First, it serves administrative purposes in areas like reward allocation (salary increases ,bonuses) and assignments decisions (promotions, transfers, demotion). Second, it aids in employees' devlopment as it makes possible the idenitification of their strengths and weaknesses provides performance feedback and facilitates communication between supervisors and employees. At present, there is no more Department of Inspection in our education system. And it has been replaced by Department of Educational Programs Supervision because of the new organizational structure of the MOE. Though a series of changes seems to have been introduced in our education system, nothing has been done concerning the appraisal of school principals. Until recently, unlike teachers, principals were not appraised on a regular basis. Different kinds of appraisal forms are also employed to appraise principals'. As far as the researcher's readings is concerned there is no a single study that focuses on the appraisal of school principals in general and that of secondary schools principals' in particular.

According to Jackson et al. (2009), performance appraisal system should be effective as a number of crucial decisions are made on the basis of score or rating given by the appraiser which, in turn, is heavily based on the appraisal system. In order for the appraisal system to be effective, it should provide consistent, reliable and valid information and data which can be used to defend the organization-even in legal challenges; its technique should measure the performance and provide information in job related activities/areas; its forms, procedures, administration of techniques, rating etc. should be standardized as appraisal decisions affect all principals of the group; the techniques should be practically viable to administer, possible to implement and economical regarding cost aspect; the appraisal should have compliance with the concerned legal provisions of the country and its interviews should permit both parties to learn about the gaps and prepare themselves for future.

To this end, their supervisors should clearly explain their performance expectations to their subordinates well ahead of the appraisal period. Once this is known, it becomes easy for employees to learn about the yardsticks and, if possible, try to improve their performance in the future. In addition, employees should know and receive adequate feedback on their performance and individuals who conduct principals' performance appraisal should be skilled in appraising performance and should have pre-planned activities.

1.2 The Study Area

This study will be conducted in ten secondary schools selected from four woredas of Metekel Zone of Benishangul Gumuz Regional State. Metekel Zone is one of the three Zones in Benishangul Gumuz Regional State of Ethiopia. It is bordered by Kamashi Zone in the South, Asosa Zone in the South West, Sudan in the West and Amhara Region in the North and North East. The Zone comprises of seven woredas. In these seven woredas there are 18 secondary schools, 18 principals, 17, deputy principals and 445 teachers. The town of the zone is Giligel Belese which is 547 k. away from Addis Ababa. Based on the CSA report of 2007, this zone has a total population of 276,367 of which 139,119 are men and 137,248 women. 13.61% of populations are urban inhabitants. The five largest ethnic groups inhabiting the zone are Shinasha(21.6%), Amhara(17.39%), Awi(11.33%), Oromo(11.09) and other ethnic groups (1.81%).

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Researches over the past 30 years clearly demonstrate that principals are important catalysts for shaping school improvements, creating lasting foundations for student learning and accelerating teacher effectiveness. The Wallace Foundation report shows that 95,000 public school principals influence 3 million teachers and 55 million students, pre-K through grade 12, and are pivotal to ensuring that all students achieve. However, the researches to date on principal evaluation suggest that many state and district evaluations do not reflect existing principal standards or proven practices, and many principal evaluation instruments are neither technically sound nor useful for improving principal performance despite the proven importance of the principal to school and student success. An even greater concern is that many principals and deputy principals are never

formally evaluated in any meaningful way. From, (1904, Association Drive Reston, Virginia 20191 1-800-253-7746).

By default, many states and districts began to use student test scores as a way of evaluating principals. But these measures taken alone can seriously distort realities and are woefully insufficient for providing principals and vice principals the information they need to improve their work and their schools. States and districts are encouraged to avoid an over-reliance on standardized test scores of student achievement in favor of multiple measures designed to encompass the entirety of a student's learning experience. The research on principal evaluation is surprisingly thin. From, (1904, Association Drive Reston, Virginia 20191 1-800-253-7746).

As Wossenu Yimam (2007), finding showed that the current principals' performance appraisal in technical and vocational schools did not include. This research tries to access whether or not the current parasail criteria include secondary schools.Moreover this finding did not showed the alignment of the current principal performance appraisal criteria with decision making, promotion rewards and professional competence of principals. So this research would fill these gaps.

The general science - practice gap is particularly evident in the area of performance appraisal in many schools. Moreover, when we see the practice of principals' performance appraisal in secondary schools of our country, including secondary schools of Metekel Zone of Benishangul Gumuz Regional State, due to the researcher's practical observation it is wrongly practiced because the method and criteria's use in our woreda is different from other woreda, even in some woreda the principals are not appraised and not promoted. That is, the appraisal process is not pre- planned, school principals 'appraisal results are not used for professional development of principals', appraisers are not skillful, there is no practice of giving feedback after appraisal has been conducted, the appraisal system is not formally structured and ,as a result, appraisees are usually reluctant to accept their appraisal results. Even, in many schools, it is the source of principal-supervisor conflicts.

Currently, this system of appraising the performance of principals is operating at all level of our education systems. Secondary schools, being one segment of the education system, are also

implementing the appraisal system. Accordingly, school principals are being appraised by students, department heads, (PTA) and woreda supervisors.

The major purpose of this study will, therefore be examining the current practices of school principals' performance appraisal with focus on the appraisal criteria or the appraisal system, i.e. its purpose, the appraisal criteria employed and the competence of the persons involved in appraising of the principals performance in secondary schools. The study also attempts to identify the major problems encountered in the appraisal process and recommend possible solutions to address them.

In order to address this problem, the following basic questions were entertained.

1. Who appraise principals?
2. Are appraisers aware of the purpose of appraising principals?
3. Are there criteria for appraising school principals' performance appraisal?
4. Are the criteria relevant to duties and responsibilities' of principals?
5. Do criteria align with the goals of the school organization?
6. How is the appraisal process conducted?
7. How frequently are principals appraised?
8. What are the major challenges in school principals' performance appraisal?

1.4 Objectives of the study

1.4.1 General Objective of the Study

The overall objective of this study would be to assess principals' performance appraisal and identify the major challenges in this practice in secondary schools of Metekel Zone.

1.4.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study are:

1. Assessing the current practice of school principals' performance appraisal.
2. Assessing the purpose of school principals' performance appraisal.
3. Assessing how frequent principals' appraisal process conducted.
4. To assess the opinion of principals as to who should assess their performance appraisal.

5. Identifying challenges and problems of principals performance appraisal and suggesting how the challenges be addressed.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The findings of the study are believed to have the following benefits.

1. Since the study on principals' performance appraisal was not given attention, this study would help information on the current practice principals' performance appraisal.
2. The study is also expected to pinpoint the major problems of the appraisal system so that the concerned authorities can take timely measures to alleviate them.
3. It may provide necessary recommendation for improving the system of principals' performance appraisal.
4. It may help woreda supervisors and other responsible officers to be well aware of the practice of principals performance appraisal and understand challenges that stand against effective implementation
5. It may provide important information to policy makers so that they would further revise and develop appropriate appraisal procedures and criteria.
6. It may help all concerned stakeholders to recognize the strength and weakness of the current principals' performance appraisal.

1.6 The scope of the Study

According to Seyoum and Ayalew, 1999 "To carry out any research work, it should be important to delimit the study both conceptually and geographically to manageable size". In this view, the research will be delimited in both geographically and conceptually. Regarding to the concept the research focuses only on the systems of appraising the performance of principals in government secondary schools. The study will also be delimited to investigating the appraisal system by taking its purpose, the appraisal criteria employed, and the competence of the appraisers as a frame of reference because this concepts are the main and necessary to make principals effective in their work. Similarly the research delimited geographically in Metekel Zone secondary schools. Hence the result will be generalized only for secondary schools out including neighbor regional secondary schools. Delimitation has been made because the research will not be manageable if all the component of the appraisal system and all the schools are included.

1.7 Operational of Terms

The following terms are used throughout this study as operationally defined here under.

Appraisees: secondary school principals and vice principals whose performance is subject to appraisal.

Appraiser: woreda, zonal education officers, supervisors teachers/ department head, students and parents /Parent-teacher-association members.

Competence: ability to apply practical situations the essential principals and techniques of a particular subject-matter filed.(Good, 1973:121).

Performance management: set of process or a concept a holistic philosophy that include motivation of employees', knowledge about what their managers expect of them, development of employees, monitoring and measuring performance in order to know what areas are to be improved (Aslam, 2010:1).

Performance evaluation: the process of monitoring activates to ensure that they are being accomplished as planned and correcting any significant deviations (AdaneTesera el. At, 2000:156).

Performance appraisal: is a method by which the job performance of an employee is evaluated generally in terms of quality, cost and time typically the corresponding manager or supervisor. (Jackson et. al, 2009).

Secondary school Principal: the formally appointed executive, head of a secondary school.

Secondary school: school of two year duration that is form 9th -10th which will enable the students to identify their interest for further education for specific training and for the world of work (MOE. 1994:14).

School principal professional standard: is the broad category of principals' knowledge and skills. It is overarching goals and themes that provide a framework for what principals should know and be able to do and indicates the level of performance required for the successful achievement of work expectations.

Unit of competence: is a coherent and explicit grouping of performance specifications within a qualification, which involves the application of knowledge, skills and ability required in the workplace. A unit of competence is an assessable achievement in terms of outcomes based on a particular work function that focuses on what people are expected to perform (duties and tasks).

Performance Criteria*:* are observable and measurable statements to serve as tools in discussions of principals' skills and knowledge. Performance criteria specify what is to be assessed and the required level of performance. It is here that the activities, skills, knowledge and understanding which provide the evidence of competent performance are specified. Performance criteria contain an outcome and a standard of performance. Each element is accompanied by a number of performance criteria.

1.8 Limitation of the Study

It is obvious that research works cannot be totally free from limitations. Due to this reality one pertinent limitation which the researcher faced while conducting this research was lack of local related literatures in the area which are written in Ethiopian case. In addition, lack of policy manuals and guides which clearly describe the roles and responsibilities of principals performance appraisers in Ethiopian case. Due to this reason the researcher was forced to see principal's performance appraisal practice in global perspectives.

1.9 Organization of the Study

This study consisted of five chapters. The first chapter has deal with background of the study, statement of the problem, objective, significance, limitation, as well as delimitation of the study and definition of key terms. The second chapter presented review of relevant literature. The third chapter was about design and methodology which consisted the source of data, the study population sample size and sampling technique, procedures of data collection, data gathering tools as well as data analysis. The fourth chapter was deal with data presentation, analysis and interpretation. The fifth chapter incorporated the summary, conclusion and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter assesses relevant literature on the general concepts of performance appraisal, purposes, performance management, purposes, features, roles of principals, Performance process and methods of principals' performance appraisal, participants in Principals performance appraisal (PPA), the prevailing challenges in rating principal performance, strategies to overcome rating errors and ethical issues in principals performance appraisal(PPA).

2.1 Concept of Performance Management

As everyone knows, organizations are established for accomplishment of some intended goals. In line with this,Robets (2003) states that organizations are associates of persons grouped together around the pursuit of specific goals. They are social units deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals. As organizations are existent for achievement of some specific goals, one major and critical aspect that managers of any organization should do in order to be successful in achieving their goals is conducting performance management. If performance management is very important program of organizations, what is performance management by itself?

Different scholars described the term 'performance management' in different ways but with the same concept. Performance management, according to Jacksonetal.,(2009), is formal structured process used to measure, evaluate and influence employees' job related attitudes, behaviours and performance results. Performance management helps to direct and motivate employees to maximize their efforts on behalf of their organization. According to these scholars performance management is concerned not only with the performance of individuals but also the performance of team and organization.

Another scholar, named Ivancevich (2009:251) defines performance management as ''a process by which executive managers and supervisors work to align employee performance with the organization's goals.'' Here, it seems that performance management in schools is the process through which school leaders ensure teachers' activities and outputs contributing to achievement of school goals. Performance management in school is the component of human resource management which is concerned with managing the school staff and their performance. Hence, performance

should be basically a shared process between school leaders and work teams among whom objectives are agreed and jointly reviewed.

According to Noe, et al., (2009), effective performance management can tell top performances that they are valued, encourage communication between managers and their employees, establish uniform standards for evaluating employees and help organization to identify its strongest and weakest performances. From this, in school context, it is possible to say that meaningful school performance management helps school leaders to create shared understanding among staff especially teachers about what, how, and why they are going to perform school tasks and evaluate their performance levels all the time. In addition, it enables school leaders and teachers to know what activities and outputs are desired, identify what has occurred and provide feedback based on the observed results.

2.2 Purposes of Performance Management

As one can understand from the definitions given above, performance management is a purposeful process which involves several activities such as defining and measuring performance and providing feedback about performance information. According to Noe et al. (2009: 216), organizations establish performance management systems to meet three purposes. These are strategic, administrative and developmental purposes.

2.2.1 Strategic Purpose:

Effective performance management helps the organization to achieve its goals and objectives. It does this by helping employees to link their behavior with their organizational goals. This is because performance management starts with defining what organization expects from each employee and it measures each employee's performance to identify whether these expectations are met or not. This enables organizations to take corrective actions such as training, providing incentives and taking disciplinary actions. Performance management can achieve its strategic purposes only when performance measurements are truly linked to the organizational goals and when the goals and performance feedback are communicated to employees.

2.2.2 Administrative Purpose

The administrative purpose of performance management system refers to the ways in which organizations use the system to provide information for day-to- day decisions about salary, benefits and recognition programs of the organization. It can also support decision making related to employee retention, termination for poor behavior and hiring or layoffs. This is because performance management supports the administrative decisions since information in performance appraisal can have a great impact on the future of individual employee. For example, in the case of Ethiopian schools, teachers' career development is accomplished based on their performance evaluation results.

2.2.3 Developmental Purpose

Performance management serves as basis for developing employees' knowledge and skill. Even employees who are meeting expectations can become more valuable when they hear and discuss about their performance feedback. Effective performance management makes employees aware of their strength and the areas in which they can improve. Although discussing weakness may make one uncomfortable, it is necessary when performance management has a developmental purpose.

As Harris (1997) justifies, organizations use performance management for human resource decisions such as pay increase, promotion and termination of ineffective employees; providing feedback to and development of employees based on evaluation result; designing and evaluating of various human resource management systems such as training programs and human resource planning as well as documentation of personnel decisions.

Whatever the purpose is, all the programs of performance management are important for human resource management of a given organization. Hence, implementing effective performance management systems should take considerable time and effort throughout the process.

While emphasising this point, Jackson et al. (2009:246) state, Performance management seeks to find ways to get the best performance from all the concerned by motivating employees to achieve organizational objectives. Hence, it should be well coordinated and organized throughout its process.

Based on the above explanation, in school case, it must also remembered that performance management system seeks to get the best from teachers and other non-academic staff as it is a way

to motivate them to perform better by addressing ways of integrating teachers into the workforce and ensuring that they are aware of the contribution that they make towards achieving the school strategic objectives. In addition, it provides ways of dealing with poor performance in their daily instructional tasks.

2.3 Typical Features of Performance Management

As it is possible to understand from the descriptions given above, generally performance management is a process which creates shared understanding about what needs to be achieved and managing as well as developing employee in a way which will facilitate the excellent communication in all directions which, in turn, fosters employee involvement in organizational goal achievement. Based on its critical importance for organizations and employees, Foot and Hook (1999), identified the following major typical features of effective performance management system:

a. *Clear Links with Organizational Objectives:* The objectives of work group and individuals are derived from organization's strategic objectives. Hence, such work groups and individuals should clearly see what they have to do to make their contribution to the organization's overall effectiveness. The objectives need to be clear and measurable as well as should be agreed upon after discussion between the team, individuals and the manager. Both good communication and involvement are extremely important aspects as organization's objectives and mission need to be clearly communicated to all employees in order that they can participate in setting objectives and contribute to the fulfilment of organization's objectives. In addition to top-bottom communication, bottom up and lateral communications are very important.

b. *Clear Links with Job Descriptions:* In any organization, including schools, individuals should have clear job descriptions which they have had agreed and reviewed regularly as the job changes. From this, it is possible to say that in effective performance management, the job descriptions are reviewed regularly and are also agreed upon between the subordinates and the manager.

c. ***Objective Assessment Process:*** The objectives for the individual and the team, which are derived from the organization's strategic objective, will be jointly devised by the appraiser and appraise and should have clear and measurable intended contribution for the achievement of goals. Management by objectives approach to performance evaluation will fit easily with this framework. The assessment process is not just top-down approach but increasingly uses assessment of managers by their subordinate's 360° assessment.

d. ***Individual Development Plans:*** Each individual will have an individual development plan which is designed to give detailed goals and provide for activities to enable that individual to achieve his or her goals. This is jointly designed by the manager and employee. The manager will provide support and coaching to help employee to meet his/ her goals. This relates very closely to the idea of the organization being a learning organization where everyone is encouraged to learn.

e. ***On-going Assessment:*** In effective performance management, the evaluation of the performance level of individuals, teams and the organization as the whole undertakes on a more frequent basis by involving managers, individuals and teams. The major intention of continuous assessment is to motivate employees and help them focus on developmental issues. This idea also clearly relates to the idea of learning organization and continuous development for individuals and teams. In order for this to happen, communication is extremely important and organizational culture should be such that encourages feeling of openness and trust among employees.

f. ***Links between Assessment and Pay:*** In effective performance management system, the annual performance appraisal is often linked with pay and is intended toward those who have done well in meeting their objectives. In practice, relating assessment to pay suffers in that there is a potential conflict between the need for employees to talk frankly about their performance and reluctance to do so because it would jeopardise their pay award.

Generally, whatever the purpose is, performance management decisions should be made based on effective and efficient performance evaluation and appraisal of the organization as the whole and individual employees.

2.4 General Concept of Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal, in general, is a continuous process through which performance of employees is identified, measured and improved in the organization. This process includes various practices like recognition of employees' achievements, providing them regular feedback and offering career development (Aguinis, 2007). In supporting this idea, Roberts (2003) states that performance appraisal is neither a technique nor a single step process; it can be considered as a set of process that includes knowledge of employees about what their managers expect of them, their motivation to perform well, mentoring and evaluation of their performance aimed at identifying areas where the improvements are needed. Principals' performance appraisal, consequently is process of evaluating teachers' worth or quality in terms of requirements set by government, in general, and schools in particular. It is the process whereby the strength and limitations of principals' on their practice is identified. In view of this, Mani (2002) describes principal performance appraisal as a structured formal interaction between a principal and supervisors which usually takes the form of a periodic interview in which the performance of the principal is examined and discussed. It has the purpose to identify weaknesses and strengths as well as opportunities for improvement and skills development of principal. Performance appraisal of principals is necessary to understand each principal's abilities, competencies and to measure the performance of the principals and evaluate their contribution towards the school goals. It helps to align the individual performances with the school goals and also review their performance. Performance appraisal of principals takes into account the past performance of the principals and focuses on the improvement of the future performance (Ibid).

In larger context of school improvement, principal performance appraisal system provides principals and teachers with processes and procedures that can help them to bring about improvements in teaching and learning. The appraisal process can also promote the collaboration and relationship building essential to create and sustain an effective learning community. It is especially important to see the appraisal system as a supportive and effective way of helping principals grow and develop as confident, proficient teachers (Namuddu, 2005).

As the most significant resource in schools, principals are critical to raise education standards. Improving the efficiency and equity of schooling depends on ensuring that principals are highly

skilled, well-resourced and motivated to perform at their best. Raising teaching performance is perhaps the policy direction most likely to lead to substantial gains in student learning. For this purpose, the effective monitoring and evaluation of teaching is central to the continuous improvement of teaching and learning in a school. It is essential to know the strengths of principals and those aspects of their practice which could be further developed. From this perspective, the institution of principal evaluation is a vital step in the drive to improve the effectiveness of teaching and learning and raise educational standards (OECD, 2009). Meaningful principal evaluation involves an accurate appraisal of the effectiveness of teaching, its strengths and areas for development, followed by feedback, coaching, support and opportunities for professional development. It is also essential to celebrate, recognize and reward the work of principals. The great majority of teachers' interest shows that the appraisal and feedback they receive should be beneficial, fair and helpful for their development as principals (Ibid).

Although performance appraisals are an integral part of organizations, it is important not to become complacent with the process. The process needs to be evaluated continuously due to underlying issues that may occur if appraisals are not conducted properly. In this chapter   several bodies of literature were reviewed with specific attention given to the fairness of appraisals. The main focus was on literature that indicated whether performance appraisals are being administered in an equitable manner among all employees. As Patten (1982) suggested, performance appraisals should focus on what the employee does rather than on individual traits. Specific attention was given to the process of appraisals that involves guiding the individual employee to improved future performance and to personal development of skills and capabilities. Additionally, the process of appraisals focused on planning centered on the stated job requirements, judgment by the manager as the appraiser and a discussion between manager and employee. Finally, attention was given to the effectiveness of appraisals centered on opinions as to whether performance appraisals are biased, whether different approaches other than graphic rating scales are needed, and whether appraisals should be eliminated altogether.

2.4.1 Perspectives in Principal Performance Appraisal

According to McKirchy (1998), there are four types of performance appraisal systems: self-directed work teams, peer appraisal systems, self-rating systems combined with formal performance appraisal, and other performance systems.

In the self-directed work team model, the performance appraisal is the primary vehicle for communicating business strategy to employees (McKirchy, 1998). According to McKirchy, each team has a family of critical measures linked to measures of performance that, in turn, constitute the overall business strategy. In this type of system, measures are revised annually and fall into the following groups: quality, financial, timeliness, and productivity/efficiency (McKirchy, 1998). "Associated with each measure are three criteria: a long-term goal, short-term goals, and the minimum standards of performance" (McKirchy, 1998, p: 32).

According to McKirchy, the self-directed work team system allows organizations to conduct short, ongoing, informal reviews, as well as formal quarterly reviews. Thus, it provides the freedom to structure the review in light of individual and team needs (McKirchy, 1998)."It is not just a paper work exercise but realongoing communication with no once a year surprises" (McKirchy, 1998, p:33). Therefore, possible legal ramifications can be avoided. McKirchy also discussed peer appraisal systems. In this type of appraisal system, his or her peers review the employee. "Feedback is collected from team members, compiled by the appraiser, and used in combination with a more traditional appraisal form" (McKirchy, 1998,p: 33).The advantages to this process are a well-rounded view of performance that can be gained by combining a variety of perspectives. It also builds peer accountability (McKirchy, 1998). The disadvantages of this system are the veracity and required commitment of employees as well as the time it takes to help employee's feel good about the process (McKirchy, 1998).

Another system McKirchy discussed is self-rating systems combined with formal performance appraisal. This type system creates a participative approach to the traditional appraisal method (McKirchy, 1998). Accordingly, employees rate their performance and then review it with the supervisor. This system gives the supervisor the flexibility of changing the rating to reflect the true situation if the employee has rated himself or herself too high or too low. Thus, responsibility for

performance appraisal is delegated to the employee and the supervisor's role truly becomes that of counselor, teacher, and coach (McKirchy, 1998, p: 35).

King (1984) states that because performance appraisal has been based largely on subjective ratings and personality traits, not job-related criteria, over the past ten years appraisals have increasingly become the target of federal regulation. "Since appraisals are often used to make decisions about promotions and transfers, they are considered a test and are subject to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) guidelines. Consequently, appraisals used in decision-making need to be fair.

According to Smither (1998), performance appraisals are central to disputes that arise after an employment relationship has been established. Nevertheless, Simmons (2003) argued that performance reviews often conflict with relationship management. Furthermore, Simmons said negative feedback does not motivate, and ignoring subjective elements in reviews can undermine employees' attitudes. Nevertheless, Simmons said this primary tool performance appraisal, designed to improve performance can, and often does, create the opposite of the desired and intended result.

"Performance and other ratings are used to select present employees for merit pay, promotion or termination"(Smither, 1998, p:50). Thus, the need for organizations to implement effective performance appraisal systems is not to be overlooked. It seems to be a consensus among most researchers that performance appraisals reflect actual job duty. According to King, the law requires that performance appraisal be:
   - Job-related and valid
   - Based on a thorough job analysis
   - Standardized for all employees
   - Not biased against any race, color, sex, religion, or nationality
   - Not based of subjective or vague criteria
   - Performed by people who have adequate knowledge of the person and the job. Performance appraisals like any other measurement tools need to be valid.

"Basically performance appraisal system is valid if the school using it can demonstrate that the system accurately measures job-related performance criteria" (King, 1984, p:146). Likewise, Fletcher (2004) argues that appraisals should envelop an organization's own practice philosophy. This is in agreement with Patten (1982) who also talked about the validity of job descriptions.

Patten (1982) makes similar assertions as King about job descriptions. According to Patten, job descriptions that are based upon "half-baked" job analyses are likely to come under governmental scrutiny in the event of an EEO lawsuit. Thus, Patten believes it behooves management to analyze the tasks and duties it considers integral in job content and to evaluate principals' job performance on the basis of an adequate and realistic understanding of what the job entails. Like Smither, Patten said more and more employees resent and resist performance appraisals that are based on unclear job duties that were never intended to be included in the job in the first place.

Poor performance appraisals, along with other business decisions that might make principals unhappy, are not necessarily considered adverse actions. "Courts generally look at whether the action at issue is a 'tangible employment action' that amounts to 'significant change in employment status, such as hiring, firing, failing to promote, reassignment with significantly different responsibilities, or a decision causing a significant change in benefits" (Armstrong and Appelbaum, 2003, p: 149).

Although Patten acknowledged that human resources professionals are charged to maintain the overall job evaluation and performance review systems as systems, he also said that managers play an important role in the performance appraisal process. Accordingly, managers must bring changes to the attention of human resources professionals. If this occurs, human resources professionals can then audit the appropriateness of the job description for the work actually being performed by principals. "Unfortunately, orderly and methodical audits of the validity of job descriptions are rare indeed in American industry, except in unionized settings where the union typically policies such descriptions carefully" (Patten, 1982, p: 38).

Accordingly, King said a legal performance appraisal system also makes sure that the emphasis given any job-related criterion is appropriate-that employer's do notemphasize any particular job

requirement. Unfortunately, most companies do not validate their appraisal systems statistically, but, rather, rely on content validity or fate by having systems that are subjective and impossible to defend (King, 1984).

The emphasis placed on the legalities of performance appraisals has made management more responsible. "Ironically, as our society hunts its way through the legal morass that surrounds appraisals, it also is learning more about how appraisals can be constructively used" (Mohrman, Resnick-West, & Lawler, 1989, p:160). Nevertheless, Mohrman et al. highlighted the fact that appraisal systems come under scrutiny in both employment discrimination and wrongful termination litigation. Additionally, appraisal systems contribute to the implied contract that employers have with their employees.

2.4.2   The Process of Appraisal

Similar to the beliefs of many other researchers, Walker (1980) believed a major purpose of performance appraisal is to motivate and to guide the individual employee toward improved future performance and purposeful personal development of skills and capabilities. According to Walker, this is the sole purpose of appraisal to some managers. Walker believed there are four keys to effective planning and review for individual performance and development.

1. Clearly stated job requirements or performance criteria
2. Employee self-review of performance, interests, goals and plans
3. Independent judgment by the manager as appraiser, using available indicator sand measures of actual performance
4. Discussion between the manager and the employee, comparing the results of their independent reviews and developing together a mutually agreeable review of past accomplishments and a plan for future activities and targeted accomplishments.(Walker, 1980, p: 209).

Furthermore, Walker believed without any one of these four key components, the process of mutually discussing and planning performance progress breaks down. In addition, Walker felt effective developmental appraisal is a job oriented, mutually shared, discussion-based planning activity. "Whereas in performance evaluation the responsibility rests primarily with the appraising manager, the responsibility in the development process rests on both the employee and the manager"(Walker, 1980, p: 209). Consequently, this shift in roles, of course, is often difficult for

both employees and managers to adjust to and represents a major obstacle to effective performance and development planning (Walker, 1980).Moreover, Walker advocated giving employees a worksheet in advance that maybe used as a self-analysis tool in advance of the review discussion. This is also a useful starting point in conducting the performance review discussion (Walker, 1980).

Thus, the worksheet is a planning tool, and includes a heavy dose of goal setting as an inherent technique. "It can be as quantitative as the job and relevant performance measures allow; it may be tailored to fit the circumstances of particular types of jobs or employee skills" (Walker, 1980, p: 213). Furthermore, the use of the worksheet also communicates to employees a company commitment to disclosure about performance appraisal information, while not necessarily limiting the objectivity of formal performance evaluations submitted by managers (Walker, 1980).There are several researchers like Bacal (1999) and Randi, Toler, and Sachs (1992) who argued that managers and employees should discuss the evaluation process constructively. According to Walker, the purpose should be to clarify, to motivate, and direct. This, according to Walker, limits the need for any unilateral communication of appraisal results or any direct discussion of pay actions as they relate to appraisals. "The mutual discussion should eliminate the potential of surprises later in the year when compensation changes are communicated or other personnel actions are taken which relate to performance (terminations, transfers, training, etc.)" (Walker, 1980, p:213).According to Covey (1992) in a win-win agreement, people evaluate themselves." Since they have a clear, up-front understanding of what results are expected and what criteria are used to assess their performance, they are in the best position to evaluate themselves" (Covey, 1992, p: 196). Covey also said that the old notion in which the manager evaluates the performance of principals, sometimes using a secret set of subjective criteria that he/she springs on them at the end of a specified work period. Such a method, is insulting to people, and often negatively impacts the manager's appraisal.

Thus, unless expectations are clarified and commitments are initially, people can expect performance appraisals to be difficult, embarrassing, and sometimes downright insulting (Covey, 1992).According to Covey, in a win-win wherein everyone involved in a situation wins, a manager's attitude is helpful not judgmental. The manager identifies himself as a resource. Thus, a manager should be a trainer and a counselor and should involve people in establishing the win-win

agreement (Covey, 1992). The manager also allows employees to evaluate their performance. "If the trust level is high, the employee's evaluation will be more accurate, more complete, more honest, than the manager's evaluation ever could be, because the person knows all the conditions and the details" (Covey, 1992, p: 196).Finally, it is up to the manager to follow-up on changing trends in the original performance appraisal agreement and to re-open the agreement for rethinking, preplanning, and reformulation (Covey, 1992).

2.4.3   Effective Appraisals

The literature reflects various opinions on the issue of performance appraisals: some argue that they are biased, some arguethat for different approaches than graphic rating scales, and some that argue that for the elimination of performance appraisals altogether. Maddux (1986, 1987) compared performance appraisal to that of a baseball game. According to this writer, every session requires a team effort and a game plan; Winning depends on how well the team has prepared.Players need a turn at bat.

Four basic essential needs to be covered in each meeting to achieve maximum results.(Maddux 1986, 1987, p: 22).According to Maddux, during the appraisal process, one gets to first base with solid preparation; makes it to second base when both parties freely communicate key aspects of job performance; arrives at third when the parties agree on objectives and summarize the agreements; and scores when post appraisal follow-up reflects a job well done by both parties.

Additionally, employee preparation is a major ingredient in Maddux's plan. Furthermore, the appraisal discussion should be a structured and planned interpersonal meeting, not a casual conversation; a specific time, agreeable to both parties should be reserved; topics for discussion should be known in advance so the participants can prepare accordingly (Maddux, 1986, 1987).

The benefits of a productive appraisal are enormous. According to Sachs, most managers dread giving performance reviews because they feel obligated to do most of the talking. Sachs, like Maddux, did not believe this is the appropriate method to follow. The appraisal process should involve two-way communication between the manager and the employee. The manager, in addition to giving his or her opinions about the employee's past performance and future potential, should listen carefully to what the employee has to say" (Sachs, 1992, p: 6). Therefore, a manager would

actually make decisions about future assignments and goals based on what both he or she and the employee decide together.

Goal setting after each appraisal is important because it keeps employees interested in their jobs and gives them a sense of purpose and worth. When goal setting is done in concession with the employee, it adds value to the process. "Establishing performance standards or expectations and assessing actual performance against standards or expectations is an important part of the supervisory role. Employees need to understand what is expected of them in all aspects of their work. They must also understand that performance assessment is a continuous process, and the distribution of reward is a function of actual performance" (Imundo, 1980, p: 184).Imundo (1980) said that principals are motivated to seek rewards that are meaningful to them. In comparison to similar type researchers, Imundobelieves principals will plan, organize, direct, and adjust their behavior in ways to obtain such rewards. However, this does not necessarily mean that their behavior is logical or even rational. This is due to the fact that behavior is subject to perceptual distortion, incomplete information, inaccurate information, and emotions (Imundo, 1980).Like other researchers, Imundo said people want to believe that the ways they behave are right and seek to rationalize their behavior.

"In the absence of feedback as to whether their behavior is right or wrong, proficient or inefficient employees, from their perspectives will conclude that what they have been doing is right and that they have been doing it well" (Imundo, 1980, p: 185). Imundo demonstrated that the need for feedback in the appraisal process is very important. Consequently, Imundo said people expect to be rewarded by the organization for their behavior and if suddenly told that their behavior is wrong, that their accomplishments are unacceptable, and that their rewards will not be forthcoming, problems will occur.

Additionally, Imundo argued that behavioral research shows that there are only a few high achievers in organizations and that most employees do not continually try to improve their job performance. "The large majority of employees who are not high achievers are influenced by a variety of factors which affect their aspirations, goals, needs and job performance"(Imundo, 1980, p:185). Accordingly, peer pressure is a significant factor that influences employees, and unless

supervisors establish and communicate performance standards, employees will be influenced by others to establish their own performance standards (Imundo, 1980). Generally, an employee's standard for performance is lower than the organization's standards or expectations (Imundo, 1980).Thus, Imundo believes performance must be assessed, feedback given, corrective action taken when necessary, and rewards given to employees whose performance meets or exceeds standards or expectations. Imundo also agreed with other researchers that most organizations do not properly assess employees. When developing performance appraisal systems, managers need to be aware of the needs of the individual. According to Adair (1983) individual needs are especially important in relation to motivation, which is closely connected with leadership.

2.5 The Purposes of Performance Appraisal

In the design of a performance appraisal scheme, identifying and determining its purposes is the most crucial step because, as Turner and Clift (1988: 59) cited, "The success of an appraisal scheme has to be judged in terms of how far it achieves the purpose or purposes for which it was established." Authorities in the field of Human Resource Management have identified a variety of purposes which they believe a system of performance appraisal should serve. To mention some, Szilagyi (1981:584), cites the following purposes: identifying training needs; providing information for selection, placement, and termination decisions; and providing information for reward allocation. According to Megginson, (1981:311-313), there are two general purposes of performance appraisal. First, it can be used for making administrative decisions such as selecting employees for transfers, promotions, and demotions; determining employees' training needs; offering merit salary adjustments; etc. Second, it can be used for development purposes in that it provides employees with information about the performance expectations of their employers; feedback concerning subsequent performance; etc. Moreover, as pointed out by Turner and Clift (1988:59), appraisal systems are designed to achieve:

(a) **Formative purposes** which focus on professional development, the improvement of practice by identifying strengths, weaknesses, needs, and interests; and

(b) **Summative purposes** which emphasize the selection, promotion, redeployment and dismissal of the appraisees. Stoner and Freeman (1989:349), also enumerate the purposes of systematic performance appraisal as follows:

     1. to identify those employees who deserve merit raise

2. to locate those employees who need additional training,

3. to identify those employees who deserve promotion.

Moreover, Randell, Packard, and Slater (1984:32), consider appraisal as primarily serving the purpose of improving the performance of employees in their current jobs.

To Graham and Bennett, (1990:203), the principal purposes of appraisal are:

a. To help an employer decide what pay raises shall be granted on grounds of merit, and

b. To motivate employees to work better in their present job by providing them with information about performance results, recognition of their contributions and the opportunity to discuss their work with their employer. Furthermore, as Torrington, Weight man, and Johns (1989:312), pointed out, organizations seek to appraise the performance of their employees for the purposes of confirming the authority of supervisors, and increasing the utilization of human resources. Rue and Byars (1990:208), also cited the provision of employee performance record, which is useful for future management decisions, as one of the major purposes of performance appraisal. Similarly, Lyons (1985:190) noted that performance appraisal serves the purpose of providing data for the organization regarding managerial resources and manpower planning. Dessler (1982:212) , on his part, indicated that performance appraisal is carried out to fulfill:

c. a control function which focuses on the identification of specific strengths and weaknesses of each employee and (if necessary) to take corrective measures for the weaknesses.

d. a feedback function which provides both the employer and the employee with information concerning the level of performance of the employee.

e. a reward function which focuses on the provision of material and/or financial rewards to the employee so as to motivate him/her for better performance.

In addition to what the aforementioned authorities have cited, Wyatt (1989:80), thinks that the purpose of performance appraisal should include the creation of improved relationships and communications with employees. In the school situation, performance appraisal is an activity which is crucial to the effective management of the teaching-learning environment. Hence, the major purpose of performance appraisal as Mathias and Jones (1989:3), noted is to enrich the educational opportunities of students through the professional development of principals, teachers, and other

staff members, thus leading to both organizational and personal growth. Similarly, Lindahl(1986:231) stated that, lithe true value of the system ...helps principals to identify areas for growth and improvement, ...and provides the necessary support to make their efforts successful.

Hattersley (1992:38), further noted that the purposes of appraising principals' performance can be seen, on the one hand, as a means of developing and counseling principals and, on the other hand, as a method of checking on principals for demotion, redeployment, or sacking. Based on a study of appraisal practices in Oregon, Duke and Stiggins (1985:88), found out the following as the most important purposes of appraising the performance of principals: promoting the professional development of principals, improving students' performance, ensuring uniform practices among principals, providing public accountability, and providing evidence needed to remove incompetent principals. In general, these are the purposes of performance appraisal which apply to personnel in education as well as in other sectors. It should be noted that the purposes of the appraisal scheme determine the nature and content of the appraisal criteria and the appraisal process. Thus from the outset, due regard should be given to the identification and determination of the purposes of the appraisal scheme. Having seen what performance appraisal is all about and the purposes for which it is established, the next task would be to deal with performance criteria.

2.6 Historical Overview of the Roles of Principals

Educational administrators who manage elementary, middle, and secondary schools are called principals. They are primary leaders in a school (Meador, 2011). The role of principal has evolved and changed over the last 150 years (Sergiovani et al, 2003). The role of the school principal in the traditional school was viewed as that of a manager or administrator (Pretorius cited in Botha, 2004).Traditionally, school principals had more managerial and administrative tasks, and less teaching duties. The description of the principal's role includes that of head educator (as used in England) and instructional leader (as widely used in North America). Both descriptions suggest a person that is knowledgeable in learning and teaching, and therefore position principals as teaching experts (Terry cited in Botha, 2004).

During the last half of the 19thc, as public schools grow in size and as state governments and national commissions and associations developed school standards, principal began to provide the

managerial functions in schools that regulations required while still serving as teachers. By the 1920s, those duties managerial functions had expanded to include the management of curriculum and the supervision of instruction. As a result, principals increasingly became professional administrators who taught no classes (Cuban, 1988).In this period, the principal was highly a professional in supervising the instructional process of the school.

Cuban as citied in Sergiovanni et al., (2003) noted that the principal in the early 20thc was a professional administrator with the expertise to supervise the instructional program of the school. Since the 1920s, this dual role bureaucratic manager and instructional leader has shaped the image of the school principal as defined in research literature and practices over seven decades, however, from 1911-1981,the evidence suggests that in reality principal have spent most of their time on non-instructional tasks(Cuban,1988).In the 2nd half of the 20thc, schools experienced new demands and became far different places .As society demanded change in schools, the conception of the principal also began to change (Donaldson,2001).

By the1980 principals become instructional leaders. During this period, they had the role in defining the school's mission and set clear goals, coordinated and supervised curriculum and instruction, established any academic climate that set high academic expectations and standards and fostered a healthy, safe school culture for both students and teachers (Donaldson, 2001).They were involved in direct supervision of the instructional process and had to ensure that their schools remained focused on learning and teaching. This role of a "learning expert" remains important today, although principals are now expected to be not only learning experts but also experts in knowledge areas (a point which was not emphasized in the past) (Johnson cited in Botha, 2004).

During the 1990s the role of the principal changed rapidly and dramatically as a result of organizational consequence stimulation accountability was the movement to more decentralized decision making so that individual school faculties and principals were more directly responsible for instructional decisions that affect their school (Dou & Keller, 1998).

In general, traditionally, principals were expected to set clear goals, allocate resources to instruction, manage the curriculum, monitor the lesson plans and evaluate principals (Dipada&

Hoy, 2008).On the other hand, today, the principals' roles includes a deeper and broader involvement in the mechanics of teaching and learning, the use of data to make decision, and prescribe and participate in meaningful and innovative professional development (King, 2002).

2.7 Overview of the Role of the School Principal

Many writers argued that the role of school principal is multi-dimensional. For instance, over the last few decades numerous studies on school principal ship around the world have shown that the role is highly demanding, multi-dimensional, and a critical determinant of school performances and effectiveness. Phillips (2001) in his study of 'Manager-Administrator to Instructional Leader' noted that it has often been said that the school principal wears many hats being manager, administrator, instructional leader and curriculum leader at different points in a day.

The role of the principal covers many different areas including leadership, teacher evaluation, student discipline, and several others. A principal has a very important role to fulfill in their daily job duties and responsibilities. They are the guiding force which makes schools what they are today (ExforsysInc, 2011).   Being an effective principal is hard work consuming. A good principal is balanced within all their roles and works hard to ensure that they are doing what they feel is best for all constituents involved (Meador, 2011).

Girvin (2005) also organized the principal's role into three broad categories: The principal as visionary: establishing practices in keeping with broader perspectives and issues, the principal as organizer: working to develop an action plan with related goals and timelines, the principal as cheerleader: conveying support through personal visibility and involvement in reviewing student assessments and achievements.

According to the GLISI (2006) study, there are eight major roles of school principals: Curriculum, assessment, and instruction; data analysis; process improvement; learning and professional development; leadership; performance; operations; and change. On the other hand, (1904, Association Drive Reston, Virginia 20191 1-800-253-7746)listed about seven major roles of school principals: They make sure the faculty is doing their jobs correctly and are happy doing their jobs. They make sure the curriculum is up to standards of teaching. They make sure that staff learning need and professional development is maintained. They keep lines of communication open with the

teachers and parents. They keep up on what is going on at other schools around them so they can stay on top of educational needs and preferences. They get together with staff on a regular basis to see if any new ideas or suggestions can be used at their school to improve it for the students' learning process. They deal with administration, funding, etc.

Principals also meet with other administrators and students, parents, and representatives of community organizations. School principals have greater flexibility in setting school policies and goals, but when making administrative decisions, they must pay attention to the concerns of parents, teachers, and other members of the community. Principals also are responsible for preparing budgets and reports on various subjects, such as finances, attendance and student performance (BLS, 2010).

Today's principal must be a legal expert, health and social services coordinator, fundraiser, public relations consultant, parental involvement expert, and security officer,
Who is technologically savvy, diplomatic, with top-notch managerial skills, whose most important duty is the implementation of instructional programs, curricula, pedagogical practice, and assessment models (Phillips, et al; 2003).

2.8 Six Key Areas of Principal Influence

It is time to rethink principal and assistant principal evaluation and to put principals themselves at the center of that activity in an effort to build individual leadership capacity and school effectiveness.

In 2011, the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) created a joint Principal Evaluation Committee to develop a framework for principal evaluation to be used as a guide for improving professional practice that leads to increased student learning. The framework includes six key domains of leadership responsibility that fall within a principal's sphere of influence. These include:

1. **Professional Growth and Learning**

Leadership development is a career-long learning experience for effective leaders. As Accountability for schools and student learning has increased, so has the complexity of the role of the principal. To develop and sustain principal effectiveness, school Leaders must actively pursue professional development and learning opportunities for themselves in addition to those for their students and faculty.

2. **Students Growth and Progress**

While they may lack direct control over student achievement outcomes, principals as leaders of schools are responsible for ensuring that student achievement goals are attained. To avoid an over-reliance on standardized scores of student achievement, data Sources must include formative and summative teacher-administered test data; work sample scores; benchmark assessments; examples of scoring/grading rubrics; attendance rates; discipline referrals; graduation rates; student participation in co-curricular activities; ACT/SAT scores; advanced placement scores; scholarship awards and other special recognitions, and accomplishments received by students.

3. **School Planning and Progress**

A well-defined and well-executed school improvement plan can be a contributing factor for attaining high student achievement results. Performance data in this domain includes the principal's leadership practices; involvement in developing an effective SIP; engaging teachers, administrators, support staff, parents, community representatives and business partners and students in implementation of the plan; ability to develop and build the capacity of a strong leadership team; distribution of responsibilities across that team; selecting appropriate work; identifying the magnitude of change desired; and matching the personal management style to the change initiative.

4. **School culture**

School culture nurtures school improvement efforts. A principal's ability to develop and maintain a positive school culture where students, teachers and other staff are motivated to collaborate, to work smarter and to take risks to achieve higher goals can accelerate improvements in student learning outcomes. Indicators of performance in this domain include a principal's abilities to develop collaborative processes that affirm the school's mission; ensure positive teacher working conditions; create time for instructional and teacher reflection; and engage teachers in high-quality professional development.

5. Professional Qualities and Instructional Leadership

A systemic principal evaluation system must include an assessment of principals' practice their daily work. Indicators in this domain include portfolio artifacts of principal performance; the degree to which a principal achieved goals from the previous year's professional growth plan; observations of principal practice; the degree to which the principal provides actionable feedback to teachers to improve practice; 360-degree surveys of faculty, staff and evaluators; and self-reflections from principals. Principals say they want this evaluation to connect school quality and student learning assessments and to be tied to a common set of professional standards, including those found in ISLLC.

6. Stakeholders Support and Engagement

Many factors outside of the classroom and school influence student learning, requiring Principals to engage and gain stakeholder support to serve a wide range of medical, emotional and social needs of students. Indicators of a principal's performance in this domain include the ability to build strong relationships with stakeholders within and outside the school, and the ability to develop cultural competencies and communication skills in working with diverse stakeholders including students, families and community partners.

2.9. A Policy Focus for Principal Evaluation

The Principal Evaluation Committee offers a framework for evaluation that includes the voice of principals and their view of an effective principal evaluation system. That framework includes the four focus areas below, which are intended to offer a clear roadmap for federal, state and local policymakers as they rethink approaches to more efficacious principal evaluation.

- **Consider context**. Principals and supervisors work collaboratively to develop goals and determine measures that consider the unique student, school and community contexts that influence a principal's job performance. Some key contextual factors to be considered when assessing an individual principal include student socioeconomic status; student mobility; student social, emotional, and behavioral issues; teacher experience; and available resources. Ideally, the district or statewide evaluation process is flexible enough to accommodate necessary differentiation based on a principal's work and grade-level responsibilities. Every

aspect of an effective principal evaluation process assists principals and evaluators alike in creating a holistic and accurate description of each principal's practice.

- **Incorporate standards that can improve practice**. While principals influence a range of school conditions, not all principals have the same roles, responsibilities, authority or autonomy in the school. Once the performance goals have been collaboratively established with the principal, the principal needs to be given the authority and autonomy to meet them. Strong evaluation systems incorporate widely accepted standards of practice so that results are relevant to the improvement of a principal's work and are routinely monitored and adapted to reflect the complex nature of the profession.

- **Use evaluation to build capacity**. The purpose of evaluation is to build a principal's leadership capacity and encourage professional development. Results of the evaluation serve as a catalyst for a principal's growth and learning. Capacity-building evaluation systems include comprehensive support structures and resources for professional development, reflective practice, induction support for early career principals, personalized professional growth plans, and advanced certification/recognition for accomplished practice. Employment decisions rely on multiple sets of evaluation data over time, not a one-time supervisory visit. Evaluation results are not intended to be punitive for the evaluation to fulfill its purpose. All evaluators need training to gather precise assessment data and analyze evaluation results within the protocols and rubrics of the design.

- **Focus on multiple measures of performance data.** Historically, principal evaluation systems have focused on measuring principal preparation and practice. Currently, many emerging state evaluation systems are focusing on one outcome: student achievement results as measured by standardized test scores. Because of the myriad of factors involved in student achievement and its measurement and the complexity of a principal's role in student achievement, principals require substantive feedback about much more than outcome measures related to student achievement. Effective feedback is timely, accurate, valid and applicable to building capacity for future performance. Accurate evaluation of a principal's holistic performance requires the collection and analysis of a comprehensive set of data

gathered from multiple sources. Source, (1904, Association Drive Reston, Virginia 20191 1-800-253-7746).

2.10 What should be appraised?

Identifying the standards of effective performance is one of the most important decisions in designing performance appraisal systems. In relation to this, Donnelly, Gibson, and Ivancevich (1992:471), cited in WossenuYimam (2007), stated that the development of criteria that indicate successful performance is a crucial step in designing a performance appraisal system.The criteria employed to appraise principal performance differ from organization to organization.

Concerning the criteria that are required to appraise the performance of principals, Gentry Jarvis, (1969:81), indicated that school and Kenney principals are concerned with a variety of activities such as curriculum, supervision of instruction, teacher morale, etc.; hence, their efficiency in criterion by which appraised. Accomplishing their success these tasks is the as an administrator is Manatt (1987:11), also presents the list of discriminating performance criteria of secondary school Principals as follows:

1. **Sets instructional strategies:** emphasizes achievement: promotes activities to identify, analyze, and solve instructional\problems, Emphasizes student achievement with teachers and students on a regular basis. Have high expectations for student academic achievement.
2. **Supports teachers**: Organizes a system in which teachers work cooperatively to develop and implement instructional objectives. Encourages free and open flow of comments, suggestions, and recommendations.
3. **Coordinates instructional program:** Defines goals and objectives of the school and works toward articulation between schools and grades. Monitors the curriculum and identifies progress toward stated curriculum/program goals.
4. **Provides orderly atmosphere:** Schedules instructional space for maximum use and strives for minimum disruption of instruction. Sets high standards of conduct and monitors all facets of school life to ensure that these standards are met.

5. **Promotes professional growth:** Provides support and direction for those staff Members seeking to improve their skills. Makes regular, systematic, and cooperative appraisals of each staff member's performance always including a follow-up conference.

According to Poster, C. and D. (1992:163), the appraisal of principals ought primarily to be concerned with the extent to which, on the one hand, they have facilitated, inspired, planned, evaluated and stabilized within the school and, on the other hand, sought and achieved for the school a public image as a caring center of learning.

Campbell, Corbally, and Nystrand (1983:235-236), on their part, contend that principals should be appraised on the basis of their knowledge about both pedagogy and organizational behavior; their exemplary behavior of demonstrating a sense of purpose for the school; and their skill in interpersonal relations.

Duke and Stiggins (1985:82), further pointed out that during the appraisal of principals, supervisors focus on such factors as meetings in the community organizations, department/ faculty meetings, and staff development activities. On the other hand, Leap and Crino (1993:341) contend that, "principals should neither be held accountable for nor evaluated on criteria beyond their control. "Stated differently, the criteria used to appraise the performance of principals need to be job related and within the control of each principal. Otherwise as Walters (1995:30) warned, "If employees feel that their performance is being judged on the basis of measures that are not fully within their control, they can only end up feeling demotivated."

Heath (1989:37), further strengthens the foregoing idea by saying that, "appraisal should only take place when clear, preferably agreed, appropriate, specific and achievable criteria have been established." Moreover, Mathias and Jones (1989:7), confirmed that the acceptability, credibility and effectiveness of appraisal. Systems depend largely on whether the criteria have been agreed with appraisees. Furthermore, Melaku(1992:49-50), pointed out that effective appraisal criteria are characterized by their level of validity, reliability, and utility. That is, for an appraisal criterion to be valid, it should be relevant and related to the appraisee's specific performance. For it to be reliable, it must be consistent in producing the same result over time and for different

appraisers. Utility of appraisal criteria, on the other hand, refers to the balance between the time and effort spent in administering the criteria, and the possibility of getting accurate and reliable information on the performance of the appraisees.

In brief, performance criteria are statements of standards against which accomplishing specified a principal's competence in instructional and managerial activities is assessed. Thus, the criteria for appraising principals' performance must be carefully identified, clearly understood, and mutually agreed - upon by both the appraisers and the appraisees.

2.11 Methods of Performance Appraisal

Performance appraisal methods are the means by which organizations use in evaluating the performance effectiveness of their employees. Since performance appraisal is used for various purposes, it requires different methods and approaches. As far as this point is concerned, authorities have proposed the following methods of appraisal.

Rue and Byars (1990:220), have identified the following three methods:

1. **The Essay appraisal** which requires the appraiser to describe an appraisee's performance in written narrative form. As Leap and Crino (1993:356-357) state, the short- comings of this method are:

    (1) It can be time-consuming,
    (2) Its usefulness depends largely on the writing skills of the appraiser, and
    (3) Its usefulness for rewards and validation of selection devises is severely limited.

2. **Approach the Work – Standard** which involves setting a standard or expected level of output and then comparing each appraisee's performance Standard to that.

3. **Management by Objectives** which consists of the appraiser and the appraisee jointly agreeing on what the appraisee's work objectives will be and how they will be accomplished. This method, according to Leap and Crino (1993:357), includes the following steps:

    a) appraisee proposes goals for the next time period.
    b) appraisee and appraiser discuss, modify, and reach an agreement concerning the specific nature of the goals.

37

c) Periodic formal and informal reviews regarding progress and problems associated with achieving the goals are made.

d) the cycle is repeated. Employing this method for appraising the performance of employees has its own advantages and disadvantages. To Megginson (1981:321), its advantages are:

i.   it is appealing to managers' need for creative expression, recognition, new experiences, and self -esteem;

ii. it increases employees' efforts by making them aware that their performance is being appraised and rewarded;

iii. the existence of specific and clear cut goals enables to appraise and reward performance easily; and

iv. it enables management to detect deficiencies in the organization immediately. On the other hand, its main disadvantage is that there is the possibility of overemphasizing on the individual employee rather than the group which may create unnecessary competition between and among members of the organization. Moreover, as long (1987:25) indicated, this method requires a high degree of inferential skills, managerial time and effort. It also needs a detailed job analysis to identify key areas and job priorities.

Long (1987: 20-26), further categorizes the appraisal methods into three major main or groups and elaborates them as follows:

1. **Comparative Methods:** These methods measure the performance of employees in a work group relative to each other. The methods to be included under this major category are: paired comparisons, ranking and forced distribution. The main limitation of these methods is that they only produce ordinal information and do not differentiate between levels of individual performance, hence, it is difficult to judge whether two employees in adjacent ranks are quite similar or dissimilar in their levels of performance.

2. **Absolute Methods:** These methods try to explain the performance of an employee by reference to some standards of performance and not to other employees. The essay or narrative - type approach, graphic or trait rating scales, check-lists, critical incidents, and behavioral - anchored rating scales are the methods included under this major category.

Some of these methods are regarded as being extremely susceptible to errors such as halo-effect, central tendency, and inter-rater error of leniency or strictness.

3. **Results - oriented Methods:** These methods focus on specific accomplishments and outcomes achieved as a result of job performance rather than on job behaviors.

Evaluation is conducted on the basis of how goals have been attained in relation to predetermined standards. These methods have the limitations of being based partly on

Assumptions of what can be achieved within a given time span and to a given standard. Moreover, efforts to set performance standards for most professional employees have proved to be unsatisfactory due to the difficulty of establishing objective criteria against which to measure performance.

All in all, these are the various methods employed in different organizations, including schools, to appraise the job performance of employees. As indicated earlier, each of these methods have its own strengths and weaknesses. The strength of any performance appraisal method, as Schermerhorn (1989: 432) noted, is measured by reliability and validity. That is, for a performance appraisal method to be reliable, it should be consistent in producing the same result over time and/or for different appraisers. For it to be valid, it must measure only factors directly related to performance. Therefore, the choice of appraisal methods should be made in view of their relative advantages, the purpose they can best serve, and the type of job the appraisee performs. So far an attempt has been made to treat the various methods of performance appraisal. Other components of appraisal are essential in the process of appraising principals' performance. Among these, the appraisal discussion is considered to be central to the success of the whole process. Hence, the task of the next section would be to deal with this important issue.

2.12 The Appraisal Discussion

The appraisal discussion lies at the heart of the performance appraisal process and is crucial to the success of the whole process. It is aimed at creating mutual understanding and agreement between appraisers and appraises about what will happen in the appraisal process.

As Fisher (1995:93) pointed out, the appraisal discussion is a forward - looking affair which focuses on the development of skills and competences and the improvement of future performance in order to achieve better results. Concerning the importance of the appraisal discussion, Leap and Crino (1993:358), stated that "the discussion of an employee's appraisal results is important in providing feedback regarding compensation, job status, disciplinary decisions, and training and development needs. "Moreover, Biggs, (in Green, 1994,p: 136-137) noted that, an initial appraisal meeting can confirm the purpose and clarify the context of the appraisal; consider the scope and agree a focus for the appraisal; agree arrangements for data collection; agree the final time-table for the process. Furthermore, the appraisal discussion provides the means through which the key elements of performance appraisal, i.e. measurement, feedback, positive reinforcement, exchange of views, and agreement can be achieved (Fisher, 1995, p: 69, 70).

During the appraisal discussion both the appraisers and appraisees need to raise various issues. One of the major issues that should be discussed is the purpose of the appraisal scheme. According to Armstrong (1994:99), the purpose of appraisal meeting would be defined as being to provide an opportunity for a frank, open but nonthreatening discussion about the appraisee's performance and development needs; give the appraisees an opportunity to discuss their aspirations and any work problem; focus the attention of both the appraisees and the appraisers on future performance agreement or plan. Since the appraisal discussion is a free-flowing affair, it has to be initiated with care and a variety of approaches and interpersonal skills are used to bring it to a successful conclusion. That is, there is no one best way of conducting an appraisal discussion. However, there are a number of guidelines which serve as golden rules for conducting an appraisal discussion. Fisher (1995: 70-71), lists these guidelines as follows: Preliminary phase, Prepare carefully Work to a clear but flexible structure, Create a supportive atmosphere, General Guidelines: Let the appraisees do most of the talking. Encourage self - appraisal, keep the whole year under review. No surprises do not suddenly launch criticisms about past behavior which should have been discussed at the time be positive, criticize constructively.

Using interpersonal skills: Seek information by asking the right questions, listen carefully, Be sensitive to the other person's concerns, observe and respond to non-verbal signals, Maintain open, friendly body languages, be open to criticism, Test understanding, Reach agreement, Completing the discussion: Check understanding, Plan ahead, rate performance, if that is part of the process, complete documentation. End the meeting on a positive note. In sum, the appraisal discussion is the focal point in the appraisal process. Its target is the creation of appraisee's acceptance and agreement to willingly participate in the appraisal process in order to make the whole process a positive and developmental endeavor. To this end, appraisees, together with their appraisers, ought to be given the opportunity to participate in the development of the appraisal criteria and procedures and other important issues before and after the actual appraisal of their performance.

2.13 Participants in Principals' Performance Appraisal

As many writers in the field confirmed, the appraisal of principals is the most difficult area to deal with both theoretically and practically. For instance, Hellawell,(inHattersley, (1992:35), cited in WossenuYimam (2007),noted that "The issue as to who should appraise the principles sounds like ...who is to guard the guards themselves?" The reason for this, as he indicated is that the emphasis regarding principals and appraisal has been very much upon the principal as an appraiser rather than an appraisee.

Moreover, since principals engage in different activities and with different groups of people, their performance is subject to the appraisal of different groups of people who have different opinions about the role of school principals. In this connection, Stanavage (in Teshome, 1975:20) says: The principal has been all things to all people, ...to the students a shadow figure, to the teachers an authority figure, to the superintendent a handy though frequently inept subordinate, to the parents Mr. Fixit ....

Though the appraisal of principals calls for the involvement of different groups of people, Champion, in Fidler and Cooper, (1992:139) stated that the pertinent appraisers of school principals are an officer from Local Education Authority and another principal with recent and relevant experience in the task of principal ship. Emphasizing the advantage of involving peers

in the appraisal of principals, Champion,(1992:142). further stated that," ...involvement in the appraisal of other principals has been the most significant staff development activity in itself ..." Similarly, Heath (1989:23) indicated that, using peer performance appraisal is beneficial in that there are no formal status differentials, no formal power relationships, and no competition for rewards. He further explains that effective peer appraisal depends, among other things, on: confidence in the peer chosen to share the appraisee's topics, issues, aspirations, strengths, weaknesses, an ability to demonstrate that the appraisee's strengths are important and are valued an ability to give and receive critical feedback in a way which leads to positive development. Peer appraisers can evaluate certain aspects of jobs performance that cannot be evaluated by others.

Although the involvement of peers in the appraisal of principals is considered to be beneficial, Williams (in Snape, Redman, and Bamber, 1994:56), argues against the use of peer appraisal by saying that, "peer appraisal may create friction, damage interpersonal relationships, and erode trust amongst peers and is also subject to a friendship bias." Likewise, Armstrong (1994:125), noted that peer appraisal can result in friction and break up group harmony.

As indicated earlier, the performance of principal is subject to the appraisal of different groups of people. Among these groups, parents are regarded as having valuable information about the worth of different aspects of a school program. In connection to this, Gorton (1983:84) states, "parents constitute an important third group that holds expectations for the role of the school administrator. "Concerning the advantages of parental involvement in the appraisal process, Strike (in Millman and Darling -Hammond, 1990:369-370) records the following. "Doing so would empower them, would allow them to contribute their views in a legitimate way, might enhance their sense of ownership of decisions, and would subject their influence to an organized process and to the requirements of due process".

As far as the involvement of students in the appraisal process is concerned, there are different opinions, some in favor and others against the application. Among the proponents of this procedure, Poster, C. and D (1992:43) Tucker (in powney,1991,p: 87) Sikes, Measor, and Woods *(1985:161)* and Perl (in Atsede, 1991:32), cited in WossenuYimam argue that since students are

consumers of instruction, and have their own expectations of schools, teachers, and education; they can provide as much information regarding the instructional process as professional appraisers do on the basis of one or two hours observation. Moreover, they consider students as effective judges of instruction whose judgment matches very closely with that of trained and qualified appraisers.

On the other hand, Rotem and Glasman (1979:498), contend that since students lack experience, knowledge, and perspective, and because their judgment is influenced by factors which are not related to the quality of teaching, they can't be competent appraisers of the instructional process. It should be noted that, although students' involvement in the appraisal of teachers as well as principals may be of value for providing useful information regarding the improvement of the instructional process, controversy continues to surround the use of students' opinion for making administrative decisions such as salary increment, promotion, or dismissal.

It is indicated earlier that different groups of people are involved in the appraisal of principals. However, as pointed out by Leap and erino (1993:342), the following two factors need to be considered in determining who the appraiser or appraisers should be:

1. Appraisers must have the capability of avoiding biases that arise during the appraisal process, and
2. Appraisers need to have the opportunity to observe the appraisee's full range of job behaviors for a long period of time. Moreover, the appraisers should be able to value and weight behavioral incidents over the appraisal period accurately (Bailey, 1986:104)

In sum, other than designated appraisers, the performance of principals can be appraised by adopting different approaches to appraisal. That is, the appraisal scheme should allow meaningful involvement of peers, teachers, students, and parents. Employing such a variety of sources of information helps to avoid bias and favoritism that may arise when appraisal is carried out only by one appraiser. Moreover, it helps to make appraisal results objective and reliable.

All the methods of performance measurement require decisions about who will collect and analyze the performance information. To qualify for this task, a person should have an understanding of the job requirements and the opportunity to see the employee doing the job.

The traditional approach is for managers to gather information about their employees' performance and arrive at performance rating (Noe et al., 2009:225).

As to Jackson et al. (2009:332), it should be apparent by now that there are many sources of performance data including organizational records, supervisors, employees themselves, peers or team members. Organizational records generally provide objective indicators of performance. All of the other sources like people provide subjective judgments. When determining whom to involve when measuring performance, managers need to consider the amount and type of contact each appraiser has with the person being evaluated. Team members, customers, supervisors and subordinates all see different facts of individual's task behavior. From this description, one can understand that using different sources in measuring the performance of an employee increases the validity and reliability of the result. In supporting this idea, Noe et al. (2009:225) state that, using just one person as the source of information poses certain problems. People tend to link some people more than others and those feeling can bias how an employee's efforts are perceived. According to these scholars, because one person is likely to see an employee in a limited number of situations, it has its own several drawbacks. Therefore, to get as complete an assessment as possible, organizations should combine information from the most or all of the possible sources in what is called a 360-dergree performance appraisal. In this regard, the possible sources of performance data, as Jackson et al.(2009:333) and Noe et al. 2009: 225) identified are described below.

(1) **The Supervisors:** The most used source of performance information is the employee's supervisor. Because it is usually safe for organizations to assume that supervisors have extensive knowledge and skill of job requirement and that they have enough opportunity to observe their employees. In other words supervisors possess the basic qualification for this responsibility. In addition, using supervisors to evaluate teachers' performance is that they have an incentive to provide accurate and helpful feedback as their own success depends greatly on teachers' performance. The final advantage of using supervisors to evaluate teachers' performance is when the supervisors try to observe teachers' behaviors or discuss performance issues in the feedback session, their feedback can improve performance and teachers tend to perceive the appraisal as accurate (Noe et al., 2009). In

some situations, there are problems which can occur when the supervisors serve as the source of performance information for employees. For example, for teachers in some jobs, the supervisor does not have enough opportunity to observe all teachers' performance duties if the number of teachers is very high.

(2) **Subordinates:** For evaluating the performance of supervisors, subordinates are valuable sources of information. Subordinates (the people reporting to the supervisor) often have the best chance to see how well the supervisor treats the employees. In relation to this, Be court et al. (1998) discuss that subordinates are in a good position to evaluate their managers since they are in frequent contact with their supervisors and occupy a unique position from which to observe many performance related behaviors. Those performance dimensions judged most appropriate for subordinate appraisals according to the above scholars are leadership, oral communication, delegation of authority, coordination of team efforts and interest in subordinates. Even though, subordinate evaluations are very useful in informing supervisors' performance evaluation, they have problems because of the power relationship involved. Subordinates are reluctant to say negative things about the person to whom they report that is, they prefer to provide feedback anonymously. Another problem related to this issue is that when supervisors receive ratings from their subordinates, the employees have more power. So, supervisors tend to emphasize employee satisfaction even at the expense of productivity. This issue arises primarily when the evaluations are used for administrative decisions. But, for Jackson et al. (2009), it is possible for anonymity. Evaluation should be made by several subordinates and take an average ratings. Therefore, as that of peer evaluations, subordinate evaluations are most appropriate for developmental purposes. Upward appraisal is most effective when it is accompanied by specific suggestions about how to improve weaknesses of supervisors. In addition, to protect employees, the process should be anonymous and use at least three employees to rate the supervisor.

(3) **Customers (Students and PTA):** As Noe et al. (2009: 231) write services are often produced and consumed on the spot. The customer is the only person who directly observes the service performance and may be the best source of performance information

of employees. For example, in evaluating teachers' performance appraisal, students and parents can be the major sources of performance information which can tell principals' performance level. These scholars stated two advantages of using customer evaluation of employee performance. The first one is, it is very useful when an employee's job requires direct service to the customer or linking the customer to the service within the organization. The other one is, customer evaluations are appropriate when organization is interested in gathering information to determine what products and services the customer wants. While emphasizing the importance of customer evaluation, Jackson et al. (2009: 334), state that when customers are used as appraisers, it is difficult for employees to discount the results because employees usually obtain the impression of many customers. From this perspective information which is obtained from students about teaches' performance in their teaching learning process is valuable as students are in a better position to evaluate teachers while they are in the classroom. In relation to this, Hammond et al. (in MalakuYimam, 1992:59) note that the use of students' judgment on teachers' performance is thought to be valuable because it is students who know the teachers when they have been motivated to learn who feel that they have undergone changes in their behaviors and students' performance feedback to the teacher can motivate good teaching and develop a feeling of recognition in the teacher. Many studies have shown that the students have their own measures of effective teaching and effective teacher. Desirable qualities of good teacher as frequently reported by students are cooperative and democratic attitude, having wide interests, good personal appearance, fairness and impartiality, sense of humor, good disposition, interest in pupils' problem, flexibility, use of recognition and praise, unusual proficiency in teaching etc. (Bradfield cited in Melaku Yimam , 1992:60) . In addition, Culling ford (2004), noted that the signs of good teacher include creating shared working atmosphere, an awareness of the needs of each pupil, being purposeful, creating well organized classroom and celebrating success.

According to Hammond et al. (cited in MalakuYimam, 1992:59), most of the qualities of good teacher listed above are, of course, too complex and trait-oriented to be accurately measured by students and still teachers are showing their reservations in accepting the result. But researchers

suggested that the student appraisal data are quite valid when restricted to simple description of teaching competence.

a) **Self-Appraisal:** An increasingly common approach to appraisal involves a combination of down ward appraisal (manager- led) and self-appraisal. Self-appraisal allows appraisee to comment on his/her own achievements and to contribute to their performance plan for their next period. The two -way process encourages participation and commitment and allows the appraisee to take greater ownership of the process (Porter, Mingham& Simmons, 2008). As to Noel et al. (2009), no one has a greater chance to observe employees' behavior on the job than doe's employee himself or herself. A common approach is to how employees evaluate their own performance before the feedback session. This activity gets employees thinking about their performance. In addition, Belcourt et al. (1998), stated that, self-appraisal is beneficial when managers seek to increase employees' involvement in the review process and helps the employees know about their strength and weakness which intern leads to discussion and identify barriers to effective performance.   The areas of disagreement between the self-appraisal and other evaluations can be fruitful topics for feedback session. According to these writers, the major problem with self-appraisal is that individuals have tendency to inflate assessments of their performance. If ratings are going to be used for the purpose of administrative decision, exaggerating one's contribution is the common problem usually observed. In addition, social psychologists have found that, in general, people tend to blame outside circumstances for their failures while taking the large part of the credit for their success. Due to this, people tend to perceive as self-appraisals are not appropriate as the basis for administrative decisions.

b) **360-Degree appraisal:** To obtain as much appraisal information as possible, many organizations now use combination of different evaluations from a person's boss, peers, subordinates as well as internal and external customers and self-ratings. Such comprehensive approach is called 360° appraisal and it is very common currently in horizontal and team oriented organization structures (Schermrhorn, et.al, 2011).   In 360° appraisal process, individuals receive ratings from three or four different source. They assess themselves and receive assessments from supervisors, peers, subordinates and customers. It provides for

47

performance feedback from the full circle of daily contacts that an employee might have (Rue &Byars, 2009). According to these authors, organizations primarily use this method for developmental purposes, to provide information to individuals being rated about how raters perceive their leadership and work behaviors. They suggest that the advantages of using multiple raters such as the ability to observe and rate various job facets of each person being rated, greater reliability, enhanced fairness and increased acceptance. 360° feedback furthers management or leadership development by providing feedback to managers about how they are viewed by direct subordinates, peers and customers. It generally increases managerial self- awareness through formalized 360° feedback process. While emphasizing this idea, Porter et al. (2008), state ''The popularity of 360° or multi-input feedback has increased as the organizations seek ways of creating more open environments with a greater emphasis on continuous performance improvement.'' From this, it possible to realize that this method enables leaders to rate employees more validly and reliably than others as it helps them to have more information about the employee performance from different sources.

2.14 Problems in Performance Appraisal

There are a number of obstacles which hamper the success of performance appraisal schemes. Chandan (1995:195-197), categorizes these problems into two as:

(1) Problems related to the appraiser, and

(2) Problems related to management support and the appraisal format. He further elaborated these problems as follows:

1. Problems Related to the Appraiser since performance appraisal is carried out by human beings, it is subject to a number of errors, biases, weaknesses, and pitfalls. Some of these drawbacks are:

   a) **The halo effect;** this is introduced when an overall impression of the appraisee is judged on the basis of a single trait.

   b) **Constant error**; this is the reflection of the trait of the appraiser such as being too liberal, or too strict or taking middle position.

   c) **Recency** of events which is judging the performance of the appraisee by emphasizing his/her recent behavior than the past behavior.

d) **The central tendency** which is the characteristics of most appraisers to give average ratings to all or in the centre of the scale.

e) **Errors of variable standards** which is apprising employees of different. Units of an organization based on different standards of performance.

2. Problems related to management support and the appraisal format. The task of appraising principals' performance is a very sensitive and challenging issue, which requires full support of the top management as well as the employees. Otherwise, it will be ineffective and inefficient.

   a. Moreover, the format of the appraisal scheme may not enable to appraise such performance factors as communication and cooperation. Furthermore, some factors may be beyond the control of the employee. Each of these problems may appear because of one or more of the following factors:

a) **Reluctance of appraisers** to take the time and trouble to prepare the periodic appraisals of each of the appraisees and record them for the purpose of using them in the future.

b) **Performance appraisals** are so often carried out, recorded, filed and forgotten during the first four or five months, then filling out the check list, personal decisions are made without reference to what has been done before.

c) **Difficulty of establishing performance standards for professional workers** like teachers, scientists, doctors, etc., whose achievement cannot be measured quantitatively Zaudneh, (1987: 174-175). Furthermore, for the successful operation of performance appraisal systems, those who run the system need to be aware of these Problems and devise some mechanisms of alleviating them. In this connection, Ubeku (1984:192) argues that, performance appraisal may be inefficient and ineffective unless the appraisers know the inherent shortcomings involved and ensure that they do not interfere with the appraisal process.

Apart from the aforementioned problems, Torrington, Weight man, and Johns (1989: 315) pointed out that, Problems such as paper work, excessive formality, ignoring outcomes, measuring performance by proxy, the 'just above average' syndrome, incomplete coverage, and ill-informed appraisers and context problems encounter in carrying out performance appraisal schemes.

Concerning the problems that exist in the appraisal of principals, Duke and Stiggins (1985:86), identified the following:

Insufficient time to observe and appraise principals, inadequate standards or competencies, lack of specified level of performance for each standard, lack of rewards for outstanding performance. These Problems are impossible to solve. Authorities in the field of Human Resource Management have proposed various means and ways of alleviating these Problems. Leap and Crino are among these authorities. According to them, problems of performance appraisal will be minimized if the following measures are taken.

1. Tailoring performance appraisal to an organization's specific set of jobs.
2. Training appraisers to understand the importance of objective, error-free assessment of employee performance.
3. Periodically monitoring and evaluating the operation of the organization's performance appraisal program, and
4. Creating an atmosphere of teamwork, employee self-development, and continual involvement (1993:362). Moreover, Dessler (1982:214) confirmed that, providing appraisers with instructions and training, and selecting the exact appraisal instrument will help to alleviate some of the previously mentioned problems and improve the validity of appraisals. Emphasizing the importance of training, Hedge and Kavanagh (1988:68), have the following to say:" ...rater training to avoid these errors is mandatory if one is to have accurate performance appraisals for organizational uses." Megginson (1981:322), on his part, put forward the following suggestions as means of improving the effectiveness of appraisal schemes:

i. Improving their validity and reliability,
ii. Using multiple appraisals,
iii. Training the appraisers,
iv. Basing the appraisals on specific work standards, and
v. Providing better feedback. Strengthening the importance of feedback, Pearce and Porter (1986:218), stated that, "feedback concerning relative performance is an important signal to

employees about how their organizations value them."Similarly, Odiorne (1987:30-35), proposes the following guides which are helpful for all managers to conducting effective appraisals.

1. Review the performance of every employee periodically.
2. Develop an organization - wide review system.
3. Conduct objective - centered performance reviews.
4. Plan your performance reviews carefully.
5. Take as much time as necessary.
6. Focus on the future, not the past.
7. Build self-esteem and increase motivation.

Finally, Wyatt (1989: 85-86), presents some dos and don'ts on administering appraisal as follows:

Be consistent in your appraisals, be aware of what the appraisee needs from the appraisal, Don't raise your employee's expectations too high, Base your judgment on limited information, Bring your prejudices to the interview, Let the 'halo' effect influence you, Rate all staff at the extremes of the rating scales, or all safely in the middle.

2.15 Special Challenges in Appraising Professionals in Schools

According to Fidler and Cooper (1992), when studying the theory of performance appraisal and its application in other organizations it is clear that there are substantial differences in the context and culture compared to educational institution. Based on this theoretical background, these scholars identified the major problem areas which make performance appraisal difficult in educational institution especially in schools. These are:

a. **Management of Professionals:** Teachers have a number of attributes of true profession. They carry out the task which cannot be narrowly defined but calls for skill and judgment acquired through training and experience and which calls for individual treatment for each client. But they are in the main publicly employed and accountable by their contract of employment to provide reasonable level of service to their client. Appraisal provides both a check on this and also support and encouragement to improve performance. According to these scholars, as an organization become more complex, more coordination of activities is required and some form of management is essential. With the gradual

51

acceptance of management in education, a balance has to be struck between management approaches and professionalism. This is a situation which make teacher performance appraisal more challenging in every schools.

b. **Results are unclear:** When the purpose of the whole organization is unclear, the appraisal of employee achievement is problematic. Accordingly the problem of assessing performance in educational institution lies on defining the goals and measuring goal achievements. Furthermore, assessing how well educational objectives have been met may be done qualitatively and quantitatively by someone others. In business, the sales of out puts or profits can be used as a basis to assess whether goals have been achieved or not. In schools no such correct mechanisms exist. It is true that, examinations could be used to assess academic progress of students but they do not indicate the physical, mental and the emotional development of students which makes teacher performance appraisal difficult (Ayelew Shibashi, 1999).

c. **Difficulty of Assessing Teaching:** As Fidler and Cooper (1992) articulate, from the school point of view, the most fundamental point which makes teacher performance appraisal difficult is that emphasis is given to students' learning rather than teaching. Problems are many folds in that it is difficult to measure desired learning outcomes; differentiate the extent of learning achieved; measure teaching and find clear relationship between learning and teaching. Generally, learning is multifaceted. So, for most learners it is difficult to specify the immediate outcomes of learning let alone medium and long term outcomes.

4. **Lack of Time**: Appraisal carried out properly in any organization takes a lot of time. This poses acute problems in schools where generally the time allowed for school leaders is too small (Handy cited in Fidler & Cooper, 1992). In schools, the two yearly appraisal cycles reduce the time required overall. The greater demand for time is series for middle line managers who are both appraised and appraisers.

2.16 Strategies to Overcome Rating or Performance Appraisal Problems

Usually people make the above mentioned and other performance rating errors unintentionally especially when the criteria for measuring performance are not very specific. Therefore, training can reduce rating errors. Hence, training programs offer tips for avoiding the errors in the future. The trainings should focus on creating awareness on raters about the complex nature of teacher performance so that raters can look at any aspects of teacher performance (Noe et al., 2009: 232). In line with this idea, Rue and Byars (2003:369) write that a promising approach to overcome errors in performance appraisals is to improve the skills of managers, in school case, principals and other concerned bodies. According to these scholars, the mangers should receive trainings in performance appraisal methods, the importance of managers' role in performance appraisal process, the use of performance appraisal information and communication skills necessary to conduct appraisal and to provide feedback. Furthermore, Harris (1997:194) proposes more inclusive strategies which enable school leaders to overcome the rating errors in conducting teacher performance appraisal. These are:

i. **Providing Training to Raters:** One major rating problem originates from low self-confidence of school leaders and administrators. School principals, who have low confidence in this area, will be particularly reluctant to give negative feedback. Therefore, to increase raters' self-confidence and to reduce judgment errors, schools should train the raters on how to conduct more effective teacher performance appraisal. In this regard, effective training program includes helping the individuals who participate in teachers' performance appraisal in understanding how to use appraisal forms, how to give feedback, how to document and use performance appraisal results so that they can be committed to conduct appraisal effectively and efficiently.

ii. **Involving Users in the Development of Rating Forms:** To make the rating forms more useable, schools should involve and participate teachers in the process of developing performance appraisal rating forms and criteria. By being involved in the process of developing appraisal forms, criteria and other standards, teachers will be more committed to improve the final product of their school.

iii. **Educating School woreda supervisors on the Importance of Teacher Performance Appraisal:** Another problem in teacher performance appraisal is that there is no training culture of appraisers regarding appraisal. So, they cannot appraise properly and as a result, teachers become frustrated and unsatisfied with the appraisal process and results. Teachers and school heads should fully understand and accept the purposes of the appraisal processes. This implies the need for thorough appraisal training (Namuddu, 2010). In supporting the importance of training for appraisers in order to eliminate appraisal related problems, Rue and Byars (2003) write that, it is important to explain to school managers why accurate ratings through feedback are important for both teachers and the school effectiveness. Mangers must be persuaded that effective teacher performance appraisal will improve their schools' performance in providing quality education for school children as per educational policy. Moreover, the school managers must be convinced by giving the best performers the highest ratings. So that teachers who are working hard will be motivated to continue. By the same token, mangers must be informed that legal requirements dictate that poorly performing teachers must be given specific feedback and correspondingly low ratings.

iv. **Rewarding School Managers for Performance Appraisals:** School managers must be rewarded for conducting effective performance appraisal. In this regard, school leaders should be held responsible for the development of teachers by using different mechanisms which includes providing effective feedback, independent evaluation of teachers and tracking teachers' performance as they move to different positions. Because, teacher development affects bonuses, financial incentives, and these issues are attached to performance management activities.

v. **Choosing Appropriate Raters:** Although most organizations involve only the employ's immediate supervisor in the performance appraisal, some organizations have begun to use other raters. For example, for some organizations, teams and coworkers may be the primary source of performance appraisal. Some other organizations seek input from customers as well. On the other hand universities and colleges found that the student evaluation of their instructors as very important. Many companies have recently begun using a 360° feedback program which involves verities of different parities including subordinates. Currently, in

Ethiopia, in the process of principal performance appraisal, students, parents, peers and supervisors are made to involve in teacher performance appraisal in order to maximize the reliability of appraisal results and to overcome the rating errors.

Rue and Byars (2003:369) also articulate that understanding and applying general dos and don'ts of performance appraisal process will help school administrators not only to prevent the errors but also to reduce errors that always seem to plague the process. According to these scholars, the dos of teacher performance appraisal process include base teacher performance appraisal on teachers' job performance only; not on other factors which are unrelated to the job, use only those rating scales that are relevant to the job itself and are indicators of objective performance and attainment, sincerely work at appraisal interview process and be problem solving oriented leader than fault finder.

To sum up, it is possible to say that, by improving the process and operation of the appraisal program, developing knowledge and skill of appraisers, involving the stakeholders and making clear about dos and don'ts of principals performance appraisal process, schools can overcome several challenges which they face in practicing principals performance appraisal and can use appraisal results for principal and organizational goals.

CHAPTER THREE
THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design, research methodology, research site, source of data, study population, sample size and sampling techniques, procedure of data collection, data gathering tools and methods of data analysis.

3.1 The Research Design

The major purposes of this study was assessing the current practice of principals' performance appraisal in secondary schools of Metekel Zone and describe the major challenges of its implementation about the purpose, the appraisal criteria employed and the competence of persons involved appraising the principals' performance. To this end a descriptive survey research designed was be employed with the assumption that it will help the researcher to gather and describe comprehensive data related to the problem under consideration. Moreover, descriptive research design makes possible the prediction of the future on the basis of findings on prevailing conditions.

> *Descriptive research design makes the researcher to gather and described variety of data related to the problem under consideration and possible predication of the future on the basis of findings on prevailing condition.*

This researcher chose to use the survey with open and closed-ended questions as the research design because it is the most convenient way to gather information from the selected audience. It is suggested that surveys with diverse type questioning are a more convenient way of gathering information.

3.2 The Research Method

The research method will incorporated both quantitative and qualitative with more focus on quantitative one for department heads and woreda supervisors) to assessing the current practice and status for principals performance appraisal demands the collection of quantitative data, and the qualitative approach is that the study midcourse focus group discussion/ for the students,

parents (PTA), interviews(for principals and Woreda education Heads),and(document analysis) to describe the current situation about the practice of principals' performance appraisal.

3.3 Source of Data

The relevant data for this study was collected from primary source. Mainly data will be obtained from principals', vice principals, Deportment heads, external Woreda supervisors, students, members of PTA (Parent-Teacher-Association), and, Woreda education heads.

Because the researcher assumed that these bodies are involved in principals' appraisal scheme and they are expected to know weaknesses and strengths of appraisal practice at their respective schools. In addition, data will also be obtained from analyzing documents in relation to principals' appraisal activities and functions. For this purpose, such documents as supervision plans and observation results, checklists, feedback reports, measures taken based on the result of evaluation, etc. will be reviewed to explore data that will reveal the picture of the current practice and problems being encountered.

3.4 The Study Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

3.4.1   The Study Population

The population for this study comprised of 10 secondary school principals, 90 departments heads, 24woreda supervisors and five zone and Woreda education office heads, 6700 students and 50 PTA/parents / members. The total study population will be 6874.

Sample size population: The sample size for this study includes 10 principals, 80 department heads (Teachers), 5 Zone and Woreda education heads, 20Woreda supervisors, 100 students (ten from each school) and 50 parents (five from each school) so the sample size for this study is 265.

3.4.2   Sample size and Sampling Techniques

The sample respondents of this study were selected using two types of the sampling techniques. That is from the seven Woreda found in Metekele zone, 4 (57.14%) Woreda were selected using simple random sampling technique by lottery system. In the same way among 12 secondary schools 10 (83.33%) found in the four woreda were selected using simple random sampling

technique by lottery system. Simple random sampling technique is chosen to give equal chance of being included in to the sample. ten principals (83.33%), eighteen department heads (100%), five Zone and Woreda education office heads (100%) using availability, twenty Woreda supervisors (83.3%) should be selected using simple random sampling techniques, hundred (42%) students and fifty PTA members were selected using purposive sampling because of their manageable size and they were in better position to give relevant data about its practice and challenges. In this regard, McMillan (1996:20) states the following:

> *Purposive sampling is technique that the researcher selects particular elements form the population that will be representative or informative about the topic. Based on the researcher's knowledge of population, a judgment is made about which cases should be selected to provide   the best information to address the purpose of the research.*

In the same way 100 (ten from each school) and 50 parents (five from each school) who usually involving in evaluating principals' performance were taken as sample for focus group discussion by using purposive sampling techniques. The Woreda and secondary schools chosen as a sample were depicted in the table below.

Table 1: Sample Woredas and schools

No	Woredas selected	Total Number of schools	Secondary schools selected
1	Pawe Woreda	4	- Pawe secondary school - $K_2 V_7$ secondary school - Pawe Girls Bording secondary school - K_2V_2 secondary school
2	Dibati woreda	2	- Dibati secondary school - Bereber secondary school
3	Bulen woreda	2	- Bulensecondary school - Agabo secondary school
4	Dangure woreda	2	- Manbukesecondary school - Gulbake secondary school

As one can see from the table the proportion of schools selected as sample from the four Woreda is different because the number of secondary schools in these Woreda are different.

Table 2: Summary of sample size and sampling technique

No	Site and types of respondents	Population size	Sample size	%	Sampling technique	Justification
1	Metekel Zone	3	1	33.3	Purposive sampling	Because of the researcher's work place and aware of the identified problems.
2	Woredas	7	4	57.14	Simple random by lottery system	To give equal chance to the sample.
3	Schools	12	10	83.3	Simple random by lottery sampling	Because of their manageable size and importance of
4	Zone and woreda education office heads	5	5	100	Availability sampling technique	Because of their manageable size and importance of information
5	woreda supervisors	24	20	83.3	Simple random by lottery system	To give equal chance to the sample.
6	Principals and vice principals	10	10	100	Availability sampling technique	Because of their manageable size and importance of information
7	Department Heads	80	80	100	Availability sampling technique	Because of their manageable size and importance of information
8	Students	4200	100	42	Purposive sampling technique	Because of their large size and importance for FGD
9	Parents PTA	90	50	55.56	Purposive sampling technique	Because of their manageable size and importance for FGD

3.5 Instruments and Procedures of Data Collection

3.5.1   Instruments

Before developing the data collection instruments, relevant literature was consulted on performance management and performance appraisal especially principals performance appraisal. Based on the information obtained from literature, mainly two data collecting instruments, i.e., questionnaire, interview and focus group discussion were developed. Besides, document analysis was done in order to solicit additional data which were not touched through questionnaire and focus group discussion on practice of principals' performance appraisal. For further detail description is given for each instrument below.

A. Questionnaire

A questionnaire consisting of both close and open ended question items was prepared for department heads(Teachers) and Woreda supervisors in English Language because it was believed that the respondents can read and understand English language as they are secondary school teachers. The main purpose of using extensive close ended questions was to gather huge data from a large number of sample respondents within relatively short time. In preparing close-ended question items, likert scale was employed to identify to what extent the respondents agree or disagree on the stated issues with regard to the practice of PPA. This is because likert scale is commonly used in survey research, easy and takes less time to construct, simplest way to describe opinion and provides more freedom to respond. For majority of questions the scale consisted of five scales: 5= strongly agree, 4= agree, 3= undecided, 2= disagree, and 1= strongly disagree was employed but, for few cases questions consisted of options such as always, sometimes, rarely, not at all were used.

The open-ended questions in a questionnaire were used as they allow the respondents to respond their answers in their own words. Moreover, they are more qualitative and can produce detailed answers to complex problems. Furthermore, open-ended question items give greater insight and understanding of the topic under study by enabling respondents to write what they feel about the issue under consideration.

B. Focus Group Discussion

Focus group discussion was conducted with purposively selected hundred students and fifty PTA members. This technique was employed to acquire qualitative data about the various aspects related to the problem under study as it combines elements of both interviewing and participant observation. In addition, this technique enabled the researcher to generate qualitative data which gave an insight into attitudes and perceptions in a social context where people can consider their own views in the context of the views of others and where new ideas and perspectives can be introduced as it allows observation of group dynamics and non-verbal communication. In order to maximize the responses which were gained from focus groups, the focus group discussion was conducted in Amharic Language and held in a non-threatening environment in which participants feel comfortable in order to extract opinions and to share ideas and perceptions through group interaction. In addition, the researcher was acting   as a facilitator and listener and asked pre-determined open ended questions which the respondents are expected to answer in any way they choose.

C. Document Analysis

Document analysis was used in order to gather additional data which helped the researcher to enrich the information obtained through questionnaire and focus group discussion. This has also helped the researcher to crosscheck the data obtained through questionnaire and focus group discussion. Documents provided the investigator with useful information about the culture of schools in practicing principals' performance appraisal. Furthermore, documents were used for making comparisons between appraisals polices and practical implementation in secondary schools of Metekel Zone. The documents were: classroom observation plans and observation results, checklists, feedback reports and measures taken based on the results of performance appraisal in each school.

D. Interview

For its advantage of flexibility semi-structured interview item would be conducted with 10secondary principals'. They would interview by the researcher himself in the date of appointment on their office. The interview would enable the researcher to explore in-depth data about the interviewees' experiences feelings. It also helps to examine attitudes, interest, concern

and values more readily. The study would purposefully use interview to collect more supplementary opinion, so as to stabilize the questionnaire responses.

3.5.2 Producers of Data Collection

For the data collection, a total of four data collectors (one from each sample Woreda) were recruited. They were selected for their local language skills, educational qualification, experience in research works and familiarity to the areas and on the basis of recommendations of the Woreda education officials. One day training has been given for the data collectors. The training focused on clarifying about general procedures for completing questionnaires. A convenient time was also chosen for the respondents for filling questionnaire so as to maximize the quality of responses and degree of return. After school principals, Woreda supervisors department head (Teachers and Woreda Head officers have been identified, questionnaires were dispatched for Woreda supervisors Department Heads (Teachers) independently according to the time schedule.

In the same way, respondent students and members of PTA were identified by the help of school principals and orientation has been given for them about the objective of the research and how their response positively or negatively affects the result of the research. Then, focus group discussion at each sample school was conducted independently for students and members of PTA at a time and place convenient for them. In addition, documents related to principals' performance appraisal activities were consulted and necessary notes were taken. The researcher himself guided FGD and conducted document analysis in all sample schools in order to avoid subjectivity of data if FGD and document analysis are done by different individuals.

3.6 Methods of Data Analysis

Both qualitative and quantitative techniques of analysis were used based on the type of data gathered and the instrument used. Hence, how the researcher has analyzed the data was described below in detail. As regards to the quantitative data, responses were categorized and frequencies tallied before analyzing, presenting and interpreting the data. In order to analyze quantitative data which were gained through close-ended questionnaire, frequency and percentage were employed. The researcher used percentage to explain the personal profiles of respondents. Moreover, percentage of responses of two different respondent groups (woreda supervisors and department heads) for each item were calculated to judge the extent to which secondary schools

under this study were practicing PPA and to identify the major challenges to the practice. In addition, chi-square test was used to test whether there was any significant difference happened in the response of appraisers and appraisees. SPSS computer program was used to compute the chi-square value. For the sake of simplifying data summarization, interpretation and analysis, the Woreda supervisors and department head respondents were considered as appraisers in one group and principals were categorized as appraisees in another group. In addition, for ease of analysis, 5 rank responses of the questionnaires consisting of the following scales; i.e., 5= strongly agree, 4= agree, 3= undecided, 2= disagree, and 1= strongly disagree has been categorized in to three scales (agree, undecided, disagree).

In analysing qualitative data, the information that was gathered through content analyses (verbal and visual communication messages) during focus group discussion was transcribed and summarized using word expression. In addition, the hand written notes of document analysis and focus group discussions were transcribed, categorized and compiled together into related themes. Summary sheets were prepared and translated into English Language and finally, the data were qualitatively analysed and interpreted to validate and triangulate the quantitative analysis.

The pilot study of this research also addressed the reliability while the panel of experts considered the validity of the proposed instrument. This researcher developed a survey questionnaire formulated by the researcher. A panel of experts was selected to check for validity. This panel consisted of, 8 Department Heads (Teachers), and 8 Woreda supervisors, from Mandura preparatory school. Each expert has 10-25 years of experience and possesses graduate in first degrees and Diploma in different subjects or a related field. These experts are familiar with the performance appraisal process utilized in Secondary Schools as well as other methods of performance appraisal. The Woreda and the Schools ensures consistent implementation of all policies and procedures within the Secondary School System. The panel was given the research questions in order to determine the survey items were related to the research questions. The instrument was composed of both open-ended and closed-ended questions.

Spunt (1999) argued that it is common to confuse reliability with validity. According to Spunt, reliability refers to the questionnaire's ability to provide the same feedback from customers regardless of which random sample of customers the researcher chooses to survey whereas validity refers to the researcher's ability to construct a

questionnaire that gives the information that he or she intended to obtain. Spunt also stated that it is possible for a questionnaire to be reliable but not necessarily valid for specific purposes. Accordingly, the determination of questionnaire validity is specific to provide the researcher with criteria to ensure that it is valid.

3.7 Checking for Validity and Reliability of Instruments

To cheek content validity and internal consistency (reliability) of the instruments pilot test study was conducted prior to the final administration of the questionnaires. This helped the researcher to make necessary modifications so as to correct and avoid confusing and ambiguous questions. For pilot testing, 8 randomly selected department head, and 8 Woreda supervisors of Mandura secondary School were made to fill the questionnaire. Thus, the reliability of the questionnaire was 0.875(alpha coefficient) and the researcher asked the respondents about the clarity and whether or not the questionnaire fully covered all the area and measures issues related to PPA practice. In addition, panel discussion had been conducted with Mandura preparatory school teachers about validity and reliability of questionnaire, FGD guiding questions and document analysis guidelines. Based on the comments obtained from respondents as well as panel discussion participants, items which were not clear have been made clear, unnecessary items were made to be omitted and other items which are assumed to be important for the objective of the research and not included have been made part of the questionnaire..

3.8 Ethical Considerations

Having received official letter of cooperation from Department of Educational Planning and Management of Jimma University, the researcher communicated all concerned bodies and individual participants. Respondents were made adequately aware of the type of information the researcher wanted from them, why the information is being sought, what purpose it will be put to, how they are expected to participate in the study, and how it will directly or indirectly affect them. Any communication with the concerned bodies was accomplished at their voluntary consent without harming and threatening their personal and institutional wellbeing. The information obtained from schools and individuals were kept confidential for anonymity of both organizations and respondent individuals. Moreover the researcher was taking care of committing bias, inappropriate use of information and inappropriate reporting of results.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

This chapter consists of two major parts. The first part deals with the profiles of the respondents and the second deals with presentation, analysis and interpretation of both quantitative and qualitative data gathered from the respondents through questionnaires, focus group discussion interview and document analysis. The qualitative data collected through FGD, document analysis and open-ended questions of the questionnaires were interpreted as complementary to the quantitative data and used for the purpose of triangulation.

The data were collected from a total of 265 respondents. For this purpose, a total of 100copies of questionnaires were distributed to 80 Department Heads and 20 Woreda supervisors of 5were not returned. Therefore, the return rate of the questionnaire was almost 95%. Moreover, 10 principals, 5 head of woreda education officers were interviewed. Hundred students and fifty PTA members participated in focus group discussion.

4.1 Profiles of respondents

The focus in here was to give some basic background information about the respondents. Accordingly, the profile of Department Heads and Woreda supervisors who involved in filling questionnaire as well as the students and PTA members who involved in focus group discussion is discussed below.

Table 3: The Profile of department heads and supervisors

No	Profile		Respondents					
			Woreda supervisors		Department Heads		Total	
			No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Sex	Male	17	94.44	53	68.83	70	73.68
		Female	1	5.56	24	31.17	25	26.32
		Total	18	100	77	100	95	100
2	Age	18-22	1	5.56	3	3.89	4	4.21
		23-27	1	5.56	19	24.68	20	21.05
		28-32	5	27.78	33	42.86	38	40.00
		33-37	7	38.88	17	21.08	24	25.26
		Above ≥ 37	4	22.22	5	6.49	9	9.48
		Total	18	100	77	100	95	100
3	Educational Background	Diploma	4	22.22	27	35.06	31	32.63
		1st Degree	13	72.22	48	62.34	61	64.21
		2nd Degree	1	5.56	2	2.59	3	3.16
		Total	18	100	77	100	95	100
4	Service in Teaching Profession in year	1-5	2	11.11	10	12.99	12	13.64
		6-10	3	16.67	13	16.88	16	18.18
		11-15	4	22.22	23	29.87	28	29.47
		16-20	2	11.11	22	28.57	24	25.26
		21-25	5	27.78	8	10.39	13	13.68
		Above ≥ 26	2	11.11	1	1.30	3	3.41
		Total	18	100	77	100	95	100

With regard to the sex, item 1 of table 3, 17(94.44%) and 68 (68.83%) of woreda supervisors and Department heads respectively were males whereas 1(5.56%) and 24(31.17%) of woreda supervisors and Department Heads respectively were females. This shows that the majority of

66

both supervisors and Department Heads were males implying that the participation offemales as both supervisors and Department Heads was very low. This obviously contradicts the government policy of empowering females and, consequently, demands high attention of concerned officials. This is because it has its own implication impact on the realization of gender equity and equality. Besides, the less number of females as appraisers might have its own impact on practicing fair and equitable principals 'performance appraisal process in schools.

As to age of the respondents (item 2, table 3)5(27.78) woreda supervisors and 33(42.83) department heads were in the age range between 28-32.This shows that they are in the appropriate age of appraising principals.

Item 3 of table 3, relates educational status of the woreda supervisors and department heads. From the responses it was learned, 13 (72.22%) and 48(62.34%) of supervisors and department heads respectively had first degree whereas, 4(22.22%) supervisors and 27(35.06%) department heads had diploma graduates and 1(5.56%) supervisors and 2(2.59%) department heads had second degree. From this, one can infer that the zone should strive to upgrade the educational level of many woreda supervisors and department heads from first degree to second degree and to totally replace diploma graduate working at secondary school with first degree holders. This is because proper qualification of woreda supervisors and department heads has its own impact on maintaining the quality of education in general, and practicing effective and efficient principals' performance appraisal in particular.

Concerning years of experience of appraisers, 5(27.78%), 23(29.87.5%) and 4(22.22%).22(28.57) of appraiser respondents respectively had served for 21-25, 11-15years.This indicates that the appraiser respondents were at the level of senior teachers and above according to teachers' career development. From this, one can infer that many of the woreda supervisors and department heads were in a better position to conduct principals' performance appraisal due to their rich experience. In addition, their rich experience may help them easily identify weakness and strengths of principals' in their school activities and provide professional support for possible improvement.

Table 4: Profiles of student respondents

No	Profile		Respondents	
			No	%
1	Sex	Male	71	71
		Female	29	29
		Total	100	100
2	Grade	9th	25	25
		10th	21	21
		11th	28	28
		12th	26	26
		Total	100	100
3	Participation in appraising principals	Once	21	21
		Twice	24	24
		Three time	27	27
		Four times &above	28	28
		Total	100	100

Regarding the sex of the student respondents the greater number,[71(71%)] were males whereas 29(29%) were females. This showed that secondary schools of Metekel zone did not adequately involve female students in principals' performance appraisal practice. Therefore, it is possible to say that female students were not in a position to exercise decision making in different issues and gender equity in schools of the study area could be questioned.

The result of item 2 of table 4 revealed that student respondents were almost equal from all grade levels. This implies that the secondary school principals of the study area were apprised by the students comprised of representatives from all grade levels. This may help the students to get valid and reliable performance information about principals. This again would help principals to get faire performance appraisal result. Regarding the experience of students in appraising principals, the majority [28(28%)] had participated more than four times. This shows that the student respondents were in a better position to appraise their principals.

Table 5: Profiles of Parent respondents

No	Profile		Respondents	
			No	%
1	Sex	Male	36	72
		Female	14	28
		Total	50	100
2	Educational background	Diploma	6	12
		1st Degree	2	4
		10th/12th complete	10	20
		Can read and write	15	30
		Cannot read and write	17	34
		Total	50	100
3	Participation in appraising principals in year	Once	8	16
		Twice	6	12
		Three time	7	14
		Four times &above	29	58
		Total	50	100

As indicated in item 2 of table 5, except 17(34%) all were literate and could read and write in Amharic language. This shows they were in a better position to take personal notes and could have documents about performance information of each principal and could give valuable performance judgment principals.

The last item of table 5 was about extent to about the experience of PTA members. Regarding this, the data showed that the majority[29(58%)]   had involved more than four times in appraising principals. This shows that principals' performance appraisal in secondary schools of Metkele Zone was conducted by more experienced parents.

4.2 Analysis and Interpretation of the Responses

4.2.1 Design of performance appraisal system

Principals' performance appraisal system is properly designed and practiced in a way that it positively affects school performance and leads schools to successfully attain their stated goals. Accordingly in designing principals' performance appraisal system, educational leaders (supervisors) should ensure that the system has clear links with school objectives, job description of principals, development plan, and pay increases. In addition, the system should allow ongoing and objective assessment. Therefore, this part of the research was concerned with assessing whether these criteria were considered or not in designing principals' performance appraisal system in secondary schools of Metekel Zone.

Table 6: Principals' Performance appraisal system

No	Items	Respondents	Responses								Computed χ^2
			Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Total		
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1	Overall, I am satisfied that the current performance method of performance appraisal is the most appropriate form of evaluation for the needs of the school	Department Heads	25	32.47	15	19.48	37	49.05	77	100	0.329
		Woreda supervisors	7	38.88	3	16.67	8	44.45	18	100	
		Total	30	31.58	20	21.05	45	47.37	95	100	
2	There is clear performance management system in the school	Department Heads	31	40.26	9	11.69	37	48.05	77	100	1.403
		Woreda supervisors	6	33.33	4	22.22	8	44.45	18	100	
		Total	37	39.95	13	13.69	45	47.45	95	100	
3	Principal Performance appraisals are an integral part of the decision-making process	Department Heads	36	46.75	10	12.99	31	40.26	77	100	1.783
		Woreda supervisors	14	77.77	3	16.67	1	5.56	18	100	
		Total	50	52.63	13	13.69	32	33.68	95	100	
4	Principal Performance appraisals are stressful	Department Heads	53	68.83	11	14.29	13	16.88	77	100	4.631
		Woreda supervisors	8	44.45	3	16.67	7	38.88	18	100	
		Total	61	64.21	14	14.74	20	21.05	95	100	
5	Principal Performance appraisals are necessary	Department Heads	61	79.22	5	6.49	11	14.29	77	100	9.979
		Woreda supervisors	15	83.33	2	11.11	1	5.56	18	100	
		Total	76	80.00	7	7.37	12	12.63	95	100	
6	Woreda supervisors setting principals task objectives and developing individual task plans	Department Heads	32	41.56	8	10.39	37	48.05	77	100	1.408
		Woreda supervisors	5	27.78	4	22.22	9	50.00	18	100	
		Total	37	38.95	12	12.63	46	48.42	95	100	

No	Statement										χ²
7	The appraiser and principals agree on goals and objectives for improvement	Department Heads	40	51.95	8	10.39	29	37.66	77	100	
		Woreda supervisors	10	55.55	3	16.67	5	27.78	18	100	3.098
		Total	50	52.63	11	11.58	34	35.79	95	100	
8	Department Heads, Woreda supervisors, students and parents are involved in the process of appaising principal performance appraisal scheme	Department Heads	41	53.25	7	9.09	29	37.66	77	100	
		Woreda supervisors	7	38.89	6	33.33	5	27.78	18	100	7.259
		Total	48	50.53	13	13.68	34	35.79	95	100	
9	Principal are receptive to performance appraisals	Department Heads	36	46.75	10	12.99	31	40.26	77	100	
		Woreda supervisors	8	44.45	4	22.22	6	33.33	18	100	0.781
		Total	44	46.32	14	14.74	37	38.94	95	100	
10	The aims and objective of Principal Performance appraisals communicated and fully understood in schools	Department Heads	29	37.66	8	10.39	40	51.95	77	100	
		Woreda supervisors	3	16.67	7	38.89	8	44.44	18	100	9.577
		Total	32	33.68	15	15.79	48	50.53	95	100	

Key: The table valueχ^2=5. 99 at 0.05 significant levels with two degrees of freedom

Appraisers include woreda supervisors and department head (teachers)

With item 1 of table 6, the respondents were asked to respond whether they were satisfied with the current principals' performance method. In their response 37(49.05%) department heads and 8(44.45%) woreda supervisors disagreed that they were not satisfied .whereas 25(32.47.3%) department heads and 6(38.88%) woreda supervisors express their satisfaction. Regarding the issue, the computed chi-square value (χ^2=0.329) is far below the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom. This shows that there was no significant difference between responses of the two groups. In addition, document analysis in all sample secondary schools revealed that there was no separate, well prepared work plan which clearly shows the what, why, how, when and where of principals' performance appraisal .Therefore, it is acceptable if the researcher concludes that there was no performance method of principals' performance appraisal in secondary schools of the study area.

Item 2 of table 6, was whether there was clear principals' performance appraisal system or not, while responding to this question, 37(49.05%) department heads and 8(44.45%) appraisers revealed that disagreed that there was no principals' performance appraisal system in their respective schools whereas 31(40.26%) department heads and 6(33.33%) woreda supervisors replied that the presence of the system. Regarding the issue, the computed chi-square value (χ^2=1.403) is far below the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom. This shows that there was no significant difference between responses of the two groups.

With regard to item 3 of table 6, 36(46.75%) department heads and 14(77.77%) woreda supervisors reacted that Principal Performance appraisals were an integral part of the decision-making process. whereas, respondents 31(40.26%) department heads and 1(5.56%) of woreda supervisors were revealed their disagreement. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=1.783) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom implies that there was no significant difference between responses of the two groups. Therefore, it is possible to say that Performance appraisal of principals were an integral part of the decision-making process.

While responding to item 4 of table 6, 53(68.83%) department heads and 8(44.45%) woreda supervisors viewed that principals' performance appraisals were stressful, Whereas, significant number of respondents [13(16.88%)]department heads and 7(38.88%) woreda supervisors] replied to opposite. As it can be seen from the table, the computed chi-square value (χ^2=4.63) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom. This shows that there was no significant difference between responses of the two groups. From this thus, it is possible to recognize that principals' Performance appraisal were stressful in secondary schools of the study area.

With regard to item 5 of table 6, 61(79.22%) department heads and 1(5.56%) woreda supervisors replied that Principals' Performance appraisals is necessary. whereas11 (14.29) department heads and 15(83.33) woreda supervisors were responded that principals performance appraisals is not necessary. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=9.797) is far from the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom. This indicates that there was significant difference between responses of the two groups. The open-ended questions and principals' interview viewed that the principals' performance appraisal is necessary if properly designed and implemented. From this it is possible to conclude that principals' performance appraisal is necessary.

while responding to item 6 of table 6, 37(48.05%) department heads and 9(50.0%) worda supervisors pointed out that Woreda supervisors were not setting principals task objectives and developing individual task plans. Were as 32(41.56%) department heads and 5(27.78%) woreda supervisors were replied they agree set principal's task objectives and developing individual task plans. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=1.408) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom. This shows that there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. In addition, document analysis in all sample secondary schools revealed that there was no separate, well prepared work plan which clearly shows the setting of objectives. From this hence, it is possible to say that woreda supervisors were not setting principals' task objectives in secondary schools of Metekel Zone

With regard to item7 of table 6, 40(51.95%) department heads and 10(55.55%) woreda supervisors responded that the appraiser and principals agree on goals and objectives for improvement. whereas 29(37.66%) department heads and 5(27.78%) woreda supervisors did not agree. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=3.098) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which points out that there was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups. Based on the data, it is, then rational for the researcher to conclude that the appraiser and principals agree on goals and objectives for improvement.

With regard to item 8 of table 6, 41(50.25%) department heads and 5(27.78%) woreda supervisors responded that school students, parents, department heads and woreda supervisors were not involving in the process of principals' performance appraisal design and criteria setting. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=8.108) is far from the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom. This implies that there was significant difference between the responses of the two groups. The FGD and interview with principals revealed that woreda supervisors, parents and students are not participating in the principals' performance appraisal design and criteria setting. Based on the data, it may be possible to conclude that the principals' performance appraisal in secondary schools under consideration was not in a position to clearly internalize the implementation of principals' performance appraisal system and contextualize the system according to the real practice, demand and capacity of their respective schools. In addition, it could be stated that the schools have no feeling of ownership since they were not part of designing principal performance appraisal system.

In their response to item 9 of table 6, 36(46.75%) department heads and 8(44.45%) woreda supervisors agree that Principal were receptive to performance appraisals. Thirty one (40.26%) department heads and 6(33.33%) woreda supervisors however disagree on the issue. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=0.781) is less than from the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom. This points out that there was no significance difference between the responses of the two groups. In addition in the open-ended questions and interview with principals showed that principals were unhappy in accepting their performance by

their respective woreda supervisors. Consequently, it is possible to conclude that Principals were receptive to performance appraisals in Metkele Zone secondary schools.

With regard to item 10 of table 6, 29(37.66%) department heads and 8(44.45%) woreda supervisors showed agreement with that aim and objective of Principal Performance appraisals were communicated and fully understood in schools, whereas 40(51.95%) department heads and 3(16.67%) woreda supervisors were disagree on the issue. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=9.577) is far above from the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom. This points out that there was significant difference between the responses of the two groups. The document analysis, interview with principals' and FGD showed that Principal Performance appraisals were not communicated and fully understood in schools. Hence, it is possible to conclude that the objective and aims of Principal Performance appraisals were not communicated and fully understood in Metekele Zone secondary schools.

4.2.2 The Purpose of principals' performance appraisal System

Effectiveness of principals' performance appraisal practice depends on how schools use the system of principals' performance appraisal. In this regard, principals' performance appraisal should be used for strategic, administrative and developmental purposes. This indicates that schools should use principals' performance appraisal specifically for identifying weaknesses and strengths of principals, bringing collaboration among staff members, creating favorable conditions which allow principals to discuss with each other, recommending a specific program designs and need–based trainings to help principals to improve their professional competence and performance and for deciding principals pay increases, promotion and other administrative decisions. From this point of view, the items in the table below were raised mainly to check whether or not secondary schools of the study area did use principals' performance appraisal system.

Table 7: Appraisers of principals' performance appraisal system appropriately

No	Items	Respondents	Responses								Computed χ^2
			Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Total		
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Principals' performance appraisal contribute to principal development(skill, potential)	Department Heads	45	58.44	6	7.79	26	33.77	78	100	4.791
		Woreda supervisors	10	55.56	3	16.67	5	27.77	18	100	
		Total	55	57.89	9	9.48	31	32.63	95	100	
2	Principal's performance appraisal instrument best serves principals	Department Heads	30	38.96	18	23.38	29	37.66	77	100	10.817
		Woreda supervisors	5	27.78	6	33.33	7	38.89	18	100	
		Total	35	36.84	24	25.26	36	37.90	95	100	
3	Principals' Performance appraisals contribute to career structure	Department Heads	39	50.65	7	9.09	31	40.26	77	100	0.221
		Woreda supervisors	10	55.56	2	11.11	6	33.33	18	100	
		Total	49	51.58	9	9.47	37	38.95	95	100	
4	Principals' performance appraisal has enabled the school to recommend a specific program designs to help principals to improve their performance	Department Heads	40	51.95	7	9.09	30	38.96	77	100	2.457
		Woreda supervisors	8	44.45	4	22.22	6	33,33	18	100	
		Total	48	50.53	11	11.58	36	37.89	95	100	
5	The performance appraisal instrument measures what it is intended to measure	Department Heads	31	40.26	7	9.09	39	50.65	77	100	2.774
		Woreda supervisors	6	33.33	4	22.22	8	44.45	18	100	
		Total	37	38.95	11	11.58	47	49.47	95	100	
6	Need-based trainings to principals are designed and provided based on their performance appraisal results	Department Heads	26	33.77	11	14.29	40	51.94	77	100	8.489
		Woreda supervisors	2	11.11	-	-	16	88.89	18	100	
		Total	28	29.47	11	11.58	56	58.95	95	100	
7	Principal performance appraisal process are effective in influencing the behavior of principals	Department Heads	35	45.45	9	11.69	33	42.86	77	100	9.053
		Woreda supervisors	8	44,45	7	38.88	3	16.67	18	100	
		Total	43	45.26	16	16.84	36	37.89	95	100	

Key: The table value χ^2=5. 99 at 0.05 significant levels with two degrees of freedom

Appraisers include woreda supervisors and department head (teachers).

Regarding item 1 of table 7, the majority of department head respondents [45(58.44)] and 10(55.56%) woreda supervisors agreed that Principals' performance appraisal contribute to principal development. whereas 26(33.77%) department heads and 5(27.77%) woreda supervisors disagree. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=4.791) is less than table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom. This shows that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. From this, it is possible to realize that Principals' performance appraisal contributes to principal development.

With item 2 of table 7, the respondents were asked whether or not Principal's the performance appraisal instrument best served principals. Accordingly 30(38.96%) department heads and 5(27.78%) woreda supervisors' agree. Whereas 29(37.66%) department heads and 7(38.89%) woreda supervisors disagree on the issue. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=10.817) is greater than table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom. This shows that there was significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. The document analysis, interview with principals' and FGD showed that principal's the performance appraisal instrument best served principal. Hence, it is possible to say that principal's the performance appraisal instrument best served principals.

With regard to item 3 of table 7, the respondents were asked to if Principals' Performance appraisals contribute to career structure. In their response, 39(50.65%) department heads and 10(55.56%) woreda supervisors agree that it contributes to career structure. whereas 31(40,26%) department heads and 6(33.33%) woreda supervisors showed that disagreement. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=0.221) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom, implies that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. From this, it is possible to realize that performance appraisals contribute to principals' career, development. In addition, as the document analysis revealed there was no any measure taken in relation to pay increases, promotion and other administrative decisions.

With regard to item 4 of the same table, the respondents were asked if Principals' performance appraisal has enabled the school to recommend a specific program designs to help principals improve

their performance. Accordingly40 (51.95%) department heads and 8(44.45%) woreda supervisors agree that it contributes. Whereas 30(38.95%) department heads and 6(33.33 %%) woreda supervisors reacted that it not enabled the school to recommend a specific program designs to help principals to improve their performance. While the researcher was trying to assess the report documents, he got document in all sample schools of the study area which showed that performance appraisal has enabled the school to recommend a specific program designs to help principals to improve their performance. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=2.457) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom, implies that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. The documented practice about discussion conducted between principals and supervisors or appraisers on the performance level of principals. Therefore, it is possible to recognize that principals performance appraisal system in the secondary schools of the study area did not help schools as the means of creating conditions for discussion between principals and supervisors about the observed strengths and weakness of principals. . From this, it is possible to realize performance appraisal has enabled the school to recommend a specific program designs to help principals to improve their performance.

With item 5 of table 7, the respondents were asked whether or not the performance appraisal instrument measures what it was intended to measure to which 39(50.65%) department heads and 8(44.45%) woreda supervisors responded that it did not measure what it was intended to measure. Whereas31 (40.26%) department heads and 6(33.33%) woreda supervisors reacted that it measures. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=2.774) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom, which shows that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. From this, it is possible to realize performance appraisal instruments did not measures what it was intended to measure. This was supported by the interview with one principal.

With item 6 of table 7, the respondents were asked whether or not need-based trainings to principals were designed and provided to principals. Consequently,40(51.94%) department heads and 16(88.89%) woreda supervisors reported that there were no need-based trainings to principals. Whereas twenty six (33.77%) department heads and 2(11.11%0 woreda supervisors, however, agreed. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=8.489) is far above from the table value

(χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom, implies that there was significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Open-ended questions and interview with principals also revealed that there was no need based training for principals in the research area. It is possible to conclude that there is no need-based trainings to principals which could   help to improve their performance.

With item 7 of table 7the respondents were asked whether or not Principal performance appraisal processes influenced in influencing the behavior of principals. Accordingly 35(45.45%) department heads and 8(44.45%) woreda supervisors agree that Principal performance appraisal processes were effective in influencing the behavior of principals whereas 33(42.86%) department heads and 3(16.67%) woreda supervisors disagreed the issue. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=8.489) greater than from the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom, implies that there was significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. The interview with principals also showed that Principal performance appraisal processes were effective in influencing the behavior of principals.

4.2.3   Process of in principals' performance appraisal

Appraisers should practice principals' performance appraisal through steps like conducting pre-appraisal meetings, post-appraisal discussion (feedback) and follow up discussions by appropriately performing each and every specific activity which should be carried out under each step. As regards this the researcher had tried to investigate the actual practice and come up with data in the table below.

Table 8: Practice of pre-appraisal meeting

No	Items	Respondents	Responses								Computed χ^2
			Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Total		
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Principal performance appraisal process involves two-way communication	Department Heads	25	32.47	15	19.48	37	48.05	77	100	0.229
		Woreda supervisors	6	33.33	4	22.22	8	44.45	18	100	
		Total	31	32.63	19	20.00	45	47.37	95	100	
2	The roles of principals at the beginning of the academic year are clearly described	Department Heads	27	35.06	9	11.69	41	53.25	77	100	5.154
		Woreda supervisors	4	22.22	6	33.33	8	44,45	18	100	
		Total	31	32.63	15	15.79	49	51.58	95	100	
3	Principals tasks are assigned based on their competence, skill and knowledge	Department Heads	17	22.08	10	12.99	50	64.93	77	100	4.666
		Woreda supervisors	3	16.67	5	27.78	10	55.56	18	100	
		Total	20	21.05	15	15.79	60	63.16	95	100	
4	Assessment of principals performance are consistence, fair and unbiased	Department Heads	22	28.57	14	18.18	41	53.25	77	100	1.637
		Woreda supervisors	3	16.67	5	27.78	10	55.56	18	100	
		Total	25	26.32	20	21.05	50	52.63	95	100	
5	Performance standards of principals daily tasks are clearly indicated	Department Heads	22	28.57	12	15.58	43	55.84	77	100	4.186
		Woreda supervisors	2	11.11	6	33.33	10	55.56	18	100	
		Total	24	25.26	18	18.95	53	55.79	95	100	
6	Objectives of each task are clearly defined	Department Heads	26	33.77	6	7.79	45	58.44	77	100	5.782
		Woreda supervisors	3	16.67	5	33.33	10	55.56	18	100	
		Total	29	30.53	11	11.58	55	57.89	95	100	
7	Appraisers conduct both pre-and post-appraisal discussion	Department Heads	25	32.47	9	11.69	43	55.84	77	100	5.656
		Woreda supervisors	-	-	7	38.89	11	61.11	18	100	
		Total	25	26.32	18	18.95	52	54.73	95	100	

Key: The table value χ^2=5. 99 at 0.05 significant levels with two degrees of freedom

Appraisers include woreda supervisors and department head (teachers).

With regard to item 1 of table 8, 37(48.05. %) department heads and8(44.55%) woreda supervisors responded that the woreda supervisors disagree that Principal performance appraisal process involves two-way communication. Whereas 25(32.47%) department heads and 6(33.33%) woreda supervisors showed their agreement. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=0.229) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom implying that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. From this, it is possible to realize Principal performance appraisal process were not involving two-way communication.

With item 2 of table 8, the respondents expressed that the roles of principals' performance appraisal was not clearly described at the beginning of the academic year. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=5.154) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom implying that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. This evidence, thus, helped the researcher realize that the secondary school principal in the study area were not clear about what they should do and contribute for their school and as a result they were not ready all the time to do their best in achieving the objectives of the school.

With item 3 of table 8, the respondents were to agree or disagree with Principals tasks assigned based on their competence, skill and knowledge asked whether they either their school. Accordingly, 50 (64.93%) the assignment of department heads and 10(55.56%) woreda supervisors disagreed on the issue. Whereas 17(22.08%) department heads and 3(26.67%) woreda supervisors agree the issue. In relation to this, the calculated chi-square value (χ^2=4.666) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which implies that there was no significant statistical difference between the respondents of two groups. From this, one may learn that Principals tasks were not assigned based on their competence, skill and knowledge of their school.

With item 4 of table 8, the majority of the respondents [41(53.25%)] department heads and 10(55.56%) woreda supervisors disagreed which means that Assessment of principal's performance were consistent, fair and was biased, Whereas 22(28.57%) department heads and

3(16.67%) woreda supervisors agree on the issue. The calculated chi-square value (χ^2=1.637) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which implies that there was no significant statistical difference between the respondents of two groups. Hence it is possible to conclude that assessment of principals performance were not consistence, fair and unbiased.

Item 5 of table 8 was related to clarity of standards of principals' performance appraisal. In response to this item, 43(55.84%) department heads and 10(55.56%) woreda supervisors disagreed that Performance standards were clearly indicated whereas 22(28.57%) department heads and 2(11.11%) woreda supervisors agreed on the issue, Concerning the item, the calculated chi-square value (χ^2=4.186) is below the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which depicts that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. In addition, the document analysis in many of sample secondary schools under the study revealed that there was no school which listed and documented the performance standards of each tasks expected of principals. From the evidences, it is possible to realize that principals' performance appraisers in secondary schools under the study area were in problem to assign and justify the performance level and standards of each principal.

Item 6 of table 8 was about to clarity of objective of each task assigned to principals. In their response to this item, 45(58.44%) department heads and 10(55.56%) woreda supervisors disagreed that principals were clear about the objectives of each task assigned to them whereas, considerable number of the respondents [26(33.77%) department heads and 3(16.67%) supervisors] showed their agreement regarding the issue raised. Concerning the item, the calculated chi-square value (χ^2=5.782) is below the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which depicts that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. This, thus, reveals that concerned officials of the study area were not exerting their efforts in making clear about the objectives of tasks to be assigned for principals.

With regard to item 7 of table 8, the majority of department heads respondents [43(455.84%)] and 11(61.11%) supervisors disagreed with the existence of the identified problem whereas, 25(32.47%) department heads respondents agreed when appraisers conduct both pre-and post-appraisal discussion. Regarding the issue, the computed chi-square result (χ^2=5.656) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which depicts that there was no significant statistical difference. This thus, reveals that Appraisers were not conducting both pre-and post-appraisal discussion with principals.

Table 9: Practice of post- appraisal discussion

No	Items	Respondents	Responses								Computed χ^2
			Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Total		
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	There is a regular feedback schedule at your school	Department Heads	28	36.36	6	7.79	43	55.84	77	100	6.768
		Woreda supervisors	3	16.67	5	27.78	10	55.55	18	100	
		Total	31	32.63	11	11.59	53	55.78	95	100	
2	Principals motivated after post appraisal discussion	Department Heads	25	32.47	9	11.69	43	55.84	77	100	12.700
		Woreda supervisors	1	5.56	8	44.44	9	50.00	18	100	
		Total	26	27.37	17	17.89	52	54.74	95	100	
3	The discussion focuses only on criticizing the weakness and strengths of principals'	Department Heads	20	25.97	11	14.29	46	59.74	77	100	2.774
		Woreda supervisors	5	27.78	3	16.67	10	55.55	18	100	
		Total	25	26.32	14	14.74	56	58.94	95	100	
4	Discussion lasts by mutual agreement of both appraiser and the appraises	Department Heads	23	29.87	18	23.38	36	46.75	77	100	1.079
		Woreda supervisors	6	33.33	4	22.22	8	44.45	18	100	
		Total	29	30.53	22	23.16	44	46.31	95	100	

Key: The table value χ^2=5. 99 at 0.05 significant levels with two degrees of freedom

Appraisers include woreda supervisors and department head (teachers)

While responding to item 1 of table 9, the majority of respondents [43(55.84%) department heads and 10(55.55%)] expressed that there was regular feedback for principals performance level. The computed chi-square result (χ^2=6.768) is above than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which this depicts that there was significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups on the issue. In addition, the response to open-ended question revealed lack of timely feedback regarding strengths and weaknesses observed during principals' evaluation. From this, it is possible to conclude that the secondary school principals of the study area were not getting appropriate feedback about their strengths and weaknesses. This implicitly shows that principals were ignorant of what they have done better or not and even they were not clear about what they should improve in the future.

In their reaction to item 2 of table 9, 43(55.84%) department heads and 9(50.0%) supervisors] respondents showed that there was no practice of discussion takes between appraisers and the principals. The computed chi-square result (χ^2=12.700) is above with table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 two degrees of freedom which means that there was significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. In addition, the result of document analysis in many of the sample schools revealed absence of discussion with principals based on observed strengths and weakness observed during appraisal.. Based on these, therefore, the researcher may say that Principal performance appraisal was poorly practiced in secondary schools of Metekel Zone.

Regarding item 3 of table 9, 46(59.74%) department heads and10 (55.55) supervisors replied that they disagree. considerable number of respondents from both group, [20(25.97%) department heads and 5(27.78%)] Supervisors however agreed and expressed that appraisers give comments on both weaknesses and strengths which they observed. Concerning this issue, the computed chi-square result (χ^2=2.774) is below the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which means that there is no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. This shows that appraisers of secondary schools in Metekel Zone were not focusing on finding weaknesses while they appraise principals than giving attention for both weaknesses and strengths.

While responding to item 4 of table 9, the majority of department heads [36(46.75%)] and 8(44,45%) supervisors replied that the discussion between appraisers and appraises if at all exist did not last by mutual agreement. Regarding the issue, the computed chi-square result (χ^2=1.079) is very less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which in turn shows that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. This thus, reveals that discussions if all any, did not last by mutual agreement of both appraisers and the principals.

Table 10: The practice of follow up and discussion between principals and their appraisers

No	Items	Respondents	Responses									Computed χ^2
			Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Total			
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%		
1	Appraisers help the principals to set the means as to how he/she can tackle challenges in his/her future performance targets	Department Heads	28	46.32	7	9.09	42	54.55	77	100		1.104
		Woreda supervisors	5	27.78	3	16.67	10	55.55	18	100		
		Total	33	34.74	10	10.53	52	54.73	95	100		
2	Appraisers continuously follow up whether principals' improved their performance level or not based on the feedback provided after school observation	Department Heads	24	31.17	11	14.29	42	54.54	77	100		4.938
		Woreda supervisors	4	22.22	6	33.33	8	44.45	18	100		
		Total	28	29.47	17	17.89	50	52.64	95	100		

Key: The table value χ^2=5. 99 at 0.05 significant levels with two degrees of freedom

Appraisers include woreda supervisors and department head (teachers).

In their response to item 1 of table 10, majority of the respondents [42(54.55%) department heads and 10(55.55%) supervisors] responded that they disagree as appraisers helped the principals in setting the means as to how they could tackle challenges in their future performance targets. Considerable number of respondents [28(46.32%) department heads and 5(27.78%) supervisors] however expressed their agreement that the appraisers properly practiced their role in helping principals. Concerning the issue, the calculated chi-square result (χ^2=1.104) is below the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which indicates that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Based on the obtained evidence, it is fair for the researcher to judge principals. Appraisers of the study area were not practicing principals' performance appraisal in a way it could help principals to solve practical problems and enhance school performance.

Item 2 of table 10, was intended to check whether or not appraisers were following up principals' performance improvement based on the feedback provided after observation. In theirresponse to this, 42(54.55%) department heads and 8(44.45%) supervisors disagreed whereas, considerable number [24(31.17%) department heads and4 (22.22%) supervisors] agreed. Regarding this issue, the computed chi-square value (χ^2=4.938) is nearly the same as the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which shows that there was significant statistical difference. Similarly, document analysis on school observation feedback and discussion had shown that there was no documented practice in many sample secondary schools. From this, it is possible to recognize that concerned officials of the study area were not checking and supporting their principals in improving their weaknesses observed during school observation.

4.2.4   Methods of   Principals Performance appraisal

Among many aspects which affect acceptance, validity and reliability of principal performance appraisal results and, generally the effectiveness and efficiency of the system is the appraisal method. This explicitly tells that appraisers can use verities of appraisal methods based on different contexts which they think give accurate and reliable performance result. Different scholars in the area listed a number of appraisal methods like management by objective, ranking

method, rating result of employees, rating behaviors and traits of employees, comparing employees, rating individuals etc.

As mentioned by different writers each appraisal method has its own strengths and weaknesses. This implicitly tells that it is up to the appraisers to use either of these methods based on their school context, the knowledge, skill and need of the appraiser him/herself and the appraisees' consent on the method. Accordingly this part was intended to identify the method which was frequently employed in secondary schools of the study area.

Principals' performance appraisal can attain its stated objectives if it is continuous and ongoing. Thus, the concerned bodies should evaluate principals both formally and informally all the time. In addition, they should communicate appraisal results with principals and take timely corrective actions. Hence, this part was aimed at assessing how frequent teachers were appraised and to what extent the practice helped them to continuously discuss with school leaders.

Table 11: Frequency of principal's performance appraisal

No	Items	Respondents	Responses								Computed χ2
			Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Total		
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Principals' are appraised only once a semester	Department Heads	27	35.06	7	9.09	43	55.84	77	100	2.291
		Woreda supervisors	3	16.67	2	11.11	13	72.22	18	100	
		Total	30	51.58	9	9.47	56	58.95	95	100	
2	Performance level of each principal's is continuously evaluated	Department Heads	26	33.77	6	7.79	45	68.44	77	100	5.391
		Woreda supervisors	3	16.67	4	22.22	11	61.11	18	100	
		Total	29	30.53	10	10.53	56	58.95	95	100	
3	Principals' performance appraisal has helped principals to get an opportunity to discuss regularly with their supervisors	Department Heads	27	36.06	7	9.09	43	55.84	77	100	4.843
		Woreda supervisors	6	33.33	5	27.78	7	38.89	18	100	
		Total	33	34.74	12	12.63	50	52.63	95	100	

Key: The table value χ2=5. 99 at 0.05 significant levels with two degrees of freedom
    Appraisers include woreda supervisors and department head.

In response to the first item 1 of table 11, 43(55.84%) department heads and 13(72.22%) supervisors disagreed that principals were appraised only once a semester. The calculated chi-square values (χ^2=2.291) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which points out that there is no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups on the issue.

With item 2 of table 11, the respondents were requested to ascertain whether or not performance level of each principal was continuously evaluated. Accordingly45 (68.44%) department heads and 11(61.11%) appraisers disagreed that such practice was nonexistent. Regarding the issue, the calculated chi-square values which is (χ^2=5.391) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which means there was no significant statistical difference.

Item 3 of the same table 11, relates to respond to whether or of principals were getting opportunity to discuss regularly with their appraisers. In their response to this item 43(55.84%) department heads and 7(38.89%) supervisors showed their disagreement. The calculated chi-square value (χ^2=4.843) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which shows that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Similarly, students and PTA respondents' explained during FGD that they were always requested to fill principals' performance appraisal criteria once a semester and continuous evaluation of principals' performance level was not yet practiced. In line with this, no sample secondary school of the study area could show written documents that support this issue.

Based on the data obtained in all above the three cases (items 1, 2 and 3 of table 11), one can recognize that secondary school principals of the study area were not evaluated continuously. In addition, it is possible to say that principals had not got chance to discuss with the appraisers and supervisors about their strengths and weaknesses to improve their professional learning competence.

4.2.5 Reliability and validity of principals performance appraisal criteria

Validity and reliability are the critical requirements of effective principals' performance appraisal system. But validity and reliability of the appraisal result depends on how the appraisal system is designed and implemented according to government policies, programs packages, school plans and programs. In addition, it also depends on the relevance of the rating criteria measure all aspects of principal performance. Hence, in this part of the study attempt was made to assess the extent to which criteria for evaluating secondary school of Principals performance were valid and reliable as is present in the table below.

Table 12: Validity and reliability of principals' performance appraisal criteria

No	Items	Respondents	Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Total		Computed χ^2
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	The Principals performance appraisal criteria are achievable	Department Heads	21	27.27	7	9.09	49	63.64	77	100	8.489
		Woreda supervisors	5	27.78	6	33.33	7	38.89	18	100	
		Total	26	27.37	13	13.68	56	58.95	95	100	
2	The rating appraisal criteria that are operating now are relevant	Department Heads	30	38.96	5	6.49	42	54.55	77	100	2.596
		Woreda supervisors	8	44.45	3	16.67	7	38.88	18	100	
		Total	38	40.00	8	8.42	49	51.58	95	100	
3	The rating appraisal criteria that are operating now are specific	Department Heads	24	31.17	8	19.39	45	58.44	77	100	1.374
		Woreda supervisors	5	6.49	3	16.67	10	55.56	18	100	
		Total	29	30.53	11	11.58	55	57.89	95	100	
4	The rating appraisal criteria that are operating now are measurable	Department Heads	23	29.87	11	14.29	43	55.84	77	100	2.008
		Woreda supervisors	6	33.33	5	6.49	7	38.88	18	100	
		Total	29	30.53	16	16.84	50	52.63	95	100	
5	Principals' Performance appraisals are linked to rewards	Department Heads	29	37.66	13	16.88	35	45.46	77	100	9.841
		Woreda supervisors	1	5.56	8	44.44	9	50.00	18	100	
		Total	30	31.57	21	22.11	44	46.32	95	100	
6	Principals' Performance appraisals are linked to disciplinary actions	Department Heads	29	37.66	9	11.69	39	50.65	77	100	3.054
		Woreda supervisors	6	33.33	5	6.49	7	38.88	18	100	
		Total	35	36.84	14	14.74	46	48.42	95	100	
7	Principals' Performance appraisals are linked assigned duties	Department Heads	31	40.26	9	11.69	37	48.05	77	100	3.203
		Woreda supervisors	4	22.22	5	27.78	9	50.00	18	100	
		Total	35	45.45	14	14.74	46	48.42	95	100	

Key: The table value χ^2=5. 99 at 0.05 significant levels with two degrees of freedom
Appraisers include woreda supervisors and department head (teachers)

While responding to item 1 of table 12, the majority of respondents 49(63.64%) department heads and 7(38.89%) supervisors disagree that Principals performance appraisal criteria were achievable, whereas 21 (27.27%) department heads and5(27.78%) supervisors agree on the issue. The calculated chi-square value (χ^2=8.489) is greater than from the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which shows that there was significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. In the open-ended questions, most of the respondents explained that Principals performance appraisal criteria were not achievable and time bound. In supporting this, the document analysis on the principal performance rating criteria revealed that points related to school SIP, CPD programs and other current educational quality maintaining packages were not included in the criteria of principals' performance appraisal. Based on the obtained evidence thus, it is possible to conclude that principal's performance appraisal criterion was not achievable.

With item 2 of table 12, the respondents were asked if the criteria they were relevant to which 42(54.55%) department heads and 7(38.88%) supervisors respectively responded by showing their disagreement.whereas30(38.96 department heads and 8(44.45%) supervisors agreed. Regarding this issue, the computed chi-square value (χ^2=2.559) is below the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which shows that there was no significant statistical difference. Based on the evidences, thus, it could be said that appraisal criteria that were in use were not relevant in the research area.

With regard to item 3 of the same table 12, 45 (58.44%) department heads and 10(55.56%) supervisors replied that the rating criteria in use were not specific, whereas24 (31.17) department heads and 5(6.49%) supervisors agree on the issue. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=1.374) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which reveals that there was no significant statistical difference. Hence it is possible to conclude that appraisal criteria in use were not specific.

While responding to item 4 of table 12, 43(55.84%) department heads and 7(38.88%) supervisors disagreed by expressing were not measurable. Whereas23 (29.87%) departments and 6(33.33%) supervisors reported that they could be measurable. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=2.008) is

less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom. This reveals that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. In supporting this, the FGD participant students explained that many of principals' performance appraisals could not measure principals' performance level.

While responding to item 5 of table 12, 35(45.46%) department heads and9(50%) of supervisors disagreed Principals' Performance appraisals were linked to rewards whereas 29(37.66%) department heads and 1(5.56%) supervisors agree on the issue. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=9.841) is greater than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom implies that there was significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Interview of responses of principals also revealed that principals' Performance appraisals were not linked to rewards. The same responses were given to open-ended questions.

With their response to item 6 of table 12, 39(50.56%) department heads and 7(38.88%) supervisors showed their disagreement that principal Performance appraisals were linked to disciplinary actions. However 29(37.66%) department heads and 6(33.33%) supervisors agreed on the issue. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=3.054) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which in turn, showed that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. So, it could be judged that principals' Performance appraisals were not linked to disciplinary actions.

The intention with item 7 of table12 was to explore if principals appraisal was linked to assign duties. Accordingly, 37(40.05%) department heads and 9(50.00%) supervisors disagree that principals' performance appraisals were linked to assigned duties, whereas 31(40.26%) department heads and 4(22.22%) supervisors agreed. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=3.203) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom this showing that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Hence it may be possible to say principals' performance appraisals were not linked assigned duties.

4.2.6 Skills and knowledge required of appraisers

As to Rue and Byars (2003), among the promising mechanisms to overcome problems in principals performance appraisal practice are choosing appropriate raters, obtaining much information concerning the performance level of principals from a number of sources and enhancing the knowledge and skill of raters'. In this regard, a number of options could be used and involve different parities in appraising principals. This includes involving department heads and woreda supervisor students and parents. In general it is advisable that one could apply the principle of 360-degree appraisal approach which enables appraisers to get as much information as possible about the performance level of each principal. On top of these, appraisers should possess the necessary skills and knowledge as to how to use appraisal forms, conduct school observation, document and use appraisal results, and design and take corrective actions etc. Hence, this part of the research was aimed at to assess how secondary schools of Metekel Zone were being evaluated interview of these requirements.

Table 13: Appraisers awareness of their roles and responsibilities and if they have knowledge and skill in appraising principals.

No	Items	Respondents	Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Total		Computed χ^2
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Supervisors have appropriate knowledge about the performance level of principals	Department Heads	30	38.96	16	20.78	31	40.26	77	100	1.410
		Woreda supervisors	5	27.78	3	16.67	10	55.55	18	100	
		Total	35	36.84	23	24.21	41	43.16	95	100	
2	Students are aware of the what, why and how of principals performance appraisal	Department Heads	25	32.48	9	11.69	43	55.84	77	100	3.799
		Woreda supervisors	3	16.67	5	27.78	10	55.55	18	100	
		Total	28	29.47	14	14.74	53	55.79	95	100	
3	Students have their own performance records and means to appraise principals	Department Heads	29	37.66	12	15.58	36	46.75	77	100	4.679
		Woreda supervisors	2	11.11	4	22.22	12	66.67	18	100	
		Total	31	32.63	16	16.84	48	50.53	95	100	
4	PTA who involve in principals performance appraisal know about the what, why, how and when of principals' performance appraisal	Department Heads	22	28.57	13	16.88	42	54.55	77	100	3.737
		Woreda supervisors	2	11.11	6	33.33	10	55.56	18	100	
		Total	24	25.26	19	20.00	52	54.74	95	100	
5	PTA who involve in principals' performance appraisal have full information about which can help them appropriately	Department Heads	24	31.17	11	14.29	42	54.54	77	100	3.652
		Woreda supervisors	3	16.67	5	27.78	10	55.55	18	100	
		Total	27	28.42	16	16.84	52	54.74	95	100	
6	Appraisers measure principals' performance by using information from only limited sources	Department Heads	29	37.66	15	19.48	33	42.86	77	100	2.906
		Woreda supervisors	3	16.67	5	27.78	10	55.55	18	100	
		Total	32	33.69	20	21.05	43	45.26	95	100	

Key: The table value $\chi^2 = 5.99$ at 0.05 significant levels with two degrees of freedom

Appraisers include woreda supervisors and department head (teachers)

While responding to item 1 of table 13, the majority of the respondents [31(40.26%) department heads and 10(55.56%)] supervisors disagreed with the appropriateness of appraisers 'knowledge whereas, considerable number of respondents [30(38.96%) and 5(27.78%)] supervisors] agreed that the supervisors were aware of each principals' performance level. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=1.410) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which implies that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Therefore, it is fair to generalize that principals' appraisers in secondary school of the study area were not in a position to know each principal's performance level which implicitly indicates that they were not implementing principal performance appraisal system as intended.

In their response to item 2 of table 13, 43(55.84%) department heads and 10(55.55%) supervisors disagree that students are aware of the what, why and how of principal's performance appraisal whereas 25(32.48) agree the issue. Regarding this issue, the computed chi-square value (χ^2=3.799) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which means that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. From this it may be and acceptable if one says that secondary schools of Metekel Zone students were not aware of what, why and how of principal's performance appraisal.

With regard to item 3 of the same table 13, 36(46.75%) department heads and 12(66.67%) supervisors disagreed that Students have principals performance records and means to appraise principals whereas 29937.66%) department heads agreed. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=4.976) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which shows that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups on the issue. So it possible to say that to Students had no performance records if principals and also did not know the means to appraise principals.

In their response to item 4 of the same table 13, 42(54.55%) department heads and 10(55.56%) supervisors disagreed on that PTA members who involve in principals performance appraisal know about the what, why, how and when of principals' performance appraisal, whereas22(28.57%)department heads and 2(11.11%) supervisors agree the issue. The computed

chi-square value (χ^2=3.737) is less than e the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which implies that there was no significant statistical difference. It is thus, possible to conclude that Parents who involve in principals performance appraisal were not know about the what, why, how and when of principals' performance appraisal in the selected schools of Metekel Zone.

In their responses to item 5 of table 13, 42(54.54%) department heads and 10(55.55%) supervisors disagree that PTA who involve in principals' performance appraisal have full information about principals; appraisal in general and performance level of principals in particular which can help them appropriately, whereas 24(31.17%) department heads and 3(16.67%) supervisors agreed. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=3.652) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom; revealing that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Hence one may safely say that parents who involve in principals' performance appraisal had no full information about principals who appraise.

With regard to item 6 of the same table 13, 33(42.86%) department heads and 10(55.55%) supervisors disagree that appraisers measure principals' performance by using information only limited sources whereas 29(37.66%) department heads agreed. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=2.906) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which reveals that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Similarly, regarding items 5 and 6 of table 13, the participants of focus group discussion expressed their practical observation by saying that we rate principals for the sake of doing it. But we do know how the principal performance appraisal result negatively or positively affects principals' life.

4.2.7 Perception of practitioners towards Principal Performance Appraisal

The practitioners' positive or negative perception on the purposes, benefits, requirements, processes, frequency etc. of principal's performance appraisal positively or negatively affects effectiveness and efficiency practice of it. Hence, this part of the research was aimed at assessing the perception of appraisers of principals in view of the above mentioned issues those data was summarized and presented in the following table.

96

Table 14: Perception towards principal performance appraisal

No	Items	Respondents	Responses								Computed χ^2
			Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Total		
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Principals' performance appraisal should be practiced only for documenting principals' appraisal results	Department Heads	37	48.05	9	11.69	31	40.26	77	100	6.647
		Woreda supervisors	4	22.22	6	33.33	8	44.45	18	100	
		Total	41	43.16	15	15.79	39	41.05	95	100	
2	Principals' performance appraisal always causes negative consequence on teachers	Department Heads	22	28.57	10	12.99	45	58.44	77	100	5.694
		Woreda supervisors	2	11.11	3	16.67	13	72.22	18	100	
		Total	24	25.27	13	13.68	58	61.05	95	100	
3	Principals' performance appraisal does not demand planning and preparation	Department Heads	26	33.77	12	15.58	39	50.65	77	100	4.663
		Woreda supervisors	-	-	2	11.11	16	88.89	18	100	
		Total	26	27.37	14	14.74	55	57.89	95	100	
4	Principals' performance appraisal does not demand knowledge and skill of appraisers	Department Heads	27	35.07	14	18.18	36	46.75	77	100	5.843
		Woreda supervisors	2	11.11	2	11.11	14	77.78	18	100	
		Total	39	41.05	16	16.84	40	42.11	95	100	
5	Principals' performance appraisers can give faire results for principals without conducting school observation	Department Heads	26	33.77	10	12.99	41	52.25	77	100	8.430
		Woreda supervisors	-	-	4	22.22	14	77.78	18	100	
		Total	26	27.37	14	14.74	55	57.89	95	100	
6	It is enough if Principals' are appraised once a semester	Department Heads	28	36.36	11	14.29	38	49.35	77	100	12.550
		Woreda supervisors	-	-	1	5.56	17	94.44	18	100	
		Total	28	29.47	12	15.58	55	57.89	95	100	
7	Principals' performance appraisal are properly recorded and documented	Department Heads	21	27.27	13	16.88	43	55.84	77	100	3.820
		Woreda supervisors	9	50.00	3	16.67	6	33.33			
		Total	30	31.58	16	20.78	49	63.64	95	100	
8	Principals' performance appraisal schemes are designed and implemented based on government policies, programs and packages	Department Heads	31	40.26	11	14.29	35	45.45	77	100	1.395
		Woreda supervisors	10	55.56	2	11.11	6	33.33	18	100	
		Total	41	43.16	13	13.68	41	43.16	95	100	

Key: The table value $\chi^2=5.99$ at 0.05 significant levels with two degrees of freedom
Appraisers include woreda supervisors and department head (teachers).

In response to item 1 of table 14, the majority of respondents [37(48.05%) department heads and

4(22.22) supervisors] agreed that principal performance appraisal was be practiced for the sake

of documentation. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=6.647) is greater than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which depicts that there was significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Most of the open-ended questions indicated that Principals' performance appraisal was merely for the sake of formality. From this it is justifiable to conclude that many of the appraisers of principals had no better understanding about how principal's performance appraisal benefits both principals and schools.

With regard to item 2 table 14, relatively greater number of respondents 45(58.44%) department heads and 13(72.22% supervisors] disagreed that principals performance appraisal always results had negative consequences on principals whereas, considerable number of the respondents department heads[22(28.57%)]agreed on the issue. In relation to this issue, the computed chi-square value (χ^2=5.694) is almost the same as the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which shows that there was no significant statistical difference between the response of the two groups. Therefore, this was sufficient evidence for the researcher to conclude that appraisers of the principals of the study area were perceived to challenge principals and the result was used for making punitive administrative decisions on. Generally, it is possible to say that they developed negative attitude toward principal performance appraisal implying that they did not participate willingly.

The intention with item 3 of table 14 was to check the respondents' perception regarding the importance of planning in practicing effective principal's performance appraisal. In their response to this 39(50.65) department heads and 16(88.89) supervisors agreed that principals performance appraisal was practiced without its own separate plan whereas, 26(33.77) department heads only and agreed that the practice had plan of its own. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=4.663)is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom implying that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Therefore, based on the data, it is fair to conclude that practitioners of principal performance appraisal in secondary schools Metekel Zone had no clear understanding that how principal's performance appraisal demands its separate work plan.

While responding the item 4 of table 14, illustrates, 36(46.75) department heads and 14(77.78) supervisors responded that knowledge and skill of appraisers was not very critical requirement for appraisers in order to practice valid, reliable, fair and acceptable principals performance appraisal whereas, the rest considerable number of respondents [27(5.07) department heads] responded that knowledge and skill is important requirements. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=5.843)is almost the same as the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom shows that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Thus, it is rational to conclude that the majority of principal performance appraisal practitioners in secondary schools of the study area had nobetter understanding of the importance of knowledge and skill for appraisers.

The aim in raising item 5 of table 14 was to check the respondents' understanding on importance of school observation in conducting principal's performance appraisal. In their response to this, 41(52.25)department heads and 14(77.78) supervisors undermined its importance in fairly and validly rating principals whereas, once 26(33.77) department heads positively accepted the importance of school observation in appraising principals. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=8.430)is greater than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which shows that there was significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Most ideas obtained through of the open-ended questions and the interview results showed that performance appraisals of principals are not fair. Hence it is possible that to conclude that Principals' performance appraisers could not fairly appraise principals.

With regard to the item 6 of table 14, 38(49.35) department heads and 17(94.44) supervisors disagreed. With adequacy of appraising principals only once a semester whereas 28(36.36) department heads were agreed to the situation. As the table depicts, the calculated chi-square value (χ^2=12.550) is greater than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which in a way shows that there was significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Most of the open-ended questions and interview results showed that it is better to appraise principals' more than a semester. Therefore, based on the data it is possible to conclude that that it is no enough if principals are appraised once a semester.

With regard to the item 7 of table 14, 43(55.84) department heads and 6(33.33) supervisors disagree that Principals' performance appraisal were properly recorded and documented whereas 21(27.27) department heads and 9(50.00) woreda supervisors agreed on the issue. The calculated chi-square value (χ^2=3.820) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which shows that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups.

With regard to the item 8 of table 14, 35(45.45) departments heads and 6(33.33) supervisors disagreed that Principals' performance appraisal schemes were designed and implemented based on government policies, programs and packages whereas 31(40.26) department heads and 10(55.56) supervisors agreed. The calculated chi-square value (χ^2=1.395) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom shows that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Hence, it is possible to say that Principals' Performance appraisal schemes were not designed and implemented based on government policies, programs and packages.

4.2.8 Errors observed in practice of Principals' Performance Appraisal

Principals' performance appraisal problems are usually related to design and operation of appraisal system, lack of skill and competence of evaluators and negative perception of staff about the practice as the whole. And in here the researcher had attempted to assess principal appraisal problems secondary schools under consideration.

Table 15: Problem of principals' performance appraisal

No	Items	Respondents	Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Total		Computed χ^2
			No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
1	Performance appraisal result in schools varies according to Principals' performance appraisal	Department Heads	40	51.95	7	9.09	30	38.96	77	100	0.367
		Woreda supervisors	8	44.44	3	16.67	7	38.89	18	100	
		Total	48	50.53	10	10.53	37	38.94	95	100	
2	Appraisers give almost the same result for many principals	Department Heads	17	22.08	18	23.38	42	54.54	77	100	2.898
		Woreda supervisors	1	5.56	4	22.22	13	72.22	18	100	
		Total	18	18.95	22	23.16	55	57.89	95	100	
3	Appraisers give information or help principals that can use to improve their performance	Department Heads	28	36.36	6	7.79	43	55.84	77	100	3.838
		Woreda supervisors	8	44.44	4	22.23	6	33.33	18	100	
		Total	36	37.89	10	10.53	49	51.58	95	100	
4	Appraisers usually rate principals based on only recently observed principals behaviors and performances	Department Heads	31	40.26	9	11.69	37	48.05	77	100	3.114
		Woreda supervisors	6	33.33	5	27.78	7	38.89	18	100	
		Total	37	38.95	14	14.74	44	46.31	95	100	
5	No feedback system exists in the school system	Department Heads	18	23.38	8	10.39	51	62.23	77	100	7.782
		Woreda supervisors	-	-	5	27.78	13	72.22	18	100	
		Total	18	18.95	13	13.68	64	67.37	95	100	

Key: The table value $\chi^2=5.99$ at 0.05 significant levels with two degrees of freedom appraisers include woreda supervisors and department head (teachers).

While responding item 1 of table 15, the majority of respondents [38.96%) department heads and 7(38.89%) supervisors] disagreed that Performance appraisal result in schools varies according to whereas 40(51.95) department heads and 8(44.45) supervisors agreed. The computed chi-square value ($\chi^2=0.367$) is less than the table value ($\chi^2=5.99$) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which reveals that there was no significant statistical difference. Therefore, it is possible to deduce that appraisers in secondary schools of the study area were rating principals' according to their performance level in each criterion.

With regard to item 2 of table 15, 42(54.54%) department heads and 13(72.%) Supervisors disagreed that they give same results respective schools whereas, 17(22.08%) department heads agreed with the existence of such errors. Concerning the issue, the computed chi-square value ($\chi^2=2.898$)is less than the table value ($\chi^2=5.99$) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of

freedom. That means there is no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Therefore, it is justifiable for the researcher if he perceives that appraisers in secondary schools of Metekel Zone, Appraisers were not giving the same result for many principals.

Item 3 of table 15 was aimed at ascertain whether appraisers in secondary schools of the study area usually give very high or very low results for many principals. While responding to this 43(55.84%) department heads and 6(33.33%) supervisors disagreed that there was such appraisal condition whereas, considerable number of respondents [28(36.36%) department heads and 8(44.45%) supervisors] agreed. As illustrated in the table, the computed chi-square value (χ^2=3.838)is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom which reveals that there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two groups. Regarding the issue, the document analyzed revealed that appraisal results were unreasonably fair.

In responses to item 4 of table 15, 37(48.05%) department heads and 7(38.89%) supervisors disagreed that appraisers usually rated principals based on only recently observed behaviors and performances whereas 31(40.26%) department heads and 6(33.33%) supervisors disagreed. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=3.114) is less than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom meaning there was no significant statistical difference between the responses of the two respondent groups. Hence it is possible to say concludes that appraisers were not usually rating principals based on only recently observed principal's behaviors and performances.

With regard to item 5 of table 15, the majority of respondents [51(62.23%) department heads and 13(72.22%) supervisors] replied that were no feedback system. The computed chi-square value (χ^2=7.782) is greater than the table value (χ^2=5.99) at significant level of 0.05 with two degrees of freedom. This depicts that there was significant statistical difference between the responses of the two respondent groups.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of the Findings

The purpose of this study was to assess the current practice and to identify the major challenges in principals' performance appraisal in Secondary Schools of Metekel Zone. The study mainly focused on assessing the practice in relation to how principals' performance system was designed, for what purposes the results were used, to what extent appraisal steps were followed, which appraisal methods were frequently employed, how frequent was principals' performance appraisal done, if the rating criteria were valid and reliable, extent of knowledge and skill of appraisers for conducting effective principal performance appraisal, perception of practitioners on principals' performance appraisal and errors observed in the practice in secondary schools of Metekel Zone. To realize this quantitative and qualitative data were collected from different sources using varieties of data collecting mechanisms. The data collected in this way were analyzed and interpreted and, consequently the researcher came up with the following were the major findings:

1. **The profiles of the respondents**

   ☞ The majority of [70(73.68%)] were males which shows that the participation females the principals performance appraisal was very low.

   ☞ Regarding educational status of respondents, the majority,[and 61 (64.21%)]was found to hold first degree. In the case of student respondents, they were almost equal in number and were from all grade levels. In addition, it was found that the majority of PTA member respondents were literate.

   ☞ Concerning work experience, many of the respondents were at appropriate principals' career structure level and can appraise.

2. **The design of principal's performance appraisal system**

   ➢ There was no clear principals' performance appraisal system and lacks with professional competence, development strategies, and administrative decisions.

   ➢ Appraisers were not satisfied with the current principal performance appraisal instrument/methods.

   ➢ A principal performance appraisal was an integral part of decision making.

- ➢ Principal performance appraisal was stressful.
- ➢ Principal performance appraisal was necessary.
- ➢ Woreda supervisors, department heads, students and members of PTA were participating in Principal performance appraisal.
- ➢ Appraisers and principals were not agreeing on goals and objective for improvement.
- ➢ Woreda supervisors were not setting principal's task objective and developing individual task.
- ➢ Principals were receptive to performance appraisal.
- ➢ The aim and objectives of principal performance appraisal were not communicated and fully understood in schools.

3. The purposes of principal's performance appraisal

- Principal performance appraisal contributes to principal development (skill, potential).
- Principal performance appraisal instrument was not serving principals, was not contributing to career structure, and did not enable to recommend specific program designs to principals to improve their performance.
- There was no need- based training. The principal appraisal process did not influence the behavior of principals.

4. In relation to pre-appraisal meetings, the findings were that:

- Woreda supervisors were not exerting their efforts in making clear that the appraisal process involves two- way commutation between them and the appraisers.
- Woreda supervisors were not exerting their efforts in making clear what principals should do and contribute for schools.
- Principals were not clear about what the school critically expects of them and were not in a position to critically and selectively use their efforts and time on very important tasks and activities.
- Principals 'performance appraisers were in problem to assign and justify the performance level and standards of each principal during appraisal.
- Secondary schools of Metekel Zone were not in a better position to easily evaluate principals based on the identified core operational values in relation to maintaining quality of education in general, and, properly serving clients.

- Secondary school principals of the study area were not clear about the reason why they were appraised., what aspects if their work should be appraised and when they would be appraised implying that they were not willing to participate in it and have developed negative attitude towards its process and practice.

5. **Post appraisal discussion or feedback and follow up**
   - Principals were not getting appropriate feedback about their strengths and weaknesses observed during appraisal.
   - Appraisers were focusing on finding weaknesses while appraising principals than focusing on both weaknesses and strength.
   - There was superior-inferior relationship between appraisers and appraisees and appraisers were not providing professional support for principals in improving their future performance based on identified weaknesses during appraisal period.

6. The secondary school principals of Metekel zone were appraised only once a semester, as a result were not getting opportunity to discuss with their appraisers for learning from their mistakes.

7. Concerning validity and reliability of the appraisal criteria, the research finding has depicted that:
   - Most of the criteria in use were not achievable, relevant, specific, and measurable.
   - The appraisal criteria were not linked to rewards, disciplinary actions and assign duties.
   - there was no self and peer appraisal practice in secondary schools of Meekel Zone.
   - students and PTA members who were involving in principal performance appraisal had no any documented information about principals and they lacked knowledge about the why, what , how and other aspects of principal appraisal practice ;
   - the secondary schools of the study area were using limited sources of information about apraisees i.e. 360-degree appraisal method was not evident.

8. The understanding appraisers and appraisees of the purpose, process, prerequisites, their roles and how of principal performance appraisal was very low.

9. Concerning errors that appraisers were committing in appraising principals, the finding of this revealed that:

- appraisers in secondary schools of the study area were rating principals not according to their performance level as per the criteria rather they were giving appraisal results based on a single prominent principal characteristic implying that hallo effect was the appraisal problem;
- they were rating principals without having properly documented evidences that recent behavior bias was evident in schools of the study area.
- appraisal results given to different principals were fairly distributed which implicitly indicates that constant error was not a problem in appraisal practice in secondary schools of the study area.

5.2 Conclusions

Based on the major findings, the researcher has arrived at the following conclusions:

1. Principals' performance appraisal system was not properly designed.

2. Responsible bodies like word supervisors did not create awareness about the benefit of principals' performance appraisal to both the principals themselves and the schools.

3. Principal performance appraisers were not using multiple sources of information.

4. There had been no policy documents, guidelines and manuals to refer to.

Consequently, it can be concluded that principal's performance appraisal is not only improperly practiced but also is ineffective

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the major findings and the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations were forwarded.

1. For principal performance appraisal to be effective there must be clear and achievable objectives. If an appraisal system does not have a clear purpose, it will be a meaningless exercise (Monyatsi 2003).

2. Effective principal performance appraisal is continual cyclical process of determining performance expectation, supporting performance, reviewing and appraising and finally managing performance of principals.

3. Effective principal performance appraisal is a comprehensive principal's review process, not just an event that occurs once a year. Performance appraisal must be workable, equitable, ongoing and as objective as possible because the organization and all involved are expected to follow and meet all legal requirements (Monday, 2001).

4. Validity and reliability of the appraisal criteria can affect the acceptability of the principal performance appraisal results by principals and those who use it for different decisions. The criteria must be achievable, time bounded, relevant, measurable and specific. The criteria should be linked to rewards, disciplinary action and assign duties.

5. It is clearly stated in the finding of the research that appraisers were evaluating principals without having relevant performance information. About each principal which resulted in committing several appraisal errors. Therefore, it is advisable that:

   5.1. The appraisers who evaluate principals in a given academic year need to be assigned and informed at the beginning of the academic year so that they can have documented information.

   5.2. Both student and PTA member appraisers to have principal performance appraisal criteria at hand a head of time so that it would help them familiarize themselves with each criteria and take their notes about daily performance of each principal.

   5.3. All concerned bodies in the school need to practice planned and consistent Principals performance observation which would help them to have adequate information about each principal to judge his/ her performance result objectively and fairly.

6. The research finding has indicated that secondary schools of the study area were usually using principals' performance appraisal results for mere administrative and documentation purpose. Hence, it is advisable that the concerned education officers of the study area use it for other purposes such as strategic, developmental and communication purposes which would enable them to improve Principals leadership competence and improve school performance as the whole. In doing so, they are specifically advised to:

   6.1. design regular and consistent feedback system so that principals could understand their weaknesses and plan to improve.

   6.2. designed need-based trainings for principals for the sake of improving principals' leadership competence based on identified weakness.

   6.3. design reward system which enables them to encourage principals who perform better.

107

7. As one can see from the finding of this research, secondary schools of the study area were not using as many information sources as possible in judging the performance result of principals specifically; peer and self-appraisal methods which are valuable sources of information about one's performance level were not utilized. Therefore, it is recommended if they can use self and peer as well as other appraisal methods to get total performance judgment about one's own appraisal result.

8. Currently, principals of primary and secondary schools in all parts of Ethiopia are expected to exert greater efforts to perform school activities related to school improvement program, continuous professional development program, civic and ethical education, English language improvement and others. In this regard, they are more or less investing greater share of their time and energy in performing different tasks which are directly or indirectly related to these programs. But the research finding has indicated that there were no principal performance appraisal criteria that relate to the above issues. Hence, it is advisable that concerned bodies for secondary schools of the study area include issues related to the above school programs and packages in their principal performance appraisal criteria.

9. As the finding of this research indicated, woreda supervisors under consideration were using principal's performance criteria which are prepared and approved by someone elsewhere. Therefore, it is advisable for schools to design principal performance appraisal systems and set appraisal criteria by considering factors which are beyond and under their control. In addition, it is good if schools are given the right to design appraisal criteria based on their demand and context by being under the umbrella of Federal as well as Regional Civil Service policies.

10. The finding of this research has shown that appraisers were lacking the necessary skills and knowledge as to how to use appraisal forms, how to conduct performance observation, how to give feedback and follow the improvements of principals etc. In addition, appraisers and appraisees have negative attitude toward principal performance appraisal. Based on this finding, it is recommended that concerned bodies of all levels design trainings for all practitioners to create awareness and to capacitate them concerning why, what, how,etc of principals performance appraisal. It is also recommended that all principals have a copy of appraisal criteria written in black and white.

References

Adane Tessera, Grimay Berhe, Melaku Yimam and Worku Getachew. (2000).School organization and management: distance education material for in-service training. Unpublished Distance Education Module, Addis Ababa University, Faculty of Education Addis Ababa**.**

Aguinis, H. (2007). *Performance management.* London: Printice Hall.

Armstrong,S., and Appelbaum,M(2003). Stress- free performance Appraisal: Turn your painful management duty into motivation tool. Franklin Lakes, N.J, career press.

Autory,J.A (2001). The Servant Leader. Roseville, CA : Prima Publishing.

AyalewShibashi (1991).*Approaches to educational organization and management. Unpublished teaching material .*A.A.U Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education..

Bascal, R. (1999). *Performance Management.*New York: McGraw-Hill.

Belcourt, Sherman, Bohlander& Snell. (1998).*Managing human*

resources: Secondcanadianedition. Toronto: An International Thomson Publishing Company.

Brown, A.(2006). *The Effectiveness of Performance Appraisals as Measured by a Community College's Employees*. (Unpublished PhD dissertation Walden University).

Coens,T and Jenkins,M.(2000). Abolishing performance appraisal why they backfire and what to-do instead. Sanfancisco: Berret. Koehler.

Cohen, L. (1994). *Research methods in education (4thed).*New York: Routhledge.

Cokins, G. (2004).*Performance management: Finding the missing pieces and closing the intelligence gap.* Australia: John Wiley and Sons.

Covey,S.R.(1992). Principle- centered leadership. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Cullingford, C. (2004). *The effective teacher.* Great Britain: Biddes Ltd.

Danielson, C. (2001).*New trends in teacher evaluation:* Educational leadership. New York: NY Sage.

Davis,J.P(1997).Assessing what professors Do. An introduction to Academic Performance Appraisal in higher education.

Decenzo, A. & Robins P. (2007). *Fundamentals of human resource management (9thed).* USA: Wiley and Sons .Inc.

Dessler, G. & Cole, D. (2002).*Human resource management in canada: Canadian eighth edition.*Virginia: Sir Sandford Fleming College.

Edwards,M.RandEwen,J.A (1996) . 360^0feed back ; the powerful new model for employee assessment and performance improvement. New york ; AMACOM.

Emojong, J. (2004). In-service training programs and their effects on the performance of staff at the uganda revenue authority. Kampala: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Makerere University.

Eric A.Brown (2006). The effectiveness of performance appreisel; walden university

Fidler, B. & Cooper, R. (1992).*Staff appraisal and staff management in schools and colleges:* A Guide to implementation. UK: Longman Group.

Fletcher,J (2004). Appraisal Systems: friend or foe? Royal college of Nursing publishing company,14,20.

Foot, M. & Hook, C. (1999).*Introducing human resource management (2nded).*Malaysia: LongMan.

GetuWodajo . (2011) .Human resource utilization in some selected government technical and vocational institutes and colleges in North Wollo Administrative Zone. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Addis Ababa University, Faculty of Education, Addis Ababa.

Graw - Hill book.

Greer, R. (2001). *Strategic human resource management: A general managerial approach (2nded).* London: Printice Hall.

Hall . Armstrong, M. (2005).*Managing performance: Performance management in action.* London: CIPD.

Harris, M. (1997).*Human resource management: A practical approach.* New York: The Dryden Press Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Imundo ,L.V.(1980) .The effective supervisor's hand book. New York ; AMACOM.

Ivancevich , M. (2009*). Human resource management (10thed).* Boston: McGraw Hill.

Jose, F. &Gonzales .(1993). *Methods of research and thesis writing.* Paris: National Book store, Acebost.Marulas.

Kermally, S. (1997).*Managing performance in the brief.* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

king,p(1984). Performance Planning and appraisal: A how to for manager , New York; Mc

Maddux, R.B(1986, 1987). Effective performance appraisal: Revised edition. Los Altos, CA; crip publication, Inc.

McKirchy, K(1998). Powerful performance appraisals: How to set expectations and Work together improves performance franklin cakes, NJ: career press.

Mcmillan, H. (1996).*Research fundamentals forthe consumer. (7thed).*Virginia: Common Wealth University.

Meilman , p. w (2001). Human Resouce Issues in Unversity Health sevices. Journal of American College Health, 50, 43.

Melaku Yimam . (1992). Appraise -appraiser perception of teacher performance appraisal in senior secondary schools of Addis Ababa. Unpublished Master'sThesis.Addis Ababa University, Faculty of Education, Addis Ababa.

Merriam,S.B.(2001).Qualitatively Research and case study application in education Sanfracisco:Johnwiley and Son, Inc.

MOE .(1994). *New education and training policy.* Addis Ababa: St.George Printing Press.

Mondy R.(2001). *Human resource management (2nded).* Toronto: Prentice Hill.Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of South Africa: Pretoria.

Namuddu, J. (2005).Staff appraisal systems and teacher performance at Aga Khan Schools In Kampala District. Un published Doctoral Dissertation.

Noe, A. Hellonback,R. Gehart, B. &Wright,M.(2009). *Fundamentals of human resource management (3rded).* London: McGraw Hill.

OECD.(2009). Teacher evaluation: A conceptual framework and examples of country practices. (Un Published).Porter, C. Bingham, C. & Simmonds, D. (2008).*Exploring human resource management.* London: McGraw-Hill.

Rue, W. &Byars, L. (2003). *Management skills and application.(10th ed.)* .Boston:McGraw Hill Ir win.

Simmons,A.(2003) when performance review fail: performance management often conflicts with relationship management.

Smither,J.W.(1980) Performance appraisal: State of the art in practice .san Francisco, CA: Jossey-Baass.

Spunt,T.M.(1999). Guide to customer surveys: Sample questionnaires and detailed guide for creating effective Surveys. New York : The customer service group.

Wossenu.Yimanm (2007): survey study on principals performance appraisal in TVET school of Ethiopia: Unpublished Master's Thesis. Addis Ababa University, Faculty ofEducation, Addis Ababa.

Questionnaire to be filled by Department

Heads (Teachers) and Woreda supervisors

Dear respondents:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect relevant data on the study titled "Practices of Principals' performance Appraisal in Secondary Schools of Metekel Zone". Since your responses are vital for the success of the study, you are kindly requested to read all questions and fill the questionnaire genuinely. Be sure that your responses will be used for academic purpose only and information will be strictly confidential and kept only with the researcher.

General Directions

1. You do not need to write your name on the questionnaire;

2. Read all the instructions before attempting the items in the questionnaire;

3. There is no need to consult others to fill the questionnaire;

4. Please, use a tick mark "√" or "X" to choose one of the suggested scales. For the short questions write your opinion in brief.

Thank you for your cooperation!

Part One: Background Information

Indicate your response either by using a tick mark (√) in the box provided or by giving short answers on the space provided.

1.1 School…………………………………………………

 1.2 Sex Male ☐ Female ☐

1.3 Age   18 -22 ☐   23 – 27 ☐   28 -32 ☐   33 -37 ☐   above 38   ☐

1.4 Work experience: 1-5 years ☐ 6-10 year's ☐ 11-15 years ☐

16-20 years ☐ 21-25 year's ☐ above 26 years ☐

1.4   Educational background: Diploma ☐ First Degree ☐ Second Degree ☐

1.5 Current work position: Department head ☐ Woreda supervisor ☐

Part Two: Please, respond to the following liker scale questions based on the instruction given above each table.

2.1 In the following table, there are items which describe as how performance management system is designed, So, read each item and express your feeling based on your practical observation whether these items show the real practice of performance management design at your school or not by choosing N.B 5=Strongly Agree (SA), 4=Agree (A), 3=Partially Agree (PA), 2= Disagree (D) or 1=Strongly Disagree (SD) Use '√' or 'X' mark under the scale you choose in the table corresponding to each item

2.1 About performance appraisal system

No	Items	Scales				
		5	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
1	Overall, I am satisfied that the current performance instrument/method of performance appraisal is the most appropriate form of evaluation for the needs of the school					
2	There is clear performance management system in the school					
3	Principal Performance appraisals are an integral part of the decision-making process					
4	. Principal Performance appraisals are stressful					
5	Principal Performance appraisals are necessary					
6	Woreda supervisors setting principals task objectives and developing individual task plans					
7	The appraiser and principals agree on goals and objectives for improvement					
8	Department Heads, Woreda supervisors, students and parents are involving in the process of appraising principal performance appraisal scheme.					
9	Principal are receptive to performance appraisals					
10	The aims and objective of Principal Performance appraisals communicated and fully understood in schools					

2.2 About the purpose of principals' performance appraisal

2.2 In the following table, there are items that describe about purposes of principals' performance appraisal. So, give your responses based on your practical observation as to whether these items reflect the real practice or not at your school. N.B5=Strongly Agree (SA), 4=Agree (A), 3=Partially Agree (PA), 2= Disagree (D), 1=Strongly Disagree (SD). Use '√' or 'X' mark to each items.

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Principals' performance appraisal contribute to principal development(skill, potential)					
2	Principal's the performance appraisal instrument best serves principals					
3	Principals' Performance appraisals contribute to career structure					
4	Principals' performance appraisal has enabled the school to recommend a specific program designs to help principals to improve their performance					
5	The performance appraisal instrument measures what it is intended to measure					
6	Need-based trainings to principals are designed and provided based on their performance appraisal results					
7	Principal performance appraisal process are effective in influencing the behavior of principals					

2.3 About the process and steps of principal performance appraisal

2.3. In the following table, there are items which describe about the process and steps of PPA. So, give your response based on your practical observation as to whether the Woreda supervisor passing through these steps in appraising principals or not. <u>N.B</u>5=Strongly Agree (SA), 4=Agree (A), 3=Partially Agree (PA), 2= Disagree (D), 1=Strongly Disagree (SD). Use '√' or 'X' mark to write in the table corresponding to an item described below.

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	**Pre- appraisal meeting practice**					
1.1	principal performance appraisal process involves two-way communication					
1.2	The roles of principals at the beginning of the academic year are clearly described					
1.3	Principals tasks are assigned based on their competence, skill and knowledge					
1.4	Assessment of principals performance are consistence, fair and unbiased					
1.5	Performance standards of principals daily tasks are clearly indicated					
1.6	Objectives of each task are clearly defined					
1.7	Appraisers conduct both pre-and post-appraisal discussion					

2	**Post-appraisal discussion and target setting practice (Feedback practice)**					
2.1	There is a regular feedback schedule at your school					
2.2	Principals motivated after post appraisal discussion					
2.3	The discussion focuses only on criticizing the weakness and strengths of principals'					
2.4	Discussion lasts by mutual agreement of both appraiser and the appraisees					
3	**Follow up and discussion practice**					
3.1	Appraisers help the principals to set the means as to how he/she can tackle challenges in his/her future performance targets					
3.2	Appraisers continuously follow up whether principals' improved their performance level or not based on the feedback provided after school observation					

2.4 About how frequent appraise principals

2.4. In the table below, there are items which describe how frequent Woreda supervisor and Department Heads appraise principals. So, answer the items based on your practical observation. <u>N.B</u>5=Strongly Agree (SA), 4=Agree (A), 3=Partially Agree (PA), 2= Disagree (D), 1=Strongly Disagree (SD). Use '√' or 'X' mark to write in the table corresponding to an item described below.

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Principals are appraised only once a semester.					
2	Performance level of each principals is continuously evaluated					
3	Principals' performance appraisal helped principals to get an opportunity to discuss regularly their performance level with their appraisers					

2.5 About reliability and validity of criteria of principals' performance appraisal

2.5. In the following table, there are items which are talking about reliability and validity of criteria of principals' performance appraisal which Woreda supervisors should use in designing and implementing PPA. So, give your response based on your practical observation as to whether or not principals' performance appraisal criteria at your school are reliable and valid. <u>N.B</u>. 5=Strongly Agree (SA), 4=Agree (A), 3=Partially Agree (PA), 2= Disagree (D), 1=Strongly Disagree (SD). Use '√' or 'X' mark to write in the table corresponding to an item described below.

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	The Principals performance appraisal criteria are on achievable and time bounded					
2	The rating appraisal criteria that are operating now are relevant					
3	The rating appraisal criteria that are operating now are specific					
4	The rating appraisal criteria that are operating now are measurable					
5	Principals; Performance appraisals are linked to rewards					
6	Principals' Performance appraisals are linked to disciplinary actions					
7	Principals' Performance appraisals are linked assigned duties					

2.6. About parents students department heads and Woreda supervisors, to what extent they Are knowledgeable, skillful and aware of their roles and responsibilities

2.6. In the table below, there are items which describe about how often Woreda supervisors, Department Heads, students, and parents and involve in PPA as well as to what extent they are knowledgeable, skillful and are aware of their roles and responsibilities in PPA. So, answer the items based on your practical observation. N.B5=Strongly Agree (SA), 4=Agree (A), 3=Partially Agree (PA), 2= Disagree (D), 1=Strongly Disagree (SD). Use '√' or 'X' mark to write in the table corresponding to an item described below.

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Supervisors have appropriate knowledge about the performance level of principals'					
2	Students are aware of the what, why and how of principals' performance appraisal					
3	Students have their own performance records and means to appraise principals					
4	Parents who involve in principals performance appraisal know about the what, why, how, and when of principals' performance appraisal					
5	Parents who involve in PPA performance appraisal have full information about principals' which can help them to appraise principals appropriately					
6	Woreda supervisors measure principals' performance by using only limited sources					

2.7 About methods of Principals' performance appraisal

2.7. In the following table, there are items which describe to what extent the respondents know and understand about why, what, how when and other aspects of steps PPA. So, give your response based on your perception regarding the above issues. N.B5=Strongly Agree (SA), 4=Agree (A), 3=Partially Agree (PA), 2= Disagree (D) or 1=Strongly Disagree (SD). Use '√' or 'X' mark to respond each to item.

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Principals' performance appraisal should practice only for documenting principals' appraisal results					
2	Principals' performance appraisal always causes negative consequence on principals					
3	Conducting principals' performance appraisal does not demand planning and preparation					
4	Conducting principals' performance appraisal does not demand knowledge and skill of appraisers					
5	Principals' performance appraisers can give faire results for principals without conducting school observation					
6	It is enough if principals are appraised once a semester					
7	Principals' performance appraisal are properly recorded and documented					
8	Principals' performance appraisal schemes are designed and implemented based on government policies, programs and packages					

2.8 Aboutregarding to problem with Performance appraisal result

2.8. In the table below, there are items which describe problems which can be created in the process of PPA. So, respond based on your practical observation as to whether the items describe the existing problems at your school or not. N.B.5=Strongly Agree (SA), 4=Agree (A), 3=Partially Agree (PA), 2= Disagree (D), 1=Strongly Disagree (SD),. Use '√' or 'X' to mark under each scale.

No	Items	Scales				
		5	4	3	2	1
1	Performance appraisal result in schools varies according to Principals' performance appraisal					
2	Appraisers give almost the same result for many principals					
3	Appraisers give information or help principals that can use to improve their performance					
4	Appraisers usually rate principals based on only recently observed principals behaviors and performances					
5	No feedback system exists in the school system					

Part Three: Challenges of Principals' performance Appraisal Practice and Recommendations for Improvement..

1.   How do you think the current the Principals performance appraisal criteria in your school are specific, achievable, measurable, reliable, and time bounded?

_____

_____

_____

2. How do describe the current principal performance practice in your school? What do you suggest? Explain?

_____

_____

_____

3. What are the major problems in principal performance appraisal practice in your school? What are the possible solutions?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Jimma University

Institute of Education and Professional Development Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Focus Group Discussion Questions for Student Respondents

I. Dear respondents:

The purpose of this group discussion is to collect relevant data on the study titled as "Practices and challenges of principals' performance Appraisal in Secondary Schools of Metekel Zone". Since your ideas are vital for the success of the study, you are kindly requested to freely discus and express your feeling concerning practical observation of principals' performance appraisals practice. Be sure that your responses will be used for academic purpose and information will be strictly confidential and kept only with the researcher.

II. Background Information

- Name of the school...
- Number of participants: Male...........................Female........................Total....................
- Grade Level: 9th ....10th ....11th ....12th ....
- Experience of participating in principals performance appraisal:

once.......................twice...................three times............... four times and more than that...........

III. Focus Group Discussion Guiding Questions

1. When you frequently participating in appraising principals?
2. Do you have wide information about the purposes for which principals' performance appraisal results are used and the procedure of appraisal?
3. Is there a system for students to have performance information of each principal all the time?
4. Is there training before appraising principals?
5. Is there the practice of giving feedback to principals' after evaluation?
6. What are the major challenges that you usually face during principals' performance appraisal?
7. What solutions can you suggest to overcome the problem?

Appendix-III

Jimma University

Institute of Education and Professional Development Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Focus Group Discussion Questions for Parent Teacher Association Members

I. Dear respondents:

The purpose of this group discussion is to collect relevant data on the study titled as "Practices and challenges of principals' performance Appraisal in Secondary Schools of Metekel Zone". Since your ideas are vital for the success of the study, you are kindly requested to freely discuss and express your feeling concerning practical observation of principals' performance appraisal practice. Be sure that your responses will be used for academic purpose and information will be strictly confidential and kept only with the researcher.

II. Background Information

- Name of the school..
- Number of participants: Male...........................Female.......................Total.....................
- Diploma ....first degree ....12 completed ....can read write.................. cannot read and write...................
- Experience of participating in principals performance appraisal:

  Once.......................twice...................three times.............. four times and more than that...........

III. Focus Group Discussion Guiding Questions

1. When you frequently participating in appraising principals?
2. Do you have wide information about the purposes for which principals' performance appraisal results are used and the procedure of appraisal?
3. Is there a system for students to have performance information of each principal all the time?
4. Is there training before appraising principals?
5. Is there the practice of giving feedback to principals' after evaluation?
6. What are the major challenges that you usually face during principals' performance appraisal?
7. What solutions can you suggest to overcome the problem?

Appendix- IV

Jimma University

Institute of Education and Professional Development Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Guiding questions for consulting documents related to principals performance appraisal

I. General Direction

The purpose of this checklist is to collect relevant data on the study titled "Practices and challenges of Principals' performance Appraisal in Secondary Schools of Metekel Zone". Since the data which the researcher is going to collect using this instrument are vital for the success of the study, the concerned school personnel are kindly requested to show all the documents which the data collector asks them to do so. Be sure that the data will be used for academic purpose and information will be strictly confidential and kept only with the researcher.

II. The Profiles of the School

Name of the Woreda…………………………………………..

Name of the School …………………………………………

III. Guidelines for document Analysis

1. The presence of separate performance appraisal format

2. The presence of school observation plan

3. The presence of pre-appraisal meetings properly documented

4. Regarding documents which show post observation

5. Concerning checklists for follow up of school observations

6. Feedbacks given for each principals' are properly documented

7. The presence of strengths and weaknesses of each principal identified and documented

8. The presence of rewards given for better performing principals properly documented

9. Concerning documents which show disciplinary measures taken based on the results of performance appraisal in each school

10. Personal documents of principals regarding their appraisal results given by PTA, students, Woreda supervisors

Jimma University

Institute of Education and Professional Development Studies

Department of Educational Planning and Management

Interview questions for principals' and woreda education Heads related to principals performance appraisal

I.   General Direction

The purpose of this interview is to collect relevant data on the study titled "Practices and challenges of Principals' performance Appraisal in Secondary Schools of Metekel Zone". Since the data which the researcher is going to collect using this interview are vital for the success of the study to get deep information about the Practices and challenges of Principals' performance Appraisal, concerned school principals and Woreda education office heads are kindly requested to answers the interviews.

1. How do you express the current Practices of Principals' performance Appraisal in your school?
2. What relations do observe between performance Appraisal criteria and a career structure schemes in your school?
3. What are the major problems and possible solutions related to principal performance appraisal in your school?

Appendix VII

የርዕሰ መምሕራን የስራ አፈጻጸም መገምገሚያ ቅጽ

በት/ቤቱ አመራር አካላት የሚሞላ

ተ.ቁ	መስፈርቶች	መለኪያ				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	ት/ቤቱ ለማስተማር መምር ሂድ እገዛ እንዲደረግ በተገቢዉ ሁኔታ እንዲደራጅ የማድረግ አፈጻጸሙን የመከታተል ብቃት					
2	የት/ቤቱን የህበረተሰብ በማሳተፍና የተጎዳኝ ትምህርት ፕሮግራሞችን የማደራጀት የማቀድና የማስተባበር ብቃት					
3	የማስተማር መመር ሂደት እንዲሰምር ለት/ቤቱ አመራር አካላትና መምህራን ድጋፍና አመራር መስጠት					
4	የመምን የት/እቅድ ዝግጅት አቀራረብ በቅርብ የመከታተል ሙያዊ ድጋፍ የመስጠትና ተግባራዊነቱንም የመቆጣጠር					
5	ከወላጆች ጋር የቅርብ ግንኙነት የመፍጠር ለወላጆቻዉ ትምህርትና ስነ-ሰርአት አከ					
6	የመምህራን ሰራኞችና ተማሪዎች ስራ ጊዜያቸዉን አክበረዉ መገኘታቸዉንና የተመደቡላቸዉን ስራና ሀላፊነት መወጣታቸዉን በቅርብ የመከታተልና የመቆጣጠር ብቃት					
7	በመማር ማስተማሩ ሂደትም ሆነ በት/ቤቱ አደረጃጀት አመራርን በአስተዳደር ጉዳዮች ላይ ጥናትና መርምሮች እንዲካሁዱ የማስተማር ብቃት					
8	ስርዓተ ተምህርትን በአካባቢዉ ተጨባጭ ሁኔታ ጋር እያገናዘበ እንዲተባበርና እንዲዳብር የማሻሻያ ሃሳቦችን ለመምህራን በየጊዜዉ የመስጠት ብቃት					
9	እግባብነት ያላቸዉ የማስተማር ዘዴዎችን እና የትምርት መረጃ መሳርዎችን የመጠቀም ብቃት					
10	ሲለበሱን በወቅቱ ለመሸፈን በት/ዝግጅት መሰረት የማስተማርና በዕቅድ የመስራት ብቃት					

በወላጆች የሚሞላ

ተ.ቁ	መስፈርቶች	መለኪያ				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	ከጀማሪ መምህር እስከ መሪ መምህር፦- የትምህርት ተሳትፎን ለማድረግ እና ጠቀሜታዉን ለወላጆችና ለአካባቢዉ ህብረተሰብ ለማሳወቅ በመተባበር ለመስራ ደረገዉ ጥረት					
2	ተማሪዎች ቤተሰቦቻቸዉን ቤተሰብ በተማሪዎች ላይ የሚኖራቸዉ እምነት እንዲነለብት ለመምከርና በማበራታታት ደረገዉ ጥረት					
3	ለአካባቢዉ ማ/ሰብ ባህል የሚጠቅሙ ወቅታዊ ማህበረሰብ እንቅስቃሴዎች ላይ በመሳተፍ ዜግነት ኃላፊነት በተገቢዉ ሁኔታ ለመወጣት ያደረገዉ ጥረት					
4	ለአካባቢዉ ማ/ሰብ ባህል የሚሰጠዉ አክብሮትና ነጂ ባህሎች በዉይይት በትምህት እንዲወገዱ ያደረገዉ ጥረት					
5	ለተማሪዎች ለአካባቢዉ ህ/ሰ የሚያሳየዉ መልካም ስነ-ምግባር ተባብሮ የመስራ ችሎታና በወላጆች ባካባበዉ ህ/ሰብ ዘንድ ያዉ ተቀባይነት					
6	የተማሪዎችን የመማር ችግር ለማቃለል ለወላጆችና ከአካባቢዉ ህ/ሰብ ጋር የሚደረገዉ ግንኙነትና ከት/ቤት ዉጭ ከአልባሌ ቦታዎች እንዳዉሉ የማድረግ ጥረትና ክትትል የማድግ ብቃት					
7	የተማሪዎች ህፃናት የሴቶች የትምህት ተሳትፎ የማነልበት ወላጆችና የአካባቢዉ ህብረተሰብ ለመቀስቀስ ያደረገዉ ጥረት					
8	ተማሪዎች የትምህረት እድገት ለማጠናከር ተከታታይ ፈተናዎች መልመጃዎች የቤትና የክፍል ስራዎችን አዘጋጅት የመስጠት የማረም ዉቴቶችን ለወላጆች ማሳወቅ የወላጆች ክትትል ለማነልበት የደረገዉ ጥረት					
	አማካይ ዉጤት					

በተማሪዎች የሚሞላ

ተ.ቁ	መስፈርቶች	መለኪያ				
		1	2	3	4	5
1.	ተማሪዎች በተንዳን ፕሮግራሞች እንደየፍላጎታቸዉ እንዲሳተፉ በማድረግ የማስተማር ብቃት					
2.	መምህራን በተማሪዎች፣ በወላጆች መካከል መልካም አቀራረብና ወላጆቻቸዉን የትምህርት አቀራረብ እንዲከታተሉ የማድረግ ብቃት					
3	የተለዩ የአካል ጉዳተኞች ተማሪዎች አስፈለጊዉን ድጋፍ እንዲገኙ የማስተማር ብቃት					
4	ተከታታ ፈተናዎች ፣ መልመጃዎችን፣ የክፍልና የቤት ስራዎችን በየጊዜዉ የመስጠትና የማረም በትክክል መልሶች ላይ ግንዛቤ እንዲወሰድባቸዉ የማድረግ ጥረት					
5	ትምህር በአካባቢዉ ተጨባጭ ሁኔታ ጋር በማገናዘብ የትምህረት መረጃ መሳርዎችን በመጠቀም በግልጽ ቋንቋ የማቅረብና የተማሪዎች ሙሉ ተሳታፊ እንዲሆኑ የማድረግ ብቃት					
6	የስነ-ምግባር ብቃት ለስራ ያዉ ታታሪነት፣ አርነት፣ በእምነት በጸታ ወይም በሌላ ልዩነት የማድረግ ወ.ዘ.ተ.					
7	ተማሪዎች ቤተ-መጽሐፍት የመጠቅም ልምድ እንዲያዳብሩ ምክር የመስጠት ብቃት					
8	ለትምህር ስ መቃናት የመሰጠዉ የአመራር ብቃት					

የገምጋሚዎች አስተያየት
1. በት/ቤት መምህራን እና በአመራር አካላት የሚሞላ

1. C/መምህሩ ካለፈዉ ግምገማ ወዲህ ያደረገዉ ማሻሻያ

   ----

2. ከግምገማ በኋላ በተደረገዉ ዉይይት መሻሻል ስለሚገባቸዉ ጉዳዮች ምክርና እርዳታ

   ----

3. አጠቃላይ አስተያየት

   ----

4. የገምጋሚዉ ስም የስራ ድርሻ ፊርማ

   ስም -------------------------------- የስ ድርሻ ----------------- ፊርማ -------------------------

   ስም -------------------------------- የስ ድርሻ ----------------- ፊርማ -------------------------

   ስም -------------------------------- የስ ድርሻ ----------------- ፊርማ -------------------------

5. ግምገማዉን ያጸደቀዉ ክፍል አስተያየት ---

   ሰም ----------------------- ፊርማ -------------------- ቀን-----------------------

2.በተማሪዎች የሚሞላ

1. C/መምህሩ ካለፈዉ ግምገማ ወዲህ ያደረገዉ ማሻሻ

   ----

2. ከግምገማ በኋላ በተደረገዉ ዉይይት መሻሻል ስለማገባቸዉ ጉዳዮች ምክርና እርዳታ

   ----

3. አጠቃላ አስተያየት

   ----

4. የገምጋሚዉ ስም የሥራ ድርሻ ፊርማ

   ስም -------------------------------- የስ ድርሻ ----------------- ፊርማ -------------------------

   ስም -------------------------------- የስ ድርሻ ----------------- ፊርማ -------------------------

   ስም -------------------------------- የስ ድርሻ ----------------- ፊርማ -------------------------

3 በወላጆች የሚሞላ

5. C/መምህሩ ካለፈዉ ግምገማ ወዲህ ያደረገዉ ማሻሻ

   ----

6. ከግምገማ በኋላ በተደረገዉ ዉይይት መሻሻል ስለማገባቸዉ ጉዳዮች ምክርና እርዳታ

   ----

7. አጠቃላ አስተያየት

   ----

8. የገምጋሚዉ ስም የሥራ ድርሻ ፊርማ

   ስም -------------------------------- የስራ ድርሻ ----------------- ፊርማ -------------------------
   -
   ስም -------------------------------- የስ ድርሻ ----------------- ፊርማ -------------------------