PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL PRACTICES AND TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS IN GHANA: PERSPECTIVE OF TEACHERS IN THE KRACHI NCHUMURU DISTRICT

Emmanuel Anuaberor Kumah & Roger Amoako
University of Education, Winneba

Abstract

This study investigated performance appraisal practices and teacher effectiveness in Public Junior High Schools (PJHSs) in the Krachi Nchumuru District and identified possible errors committed by appraisers in the conduct of teacher performance appraisals. The concurrent triangulation mixed-method research design was employed for the study. One hundred and seven (107) teachers were selected for the quantitative phase of the study using a stratified simple random proportional sampling technique, while a homogenous sampling technique was employed to select thirteen (13) participants for the qualitative phase of the study. A structured questionnaire and semi-structured interview guide were used to collect data for the quantitative and qualitative phases respectively. The quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS Version 20, while the qualitative data were analyzed using the grounded theory model. The study revealed that teachers in PJHSs in the Krachi Nchumuru District have positive perceptions of performance appraisal practices. The study also established a positive statistical relationship between performance appraisal practices and teacher effectiveness in PJHSs in the Krachi Nchumuru District [r= .868, n=107, p<.0005]. In addition, major errors committed by appraisers in the conduct of performance appraisals are positive bias errors (M=23.04, SD=1.213), negative bias errors (M=23.06, SD=1.164), similar-to-me errors (M=23.30, SD=1.134), contrast errors (M=22.93, SD=1.160), and leniency errors (M=22.93, SD=1.135), whereas (M=22.24, SD=1.026) stated that, the conduct of performance appraisal practices in the district are not fair. Based on this outcome, it is recommended that appraisers adopt the 360-degree module of conducting performance appraisals to achieve fairness and ensure teacher effectiveness.

Keywords: Performance appraisal, teacher effectiveness, Public Junior High Schools

Introduction

The teacher is an essential human resource whose effectiveness reflects in the output of students and therefore, must be managed effectively to ensure quality educational outcomes. The teacher is a model who is consciously imitated (Annierah, Kamarulzaman, Langguyuan-Kadtong, & Onotan, 2013) whose job performance is the way he/she behaves in the process of teaching which is related to his/her effectiveness (Nurharani, Zahira, & Shaminah, 2013). Therefore, building a professional teacher corps is a process that only begins with recruiting highly qualified teachers. Once teachers are recruited, they need professional development, coaching, mentoring, and other support to develop a strong sense of their efficacy based on high-quality teaching skills and experience (Basha, 2014). Thus, to improve teacher effectiveness, support from educational stakeholders consisting of headteachers, and School Improvement Support Officers (SISOs) to assess the performance of teachers is necessary to enhance the teaching process.

According to Martocchio (2017) performance appraisals represent a company's way of telling employees what is expected of them in their jobs and how well they are meeting those expectations. Contrary to many beliefs that performance appraisal is solely for accountability purposes, teacher performance appraisal is not a system to audit and punish teachers for wrongdoing or demoralize teachers or underestimate the sacrificial efforts of teachers in the teaching profession. It is rather an activity to help retain teachers and update their competencies in the teaching profession in the fast-

changing global world of new technology and complexities of student dynamics and taste. For educational institutions to remain relevant in the fast-changing global world, there is a need for flexibility in the school sector through regular and meaningful assessment of teacher performance to identify the strengths and weaknesses of teachers to adopt strategies to help teachers take up opportunities the global world present in the teaching profession to enhance student academic performance.

Consequently, various studies such as Pedzani, Trudie, and Gerrit (2006) and Paafio (2019) have been conducted to investigate performance appraisal practices and methods. However, teachers' perception of performance practices and how that relates to their effectiveness as well as lapses in the process have not been extensively investigated. In this case, an appraisal is not an isolated event but an integral component of school improvement and the credibility of every performance appraisal system is very crucial to the convictions and level of satisfaction of employees about their performance and pay. Hence, the employee will be dissatisfied when he/she realizes that, the performance appraisal conducted by the supervisor was biasedly carried out by the subjective opinions of the supervisor (Handbook for Teachers on Performance Management, (n.d.). Therefore, accurate and comprehensive performance measures that capture the entire scope of an employee's job are essential to successful merit pay programs, [but] in most companies, employees' job performance tends to be assessed subjectively, based on their supervisors' judgments (Martocchio, 2017).

Despite efforts by education management in strengthening periodic School Performance Management (SPAM) reviews and termly appraisals in the Krachi Nchumburu district to reduce appraisal errors, there still remains mistrust in performance appraisals which is affecting the effective teaching and learning process in the district. Thus, this paper sought to assess teachers' perceptions about performance appraisal and teacher effectiveness in Public Junior High Schools in the Krachi Nchumuru District and also identify errors committed in the process to help suggest measures to reduce them. The following research questions guided the study for data collection:

1. What are the perceptions of teachers about performance appraisal practices in Public Junior High Schools (PJHSs) in the Krachi Nchumuru District?
2. What is the relationship between performance appraisal and teacher effectiveness in PJHSs in the district?
3. What are the errors committed in the performance appraisal of teachers in PJHSs in the district?

Literature Review

This study is underpinned by Professional Development Performance Appraisal Model. Studies on the appraisal process predominantly identify two models of appraisal, namely, the accountability model and the professional development model (Keitseng, 1999 in Pedzani, Trudie, & Gerrit, 2006). Monyatsi identified that the accountability model is managerial, control-oriented, judgmental, and hierarchical (Monyatsi, 2003 in Pedzani et al., 2006). In this case, Goddard and Emerson summarized the essence of the accountability model of appraisal when they stated that, in its purest form, it identifies incompetent teachers, identifies weaknesses in teachers' performance, assesses performance for pay and promotion, and provides evidence for disciplinary procedures (Goddard & Emerson 1995 in Pedzani et al., 2006). However, considering the motive behind the accountability model, the accountability model has been unpopular with teachers and their unions (Duke, 1995 in Pedzani et al., 2006) in that, its key characteristic has been seen as imposition since the philosophy is the checking of competence which is as well designed to bring about a better relationship between pay, responsibilities, and performance (Monyatsi 2003 in Pedzani, et al., 2006). In addition, the accountability model is judgmental, and teachers have questioned the capabilities of those making judgments, and the validity and reliability of

the instruments used. In this way, the model fosters defensiveness because teachers fight to serve their interests and not those of the clients (students) and more so provides evidence for disciplinary procedures (Monyatsi 2003 in Pedzani et al., 2006). Schools, like all public organizations, are however being called upon to be accountable (Pedzani et al., 2006) but the accountability model has received lots of criticism emanating from the fact that it does not address the core strengths and weaknesses of teachers in a friendly school atmosphere that promote teacher reflections and reformation to improve upon his/her performance.

From this background, appraisal for professional development has therefore gained a good deal of popularity from both teachers and their organizations, including school managers (Duke and Stiggins, 1990; Duke, 1995b in Pedzani et al., 2006). The staff development model is viewed as a genuine two-way process between appraiser and appraisee which takes place in an atmosphere of trust and confidentiality. Hence, reflection is the buzzword (Cosh, 1999 in Pedzani et al., 2006). Also, Murdock points out that, a modern system of evaluation should encourage teachers to become reflective practitioners and it should be based on the belief that, teachers wish to improve their performance to enhance students' learning. Therefore, the key characteristic of the model is negotiation and the philosophy is the support of teaching and managerial development (Murdock 2000 in Pedzani et al.,2006). In the appraisal process, data are gathered by systematic observations, not only to measure current performance but also to reinforce strengths, identify deficiencies, and give feedback and the necessary information for changes in future performance (Bartlett, 2000; Monyatsi, 2003; Haynes, Wragg, Wragg & Chamberlin, 2003; Wanzare, 2002 in Pedzani et al., 2006). For appraisal to be effective, it should be treated as an ongoing cooperative intervention between the supervisor and subordinate, shared responsibility, and not a once-a-year "confrontation" (Howard & McColskey, 2001; Monyatsi, 2003 in Pedzani et al., 2006) and if it is treated as an event, it may become judgmental, hence detrimental to individual growth and development (Habangaan, 1998 in Pedzani et al., 2006). Therefore, this study supports the essentiality of the professional development performance appraisal model to examine how performance appraisal practices can improve teacher effectiveness to help reduce teachers' negative perceptions about the fairness of the process and it being for accountability purposes rather than to enhance teacher professionalism and expertise in the teaching profession.

In this case, performance appraisals represent a company's way of telling employees what is expected of them in their jobs and how well they are meeting those expectations (Laura, 2012; Martocchio, 2017). Performance evaluations can also be called performance appraisals, performance assessments, or employee appraisals (Laura, 2012). The first step in the process of designing performance appraisal is to determine how often performance appraisals should be given (Laura, 2012), keeping in mind that managers should constantly be giving feedback to employees,… Whereas some organizations choose to perform evaluations once per year, others conduct it twice per year, or more (Laura, 2012) depending on the span of control, feedback, and the need of the organization and employee development at a point in time (Mason, Talya, & Berrin, 2012). Once the frequency, rewards, and goals have been determined, …there is the need to develop the actual forms that will be used to evaluate each job within the organization and every performance evaluation should be directly tied to the employee's job description (Laura, 2012). Finally, determining who should evaluate the performance of the employee is the next decision and this could be their direct manager (most common method), subordinates, customers or clients, self, and/or peers. Ultimately, using a variety of sources might garner the best results (Laura, 2012). A 360-degree performance appraisal method is a way to appraise performance by using several sources to measure the employee's effectiveness but organizations must be careful when using peer-reviewed information (Laura, 2012). Laura admitted that management of this process can be time-consuming for the HR professional and that's why there are many software programs available such as Halogen 360 to help administer and assess 360 review feedback.

For the acceptability of performance appraisal, there is research that shows employees have a greater acceptance of performance reviews if the review is linked to rewards (Brendan, & Balkin, 1990 in Laura, 2012). Acceptability refers to how well members of the organization, manager, and employees, accept the performance evaluation tool as a valid measure of performance (Laura, 2012). Mason et al. (2012) stated that the performance plan will contain a section on goals or objectives including a section that identifies the organization's expectations of employee competencies…based on their level in the organization including expectations of how employees deal with problems, how proactive they are concerning changing work, and how they interact with internal and external customers. In addition to basic behavioral traits, supervisors and managers are expected to exhibit leadership and, provide vision and strategic direction to ensure that employees understand these competencies concerning themselves (Mason et al., 2012). Also, goals and objectives provide the foundation for measurement. Whereas goals are outcome statements that define what an organization is trying to accomplish, both programmatically and organizationally, measures are the actual metrics used to gauge performance on objectives [such as student academic performance in class tests and BECE results] (Mason et al., 2012). Mason et. al. added that, in contrast to goals, objectives are very precise, time-based, measurable actions that support the completion of a goal and that, objectives typically must: (1) be related directly to the goal; (2) be clear, concise, and understandable; (3) be stated in terms of results; (4) begin with an action verb; (5) specify a date for accomplishment, and (6) be measurable.

Research suggests that individual and organizational performance increases by 16% when an evaluation system based on specific goals and objectives is implemented (Rynes, Brown, & Colbert, 2002 in Mason, Talya, & Berrin, 2012). Therefore, the importance of appraisal in any organization cannot be overemphasized (Kermally, 1997: Mullins, 1996). The literature on staff appraisal, covering a wide spectrum of fields such as commerce and industry as well as the private and public sectors including schools, identifies three main purposes of appraisal: to serve as a basis for modifying behavior to realize more effective working habits; to provide adequate feedback to each employee on his/her performance; and to provide managers with data with which to evaluate future assignments and determine compensation (Kermally, 1997: Mullins, 1996). The major aim of teacher appraisal is to develop teachers to improve their delivery in schools. The effectiveness of the process of teacher appraisal is, however, dependent on the perceptions of the teachers themselves (Pedzani et al., 2006), and the role of teacher appraisal in motivating teachers is also emphasized by West and Ainscow (1991) when they claim that appraisal gives teachers a clearer view of the job, their aims and what is expected of them, and of the aims of the school and there are four reasons why a systematic performance evaluation system should be implemented. First, the evaluation process should encourage positive performance and behavior (Laura, 2012). Second, it is a way to satisfy employee curiosity as to how well they are performing in their job. It can also be used as a tool to develop employees and lastly, it can provide a basis for pay raises, promotions, and legal disciplinary actions (Laura, 2012). In addition, teachers described that they "wanted stronger appreciation for their good work, as they rarely heard 'about a job well done and instead received feedback 'only when [a job] is not well done" (Geiger & Pivovarova, 2018). However, the quality of workplace climate is determined…by the feelings that an employee has at work, his perception of values, rules, patterns of behavior, ways of management, opportunities for creativity, and constructive feedback influencing his behavior and conduct and also his attitude to the purpose and performance at the workplace (Hunter, et al., 2007). Schneider (2002) also pointed out that… poor conditions of school facilities make it difficult for teachers to teach their students or provide an adequate education to their students

Akube cited in Nwezi, (2014), opined that supervisory activities consist of seeking the factors related to teachers' and learners' growth and improving teachers' skills... And aspects of teaching and learning

evaluated include lesson planning, knowledge of the subject, lesson delivery and classroom management, work output, attitude to work, punctuality and attendance, personality and social traits, human relations, and communication, (Amenu, Esia-Donkoh, & Asantewa, 2021) as well as knowledge, work quality, initiative, work attitude and cooperation, and dependability (Mason et al., 2012). Similarly, Danielson (2001) and Donaldson and Stobbe (2000) also stated that appraisal involves the teacher's professional knowledge, understanding, and skills to improve the quality of teaching and student learning in the classroom. Therefore, performance reviews help managers feel more honest in their relationships with their subordinates and feel better about themselves in their supervisory roles (Mason et al., 2012) and subordinates are assured clear understanding of what goals and objectives are expected from them, their strengths and areas for development, and a solid sense of their relationship with their supervisor, hence, avoiding performance issues ultimately decreases morale, decreases the credibility of management, decreases the organization's overall effectiveness, and wastes more of management's time to do what is not being done properly (Mason et al., 2012).

To develop the performance review process, it is important to note some of the errors that can occur during this process (Laura, 2012). According to Martocchio (2017), some of the likely errors that may arise in performance appraisal include bias errors, contrast errors, errors of central tendency, and errors of leniency or strictness. Bias errors happen when the rater evaluates the employee based on a personal negative or positive opinion of the employee rather than on the employee's actual performance. Martocchio (2017) explained that the four ways supervisors may bias evaluation results are first-impression effects, positive and negative halo effects, similar-to-me effects, and illegal discriminatory biases. Martocchio said that a manager biased by a first-impression effect might make an initial favorable or unfavorable judgment about an employee and then ignore or distort the employee's actual performance based on this impression. In this case, according to Martocchio, a positive halo effect or negative halo effect occurs when a rater generalizes an employee's good or bad behavior on one aspect of the job to all aspects of the job. A similar-to-me effect refers to the tendency on the part of raters to judge favorably employees whom they perceive as similar to themselves. However, "Similar-to-me" errors or biases easily can lead to charges of illegal discriminatory bias, wherein a supervisor rates a member of his or her race, sex, nationality, or religion more favorably than members of other classes (Martocchio, 2017).

Also, supervisors make contrast errors when they compare an employee with other employees rather than to specific, explicit performance standards. [Wherein] such comparisons qualify as errors because other employees are required to perform only at minimum acceptable standards (Martocchio, 2017). On the other hand, when supervisors rate all employees as average or close to average, they commit errors of central tendency. Such errors are most often committed when raters are forced to justify only extreme behavior (i.e., high or low ratings) with written explanations, which, therefore, implies that, HR professionals should require justification for ratings at every level of the scale and not just at the extremes (Martocchio, 2017). Finally, errors of leniency or strictness raters sometimes place every employee at the high or low end of the scale, regardless of actual performance. Under this circumstance, managers tend to appraise employees' performance more highly than they rate compared with objective criteria. However, in the long run, if supervisors commit positive errors, their employees will expect higher than-deserved pay rates (Martocchio, 2017). Hence, proper training on how to manage a performance appraisal interview is a good way to avoid errors (Laura, 2012). Also, Martocchio (2017) identified that, in using 360-degree performance appraisals, input from peers, who may be competitors for raises and promotions, might intentionally distort the data and sabotage the colleague. [However,] because so many firms use [the] 360degree feedback evaluation, it seems that many firms have found ways to avoid the pitfalls. Martocchio further stated that awarding discriminatory merit pay increases could lead some employees to level charges of illegal pay against employers (Martocchio, 2017) and it

is important to recognize that, performance evaluations are not a panacea for individual and organizational performance problems. In this regard, studies have shown that performance-appraisal errors are extremely difficult to eliminate in that, training to eliminate certain types of errors often introduces other types of errors and sometimes reduces accuracy. In this case, the most common appraisal error is leniency, and managers often realize they are committing it. Thus, mere training is insufficient to eliminate these kinds of errors rather, more systematic action is required, such as intensive monitoring (Rynes et al., 2002 in Mason et al., 2012).

Methodology

This study employed mixed-methods research approach. It was to enable the researchers to triangulate data to complement the two data sets consisting of quantitative and qualitative and to facilitate data validation and authentication. Kuranchie (2021) identified that mixed methods can be defined as a combination of quantitative and qualitative research approaches to study a phenomenon. Having chosen mixed methods research approach, the choice of concurrent triangulation design is suitable to enable the researchers to adopt different methods and instruments for collecting data from a broader category of participants. With the concurrent triangulation design, the two phases of the research (qualitative and quantitative) are conducted simultaneously so that the results of both are compared to determine whether there is agreement or disagreement in the results of the two approaches (Kuranchie, 2021).

There are thirty-one (31) PJHSs categorized into six (6) Circuits in Krachi Nchumuru District. The estimated population of headteachers was thirty-one (31), two hundred and forty-eight (248) teachers, fifteen (15) District Education Officers, and six (6) School Improvement Support Officers (SISOs) totaling three hundred (300) targeted population in JHSs in the district. Out of the targeted population of three hundred (300), hundred and seventy-one (171) participants were selected for the study. In calculating the sample size, the researchers set an error margin of 0.05 and adopted mathematical formula from Miller and Brewer (2003) cited in Dinye and Acheampong (2013). The formula is n = N/1+N(α)^2. Where "n" is the sample size (headteacher, teachers, SISOs, and GES Officers), N is the sample frame (total number of members in the selected Circuits), and (α) is the margin of error (Dinye and Acheampong, 2013). Mathematically: n = 300/1+300(0.05) ^2 =300/1.75 = 171.428 = 171 participants.

Samples were selected from both quantitative and qualitative phases for the study. In the quantitative phase, a stratified random sampling technique was used to identify all the thirty-one (31) PJHSs in the six (6) Circuits of Krachi Nchumurun District. Having identified the schools, the proportional stratified sampling technique was used to identify and select one hundred and seven (107) teachers from the six (6) Circuits in the district. After that, the convenience sampling technique, which focuses on members who are available and willing to participate in the study was used to select the headteachers, District Education Officers, SISOs, and teachers to take part in the interview process and answering of the questionnaire for the study. The proportional stratified sampling technique is to enable the researchers to, first group JHSs into Circuits according to their geographical location and proportionally select the schools from each Circuit for the study. In stratified sampling, one first identifies the strata of interest and then randomly draws a specified number of participants from each stratum the basis for stratification may be geographic, or it may involve characteristics of the population noted in scholarly literature that may be of interest (Ary, 2014).

Table 1: Sample size of teacher participants for the quantitative phase of the study

Circuit	Number of schools	Proportion	Selected schools	Teachers	Total sample size
A. Banda	9	5.8	6	72	**31**
B. Borae A	4	2.6	2	32	**14**
C. Borae B	3	1.9	1	24	**10**
D. Chinderi A	8	5.2	6	64	**28**
E. Chinderi B	3	1.9	2	24	**10**
F. Grubi	4	2.6	3	32	**14**
Total	31	20	20	248	**107**

Source: Authors (2022).

In the qualitative phase, the homogeneous purposive sampling strategy was used to select three (3) headteachers, five (5) teachers, three (3) SISOs, and two (2) District GES Officials who are 'information rich' about performance appraisal practices for an interview out of the one hundred and seventy-one (171) sample size selected for the study in the Krachi Nchumurun District. According to Creswell (2008) cited in Kusi (2012 in purposive sampling, researchers intentionally select individuals and sites to learn or understand the central phenomenon [and] the standard used in choosing participants and sites is whether they are information rich' (Creswell, 2008).

In the quantitative phase of the study, a structured questionnaire and observation were used to collect data. According to Kusi (2012), a structured questionnaire is a data collection instrument that is often used in quantitative studies and it contains predetermined standardized questions or items meant to collect numerical data that can be subjected to statistical analysis. The researchers designed the questionnaire in the form of a Likert-scale type to collect data from participants. In the qualitative phase, semi-structured interview schedules were used to collect qualitative data.

Efforts were made to ensure the validity and reliability of the research instruments. To establish face validity, questionnaire and semi-structured interview schedules were given to some colleague postgraduate students to check for wrong spelling, omissions, and grammatical errors. For content validity, the research instruments were given to lecturers with expertise in the field of educational administration and management to critique the instruments. Furthermore, to establish the construct validity of the instruments, the researchers gave the instruments to experts to determine whether the items are measuring the phenomenon that the research claimed to measure. In addition, the trustworthiness of the interview data was addressed by ensuring credibility, transferability, confirmability, and dependability (Guba,1992; Polit & Beck, 2012; Lincoln & Guba,1985). Also, ethical considerations including access, confidentiality, anonymity, and informed consent (Kusi, 2012) were addressed to avoid bias and violation of participants' rights.

To test the reliability of instruments and data, the researchers conducted a pretest of the instruments on one hundred and seven (107) teachers in Junior High Schools in Dambai, the newly created capital town of Oti Region in Krachi East District, and generated a coefficient Cronbach alpha value of .997 indicating high reliability of the instruments. According to Ary, if the measurement results are to be used for making a decision about a group or for research purposes, or if an erroneous initial decision can be easily corrected, scores with modest reliability (i.e., coefficients in the range of .50 and above) may be acceptable.

Statistical instruments in the form of frequency and simple percentages and SPSS Version 20 Mean and Standard Deviation, and Pearson product-moment correlation were used to analyze the questionnaire

for the quantitative data. In the qualitative phase of the data analysis, the grounded theory framework for data analysis was used to analyze qualitative data. Interview voices recorded were played back several times to get all the relevant data for the study. The raw data was then transcribed and color-coded to ascribe voices to their sources. The transcribed data was read several times and the main ideas in the data as presented by participants were underlined and memos were created from the raw data. The raw data and memos were then imported into an excel coding system and the various sections of the excel coding system including levels 1,2,3 coding and the theoretical concept were filled up depending on the requirement at each level to get the interpretation of the data. Horgan, Dolan, and Donnelly (2009) cited in Ary et al. (2014) identified that phases of qualitative analysis include: Data generation (including the design), Managing data (transcription and organization, and analysis (making sense of the data).

Data Analysis And Results
Research Question 1
What are the perceptions of teachers about performance appraisal practices in Public Junior High Schools (PJHSs) in the Krachi Nchumuru District? This research question had the primary intent to ascertain the views of respondents about the concept, objectives, scope, frequency, and errors committed in performance appraisal practices in public junior high schools, and the results are presented in the table below.

Table 2. Respondents' perceptions of performance appraisal in Public Junior High Schools

Descriptive Statistics								
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
Concept of performance appraisal	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	**Std. Error**
PA_Acknowledge_Performance	107	21	25	21.67	.697	1.568	.234	5.232	**.463**
Objectives of performance appraisal									
PA_assess_Knowledge	107	21	25	21.84	.826	1.432	.234	3.293	**.463**
PA_assess_Work_Quality	107	21	25	21.61	.683	1.589	.234	5.357	**.463**
PA_assess_School_Attendance	107	21	25	21.86	.995	1.225	.234	.796	**.463**
PA_assess_Dependability	107	21	24	22.07	.918	.818	.234	.047	**.463**
PA_assess_Initiatives	107	21	25	21.86	.806	1.363	.234	2.785	**.463**
PA_assess_Work_Attitude	107	21	24	21.73	.796	1.215	.234	1.539	**.463**
Scope of performance appraisal									
PA_have_Measurable_Goals_Objectives	107	21	24	21.82	.724	1.043	.234	1.903	**.463**
PA_cover_Curricular_Co_curricular	107	21	25	21.84	.859	1.314	.234	2.040	**.463**
PA_cover_Appearance_Composure	107	21	25	22.15	1.044	.960	.234	.324	**.463**
PA_finds_Fault_to_Punish	107	21	25	23.62	1.226	-.761	.234	-.484	**.463**
PA_assess_TLMs	107	21	25	22.31	1.050	.696	.234	-.391	**.463**
PA_assess_GES_Uniform_Weighting_Scores	107	21	25	22.58	1.158	.398	.234	-.915	**.463**
One_Subject_improves_PA_Performance	107	21	25	21.61	.844	1.621	.234	2.792	**.463**

Two_Subjects_improve_PA_Performance	107	21	25	23.26	1.152	-.455	.234	-.925	**.463**
PA_uses_School_Records	107	21	25	22.03	.976	1.123	.234	.926	**.463**
PA_uses_Classroom_Teaching	107	21	24	21.88	.809	.988	.234	.994	**.463**
PA_uses_Information_Stakeholders	107	21	25	22.16	1.011	.958	.234	.520	**.463**
PA_involves_GES_Intensive_Inspection	107	21	24	21.93	.749	.948	.234	1.439	**.463**
PA_determines_Promotion	107	21	25	22.09	1.077	1.056	.234	.514	**.463**
Teacher_Comments_PA_Draft	107	21	25	22.29	1.037	.632	.234	-.361	**.463**
Frequency of performance appraisal									
PA_conducted_Yearly_Reward	107	21	25	22.26	.984	.781	.234	-.169	**.463**
PA_conducted_Temporal_Projects	107	21	25	22.47	1.003	.492	.234	-.751	**.463**
PA_assess_Termly	107	21	25	22.55	1.101	.364	.234	-1.066	**.463**
PA_involves_SPAM	107	21	24	21.70	.767	.954	.234	.578	**.463**
Errors committed in performance appraisal									
PA_Errors_Difficult_Eliminate	107	21	25	23.07	1.096	-.150	.234	-1.028	**.463**
PA_Training_Introduce_Errors	107	21	25	22.79	1.071	.422	.234	-.751	**.463**
Assessment_Modes_Fair_PA	107	21	25	22.59	1.072	.326	.234	-.837	**.463**
Headteacher_Standard_Scale	107	21	25	22.51	1.031	.514	.234	-.313	**.463**
Headteacher_Positive_Bias_Errors	107	21	25	23.04	1.213	.057	.234	-1.160	**.463**
Headteacher_Negative_Bias_Errors	107	21	25	23.06	1.164	-.001	.234	-1.080	**.463**
Headteacher_Similar_To_Me_Errors	107	21	25	23.30	1.134	-.219	.234	-.967	**.463**
Headteacher_Contrast_Errors	107	21	25	22.93	1.160	.166	.234	-1.020	**.463**
Headteacher_Leniency_Errors	107	21	25	22.93	1.135	.170	.234	-1.016	**.463**
Headtacher_PA_Punish	107	21	25	23.58	1.099	-.619	.234	-.488	**.463**
Valid N (listwise)	107								

Source: Authors (2022).

Concept of performance appraisal

From Table 2 presented above, teachers (M=21.67, SD=.697) value performance appraisal practice as a constructed system to acknowledge their performance in the district. A participant said that performance appraisal in PJHSs is a planned process conducted to evaluate teacher output against the set standard of GES to provide feedback to enhance teacher performance (PA-PJHS-HDTR-1). In the same way, according to Martocchio (2017) performance appraisals represent a company's way of telling employees what is expected of them in their jobs and how well they are meeting those expectations (Martocchio, 2017).

Objectives of performance appraisal practice

From Table 2 above, a majority of respondents (M=21.84, 21.61, 21.86, 22.07, 21.86, 21.73) and (SD=.826, .683, .995, .918, .806, .796) indicated that the main objectives of performance appraisal practices are to assess teachers' level of knowledge, work quality, school attendance, dependability, initiatives, and work attitude respectively as Mason et al., (2012) also identified.

Scope of performance appraisal

It is indicated from Table 2 that, performance appraisal practices cover measurable goals and objectives, curricular and co-curricular activities, number of subjects handled, school records, classroom teaching,

and intensive inspection by GES with (M=21.82, 21.84, 21.61, 22.03, 21.88, 21.93) and (SD=.724, .859, .844, .976, .809, .749) scores respectively. Similarly, aspects of teaching and learning evaluated include lesson planning, knowledge of the subject, lesson delivery and classroom management, work output, attitude to work, punctuality and attendance, personality and social traits, human relations, and communication (Amenu et al., 2021).

In terms of teacher appearance and composure (M=22.15, SD=1.044) scores were recorded. Teacher appearance and composure are paramount in performance appraisal as recorded in the scores because, in the educational sector, the most respected profession in the world is teaching. Therefore, the teacher is a model who is consciously imitated (Annierah et al., 2013).

Also, with regards to the statement on whether performance appraisal is a means of finding faults to punish teachers generated (M=23.62, SD=1.226). The interview data revealed that performance appraisal in PJHSs is a shared activity to facilitate the identification of teacher strengths and weaknesses, achievement of expected outputs, and increase teacher desire for Continuous Professional Development (CPD) to improve performance and effectiveness rather than condemn or victimize teachers in the performance of their duties (PA-PJHS-HDTR-1). In this case, Goddard and Emerson argued that the cornerstone of appraisal is the belief that educators wish to improve their performance to enhance the education of students (Goddard & Emerson 1995 cited in Pedzani, Trudie, & Gerrit 2006).

The statement on whether the availability of TLMs to facilitate teachers' work is assessed in performance appraisal generated (M=22.31, SD=1.050). Even though some respondents devalued the importance of the availability of TLMs in performance appraisal, effective teacher lesson delivery is, however, based on proper and adequate TLMs. Hence, TLMs impact teacher performance appraisal scores. In this case, the unavailability of TLMs contributed to poor academic achievement of learners and lower teacher performance appraisal scores in PJHSs.

The interview data indicated the importance of TLMs in this comment:

> TLMs are resources that make teacher lesson delivery easier and more understandable. TLMs such as more real give the teacher or appraisee power over the subject being taught. On the other hand, the unavailability of TLMs in the district is causing poor performances of teachers in performance appraisals, where teachers even have to buy TLMs by themselves at their own expense (PA-PJHS-TR.4).

Similarly, Schneider (2002) pointed out that… poor conditions of school facilities make it difficult for teachers to teach their students or provide an adequate education to their students. Also, a participant noted that the traditional method of teaching and lack of modern TLMs leads to poor performance of teachers in performance appraisal and student academic performance in PJHSs (PA-PJHS-TR.5). In this case, six (6) out of the eight (8) appraisers interviewed revealed that, teachers challenge their scores in pedagogy in performance appraisal due to unavailability of TLMs for proper pedagogical delivery in PJHSs. A SISO in the interview section affirmed that some teachers challenge the outcome of their performance appraisals, especially, the pedagogy, and complain that, TLMs are unavailable for proper pedagogy (PA-PJHS-SISO-1).

Furthermore, the statement on whether a uniform standard of scoring teachers in performance appraisal is adopted generated (M=22.58, SD=1.158). In the same way, a participant commented in the interview that, there is no fairness in performance appraisal scores in PJHSs due to the different working conditions under which teachers teach. Hence, teachers teaching under proper infrastructure perform

better than those teaching under poor infrastructure (PA-PJHS-SISO-1) and so, therefore, there is no common standard for assessing teachers' performance in PJHSs (PA-PJHS-EDOFS-2).

The statement on whether appraisers involve a wide range of stakeholders in appraising teachers generated (M=22.58, SD=1.011). In this regard, all eight (8) appraisers with exception of one who took part in the interview process have agreed that the involvement of educational stakeholders in performance appraisal facilitates the presentation of a fair holistic picture of the performance of teachers. On the other hand, the respondent who opposed the idea of stakeholder involvement in performance appraisal argued that stakeholders such as SMC, PTA, and learners are not involved in the assessment of teachers because teachers are assessed on classroom or school-based activities but the PTA Chairman does not have knowledge about teachers' lesson notes and how they teach (PA-PJHS-EDOFS-1). Therefore, involving them in the performance appraisal process is not possible. This assertion was however opposed by another participant who stated that educational stakeholders in PJHSs are relevant in the education system to assist school administrators to monitor, supervise and discipline headteachers, teachers, and learners and help to provide and maintaining infrastructure in PJHSs (PA-PJHS-SISO-2). Hence, stakeholders such as SMC, PTA, and learners in PJHSs are essential stakeholders in the assessment of teachers during performance appraisal (PA-PJHS-EDOFS-2). Similarly, according to Martocchio (2017) in using 360-degree performance appraisals, input from peers, who may be competitors for raises and promotions, might intentionally distort the data and sabotage the colleague. [However,] because so many firms use [the] 360degree feedback evaluation, it seems that many firms have found ways to avoid the pitfalls, [therefore, adopting the 360degree performance appraisal model to assess employees' performance is paramount].

More so, the statement about whether teacher comments on performance appraisal draft generated (M=22.29, SD=1.037). Despite this outcome, a section of respondents believes that it is prejudicial to give teachers draft copies of their performance since that may lead teachers to fake themselves to be what they are not. Therefore, presenting draft copies and discussing performance appraisal results is something most Education Officers, SISOs, and headteachers overlook (PA-PJHS-HDTR-1). However, the non-involvement of teachers to access draft copies of their performance may lead to demotivation of teachers and deny them the opportunity to be heard about what led to their high or low achievement where Martocchio (2017) identified that, employees' job performance tends to be assessed subjectively, based on their supervisors' judgments… which could lead some [teachers] to level charges of illegal pay against employers, [that is GES].

Frequency of performance appraisal practices
From Table 2, in terms of the frequency of performance appraisal practices, the study revealed that performance appraisal was mostly conducted yearly to reward teachers which generated (M=22.26, SD=.984). Also, periodic School Performance Appraisal Management (SPAM) programmes for school improvement were recorded (M= 21.7 and SD= .767). This confirms the assertion of Laura (2012) that, performance appraisal is a systematic process to evaluate employees on (at least) an annual basis.

Research Question 2
What is the relationship between performance appraisal and teacher effectiveness in Public Junior High Schools (PJHSs) in the Krachi Nchumuru District? This question was aimed at establishing the relationship between performance appraisal and teacher effectiveness.

Table 3. Relationship between performance appraisal practices and teacher effectiveness in PJHSs. Correlations

Correlations			
		PA_Acknowledge_ Performance	**PA_and_Strength _Weaknesses**
PA_Acknowledge_Performance	Pearson Correlation	1	**.868****
	Sig. (2-tailed)		**.000**
	N	107	**107**
PA_and_Strength_Weaknesses	Pearson Correlation	.868**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	107	**107**
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Source: Authors (2022).

The relationship between perceived performance appraisal practices (as measured by the concept of performance appraisal) and teacher effectiveness (as measured by performance appraisal identifies teachers' strengths and weaknesses to make them effective) was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. There was a strong, positive correlation between the two variables [r = .868, n = 107, p < .0005], with high levels of performance appraisal practices associated with higher levels of teacher effectiveness. This implies that performance appraisal in PJHSs is a shared activity to facilitate the identification of teacher strengths and weaknesses, achievement of expected outputs, and increase teacher desire for CPD to improve performance and effectiveness rather than condemn or victimize teachers in the performance of their duties. The interview data revealed that performance appraisal enhances teacher effectiveness in PJHSs when his/her strengths and weaknesses are identified and corrective actions are employed to overcome the weaknesses (PA-PJHS-TR..5). Performance appraisal also makes teachers effective when there is the availability of TLMs to perform their roles (PA-PJHS-TR..3) as well as when there is the change in teaching practices to increase teacher development (PA-PJHS-SISO-2). In the same way, research suggests that individual and organizational performance increases by 16% when an evaluation system based on specific goals and objectives is implemented (Rynes et al., 2002; Mason et al., 2012). Therefore, the importance of appraisal in any organization cannot be overemphasized (Kermally, 1997: Mullins, 1996).

Section (D). Errors committed in the conduct of teacher performance appraisal practices in PJHSs.

From Table 2 presented above, errors committed by appraisers in the conduct of teacher performance appraisal practices are positive bias errors (M=23.04, SD=1.213), negative bias errors (M=23.06, SD=1.164), similar-to-me errors (M=23.30, SD=1.134), contrast errors (M=22.93, SD=1.160), and leniency errors (M=22.93, SD=1.135). The implication of these scores is that fewer of the errors listed are being committed by appraisers in PJHSs in the district. However, on the contrary, all eight (8) appraisers and four (4) out of five (5) teachers who participated in the interview process revealed that performance appraisal practices in PJHSs are not fair. Participants admitted the allocation of subjective values based on personal feelings and biased impressions, wrong score entries, and errors in analyzing and presenting performance appraisal data using central tendency measures like the mean, the median,

the mode, and standard deviation that make performance appraisal in PJHSs bias and unfair (PA-PJHS-HDTR-1). Also, it is identified that, in certain situations, teachers may write lesson notes all right, but have not taught them. While others do not teach but give exercises to learners, the bad road networks, long distances to some schools as well as inadequate time present errors and difficulties in fair performance appraisal of teachers in PJHSs (PA-PJHS-EDOFS-1). More so, errors including gender bias, personal bias, strictness on teachers, demotivating comments and body language as well as the threatening of teachers with demotion and transfers and lack of follow-ups and inadequate training for appraisers make performance appraisal practice unfair in PJHSs (PA-PJHS-SISO-2). In line with Martocchio (2017), some of the likely errors that may arise in performance appraisal include bias errors, contrast errors, errors of central tendency, and errors of leniency or strictness.

From the findings, teachers believe that performance appraisals are conducted not to find faults in teachers to penalize them (M=23.58, SD=1.099). Meanwhile, one respondent stated that appraisers are interested in fault finding and favoritism in the performance appraisal of teachers in PJHSs (PA-PJHS-SISO-1). Also, teachers in the district believe that performance appraisal errors are difficult to eliminate (M=23.07, SD=1.096). Similarly, Studies show that performance-appraisal errors are extremely difficult to eliminate. Thus, mere training is insufficient to eliminate these kinds of errors but rather, an action that is more systematic is required (Rynes et al., 2002 in Mason et al., 2012).

Generally, the findings revealed that the conduct of performance appraisal practices in the district is not fair (M=22.24, SD=1.026). Four (4) respondents out of the five (5) teachers interviewed confirmed this outcome that, performance appraisals are not fairly conducted. Most teachers believe that a lack of monitoring the teaching and learning process of teachers as well as completing teacher performance evaluation forms based on subjective opinions led to unfairness in performance appraisal practice in PJHSs. In this regard, a participant stated in this comment that, performance appraisals are not fair because, it is being completed by administrative heads using their discretions and personal records of teachers (PA-PJHS-TR.3). This revelation also confirms what an appraiser stated in the interview data that, teachers do not challenge the outcome of performance appraisal because, it is not done together with the teacher but rather a form that is filled based on what the teacher is doing and afterward having a short discussion with him/her and if he/she does not understand anything, he/she is brought on track (PA-PJHS-EDOFS-1). However, an employee will be dissatisfied when he/she realizes that, the performance appraisal conducted by the supervisor was biasedly carried out by the subjective opinions of the supervisor (Handbook for Teachers on Performance Management, (n.d.). In addition to this, teachers revealed that performance appraisals were at times based on teacher appearance rather than output and involvement of teachers in the process. Moreover, favoritism, nepotism, fear, and lack of confidence, awarding of poor marks based on a misunderstanding between the headteacher and teachers contributed to unfair performance appraisal practices in PJHSs (PA-PJHS-TR.4; PA-PJHS-TR.5; PA-PJHS-EDOFS-2). Notwithstanding this, the credibility of every performance appraisal system is very crucial to the convictions and level of satisfaction of employees about their performance and pay (Handbook for Teachers on Performance Management, (n.d.) and therefore must be conducted fairly.

Conclusion

Generally, in line with the theory of professional development performance appraisal model underpinning this study, the outcome of the study revealed that participants have positive perceptions about performance appraisal as a process of measuring teacher performance against termly or yearly measurable objectives to identify teachers' strengths and weaknesses for corrective actions to enhance teacher effectiveness in the performance of his/her duties in a fair collaborative manner. The findings again revealed that the standards employed including subject content knowledge, lesson plan, pedagogy, and student academic performance relate to the actual job description, duties, and

responsibilities of teachers in the teacher's conditions of service with GES, which is relevant for consideration in any effective performance appraisal system.

Even though teachers' perceptions about performance appraisal fell in line with the theory of professional development performance appraisal model, the study, however, identified errors including errors of leniency, contrast errors, bias errors, and challenges relating to bad road networks, long distances to schools, inadequate time, inadequate transport logistics, and unavailability of teaching and learning materials to enhance effective teaching and learning and the conduct of effective performance appraisal of teachers in PJHSs in the district.

Notwithstanding this, the study established a positive statistical relationship between performance appraisal and teacher effectiveness, which implies that a lack of performance appraisal leads to teacher ineffectiveness, low productivity, and poor student academic performance. More importantly, the study ascertained that the positive correlation between performance appraisal and teacher effectiveness is achieved when the appraisal is devoid of favoritism and identifies teachers' strengths and weaknesses to facilitate their effectiveness in the midst of available teaching and learning materials and proper school infrastructure, and effective time management. The study, therefore, concluded that the importance of performance appraisal in facilitating teacher effectiveness can never be underestimated in the educational dispensation. Hence, the need for urgent support from internal and external educational stakeholders in the provision of TLMs to facilitate teacher productivity in PJHSs in the district while organizing education programmes for appraisers to improve upon their skills on how to manage time and employ the 360degree module of performance appraisal to help minimize the errors in the process.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made;

1. Teachers should be involved in the discussion of areas of performance appraisals to achieve credible and acceptable appraisal results to enhance teacher effectiveness.
2. Adequate training workshops should be organized for teachers and appraisers to reduce lapses in the performance appraisal process and further enhance teachers' positive perceptions of performance appraisal.

3. Furthermore, the 360degree model of performance appraisal should be adopted to help minimize lapses in the performance appraisal process.

References

Amenu, A.D., Esia-Donkoh, K., & Asantewa, O.A. (2021). Headteachers' administrative duties and teacher job performance in public junior high schools at Agona Swedru, Ghana. *European Journal of Education Studies*, Volume 8, Issue 12.

Annierah, M.U., Kamarulzaman, A., Langguyuan-Kadtong, M., & Onotan, U.S.D.A. (2013). Work performance and job satisfaction among teachers. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol. 3 No. 5.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, K. C., & Walker D. A. (2014). *Introduction to research in education* (9th ed). California: Wadsworth.

Basha, K. (2014). *Teacher recruitment, induction, and retention*. Education Northwest.

Bartlett, S. (2000). The development of teacher appraisal: A recent history. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 48:24-37.

Brendan, B., & Balkin, D. (1990). Performance evaluation and compensation feedback messages: An integrated model. *Journal of Occupational Psychology 63*: 97–111.

Cosh, J. (1999). Peer observation. A reflective model. *ELT Journal*, v53 n1 p22-27.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Danielson, C. (2001). New trends in teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 58:12-15.

Dinye, R. D., & Acheampong, E. O. (2013). *Challenges of slum dwellers in Ghana: the case study of Ayigya,* Kumasi. Modern Social Science Journal 2 (2), 228–255.

Donaldson, C., & Stobbe, C. (2000). Teacher evaluation: A self-directed, inquiry-based approach. *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 29:30 -32.

Duke, D.L. (1995). *The move to reform teacher evaluation. In: D.L., Duke (ed.). Teacher evaluation policy: From accountability to professional development*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Duke, D.L., & Stiggins, R. (1990). Beyond minimum competence: Evaluation for professional development. *In: J., Millman, & L., Darling-Hammond. (eds). The new handbook for teacher evaluation*. California: Corwin-Press.

Geiger, T., & Pivovarova, M. (2018). The effects of working conditions on teacher retention. *Teachers and Teaching Theory and Practice* 24(6):1-22. DOI:10.1080/13540602.2018.1457524.

Goddard, I., & Emerson, C. (1995). *Appraisal and your school*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Guba, E. C. (Ed.) (1992). *The alternative paradigm*. London: Sage.

Habangaan, M.M.R. (1998). A study of secondary school teachers' perceptions of the Annual Teacher Performance Appraisal (ATPA) currently in use in Botswana secondary schools: A case stud y in two secondary schools in Gaborone City. Unpublished MA dissertation. Bath: University of Bath.

Handbook for Teachers on Performance Management. (n.d.). National Teaching Council and Ghana Education Service. Professional requirements manual.

Haynes, G, Wragg, T., Wragg, C., & Chamberlin, R. (2003). Performance management for teachers: Headteachers' perspectives. *School Leadership & Management*, 23:75-89.

Horgan, J., Dolan, P., & Donnelly, P. (2009). *Approaches to qualitative research: Theory and its practical application.* Cork, Ireland: Oak Tree Press.

Howard, B.B., & McColskey, W.H. (2001). Evaluating experienced teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 58:48-51.

Hunter, S.T., Katrina, E.B., & Mumford, M.D. (2007). Climate for Creativity: A Quantitative Review. *Creativity Research Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 69–90.

Keitseng, A.S. (1999). Self-appraisal: A step towards meeting individuals' professional development needs in Botswana secondary school teachers. *Journal of In-Service Education*, 25:23-37.

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

Kuranchie, A. (2021). *Research made easy*. Bookworm Publications, Kumasi.

Kusi, H. (2012). *Doing qualitative research: A guide for researchers*. Accra: Emmpong Press.

Laura, P. (2012). *Beginning management of human resources* (v. 1.0). Creative Commons. Retrieved 8/11/2021 from http://lardbucket.org.

Lincoln, S. Y., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Martocchio, J.J. (2017). *Strategic compensation. A human resource management approach.* (9th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.

Mason, A. C., Talya, B., & Berrin, E. (2012). *Management principles* (v. 1.0). Creative Commons. Retrieved 8/11/2021 from http://lardbucket.org.

Miller, R. L., & Brewer, J. D. (2003). *A-Z of Social Research*. London: Longman.

Monyatsi, P.P. (2003). Teacher appraisal: An evaluation of practice in Botswana secondary schools. Unpublished DEd thesis. University of South Africa: Pretoria.

Mullins, L.J. (1996). *Management and organizational behavior*. London: Pitman Publishing.

Murdock, G. (2000). Introducing a teacher-supportive evaluation system. *ETL Journal: An International Journal for Teachers of English Speakers of other Languages*, 54:54-64.

Nurharani, S., Zahira, N.S., & Shaminah, N.M.K. (2013). The impact of organizational climate on teachers' job performance. *Educational Research Journal,* Vol. 2. No.1.

Nwezi, S. (2014). *Administration of human resources*. Tech and Pro Publishers.

Pedzani, M., Trudie, S., & Gerrit, K. (2006). Teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of teacher appraisal in Botswana. *South African Journal of Education*. Vol 26(3)427–441.

Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2012). *Nursing research: Principles and methods*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Rynes, S., Brown, K., & Colbert, A. (2002). Seven common misconceptions about human resource practices: Research findings versus practitioner beliefs. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(3): 92–102.

Schneider, M. (2002). *Public school facilities and teaching*. Washington, D.C.: McGraw-Hill.

Wanzare, Z.O. (2002). Rethinking teacher evaluation in the third world. *Educational Management & Administration*, 30:213-229.

West, M., & Ainscow, M. (1991). *Managing school development: A practical guide*. London: David Fulton Publishers.