

## The Trajectories of Teachers Performance Evaluation in High Schools

Dimtsu Abraha<sup>1\*</sup> and Amare Sahle<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Adigrat University, Tigray, Ethiopia

<sup>2</sup> Bahri Dar University (BDU), Ethiopia

### Research Article

Received date: 28/03/2019

Accepted date: 23/04/2019

Published date: 30/04/2019

#### \*For Correspondence

Dimtsu Abraha, Ph.D., Lecturer in Adigrat University, PhD fellow, Ethiopia.

**E-mail:** dimtsua@gmail.com

**Keywords:** Teachers job performance, Performance evaluators, Factors affect performance score

#### ABSTRACT

This research investigated the quality of performance evaluation score. Results showed that teachers performance score varies with where the teacher teaches, who evaluates the teachers and what the teacher is. Some schools give high some give very low points. Students high to male, newer and younger teachers; whereas schools favour male, experienced (long stayed) and older teachers which oppose students' preference except in gender cases. Self-evaluation and actual performance are poorly correlates. From these results it can be suggested that the purposes of performance evaluation suggested to be linked to schools effectiveness evaluations. Second procedures of performance evaluation administration should be planed. Thirdly evaluators should be accountable for what they did on teacher and continuous training of evaluators of performance is important. Student's contentment with young and relatively newer teachers may indicate that older and long stayed teachers would be exposed to emotional exhaustion that need experience based sensitization.

## INTRODUCTION

### Background of the Study

Job Performance is employees' quality about their effectiveness of job as defined by the organization with an aim to appraise the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of performance within workers <sup>[1]</sup>. According to Messah, teacher appraisals are means to ends. The consequences of non-performers to assisted to develop their weak areas; or in the case of performers is to reward the performers; salary increments, it involves the movement of an individual form one step within the grade to the next <sup>[2]</sup>. It is also suggested that it has a used on recognition of increased value of the organization and therefore a need to compensate them at a commensurate level. In teaching the evaluating criteria according to Figazzol typically include the subject and pedagogical knowledge of the teacher, some assessment of teaching methods, levels of in-service training and, increasingly <sup>[3]</sup>. A teacher performance appraisal also includes value added measures such as measures of student performance from standardized tests. Comprehensive performance appraisal approach also encompasses multiple factor of the teacher the self-assessment peer assistance and review and assessments from external experts like teachers union. Countries that carry out their teacher's performance appraisal in this method and criteria are among the modern ones <sup>[4]</sup>. In many countries performance appraisal is not mandatory and not periodic.

In the study area value added approach that locally called BSC (Balanced Score Card) is employed. The criteria are prepared by central authority at least at regional level. The evaluators are the school, the students and parents. Unit leaders, vice principals and heads of departments participate in the school evaluated appraisal score all together in this research are called school evaluated performance. Students and student's parents participate in the evaluation system. The evaluation is carried out twice a year at around the end of each semester (zonal jurisdiction). Throughout the country the criteria is prepared by the ministry of education- and adopted by the regional and woreda education offices to manageable and understandable local language. Since the country's approach to performance evaluation is Balanced Score Card (BSC), inclusion of parents as external consumers and students as internal customers and as well as products of the process. The school administration as owner of the process participates in evaluating teacher's performance. Except self-evaluation/appraisal the criteria include all duties as possible. However teachers do not trust the TPAS due to various reasons. Figazzol wrote that teachers must trust performance appraisal score that help them develop confidence and efficacy. Concern of this research is on the appraisal scores gained from mainly the three evaluators i.e. the school, students and parents and recorded in the record office. Its connection with teacher characteristics and teachers evaluated level and perceived performance which is not yet investigated. The agreement among evaluators is also

analyzed. The review and recommendation teachers' performance appraisal of developed world by Figazzol looks congruent with the criteria and process of research context. What does evaluators appraisal scores tell about the teachers characteristics self-evaluation and perceived performance is the question here.

According to Hamid et al. background information of teachers can affect performance appraisal score of teachers. He reviewed that students may evaluate their female instructors due to the bias they hold against females. Student ratings of teachers may be biased in subtle but significant ways<sup>[5]</sup>. Studies consistently find that male and female instructors are perceived differently in ways that are consistent with stereotypically gendered expectations of communication and interactive patterns. In general, Lehmann and Mehrens listed established rapport between the rater and the subject whose performance is evaluated; Gender bias to and expectancy levels are also factors that can affect performance evaluators scoring. Figazzol stated that popularity is not meant good teaching<sup>[6]</sup>. Andrade and Rocha found the same result and justified that teachers develop way how to gain higher performance appraisal from students by inflating grades<sup>[7]</sup>. According to Ababaw TVET in Amhara state principals and other evaluators give more marks to teachers whom they knew well. However this is not empirically supported. The incorporation of self-appraisal in performance evaluation system suggested by Burton et al. assumes positive contribution to performance<sup>[8]</sup>.

### Statement of the Problem

According to Messah performance appraisal is one of the most problematic components of Human Resource Management (HRM) in which supervisors, employees, and HRM administrators typically are dissatisfied with their organization's performance appraisal system. Despite these indictments, leaders are reluctant to abandon performance appraisal which they still regard as an essential tool and task of leadership. Some leaders use it like a threatening stick limiting its purpose only to the employee. Surprisingly such leaders claim their organization to be uniquely good unlike the workers in it. The situation in the education sector is the same. Philosophically teacher performance appraisal score is an indicator for many quality dimensions of the school. It can measure the quality of the teacher herself or himself; student's achievement and the school performance of effectiveness besides to the issues pertained to the teachers<sup>[9]</sup>. In this research context the purpose performance evaluation score is not beyond to the teachers' personal benefit such as promotion appointment and scholarships consider performance appraisal results. It is periodically conducted and recorded however the scores only needed in some decision purposes in and outside the school while teachers have no trust on it. According to Hameed et al. genuine data about teacher's performance would have been good bases for the tremendous purposes on job trainings and other teacher development programs<sup>[10]</sup>. Teachers and leadership quarrel over performance appraisal system and is cause of dissatisfaction. Teacher complains in the process and procedure and who should evaluate them and on the criteria of evaluation. Figazzol reviewed that such discontentment appears in some European countries. The difference in evaluation scores because of work place—the school or wereda is another point of quarrel and dissatisfaction. Saljooghi and Salehi unable to use standardized criteria and procedure are sources of differences<sup>[11]</sup>.

In the context of this research teachers performance appraisal causes conflict, erodes teachers autonomy and dissatisfaction in school teachers. Three fold of the measurement of teachers' performance appraisal is determined by the school administration than the students and student-parents who together can determine teachers' performance 0.33 of the times (wereda regulation). Hence teachers complained about how and who should measure and evaluate us. Conflicts and complains are usually on the judges gentility than the tools. Ababaw reported incongruence between actual performance and self-appraised performance. This congruence enhances trust of the employee on performance appraisal score<sup>[12]</sup>. Such incongruence results emotional instability in teachers<sup>[13]</sup>. Both perceived and rated self-assessment congruence with the actual performance is not well investigated even in the global literature. This research attempts to decompose the actual appraised performance (BSC) in to its components as evaluated by students, parents and the school. The trajectories of these components to teachers' different characteristics and the self-efficacy self-evaluated level of subject matter knowledge and perceived performance of teachers in some selected school behavior are also assessed in relation to total actual performance and its decomposed components. The knowledge on the concept of teaching performance and other teacher related constructs around teachers' pertaining to internal and consumer/students and parents. As stated by Lazányi, Yao et al. and Hargreaves such contextualized knowledge is a means to ensure quality teaching and teachers' development policy reform<sup>[14-16]</sup>.

### The Purpose of the Study

The research was conducted to assess the trajectories of performance record of teachers and its determiners. Dimensions of actual performance and teachers self-perceived performance as well as the self-ratings. Specifically the relationship among judges of teacher performance, teacher related characteristics (sex, age, experience, work place) that affect the judges; the relationship among the components of performance and with perceived and teacher self-ratings. Worde based comparison performance evaluation was also conducted.

What are the technology needs of local agencies?

### The Significance of the Study

Philosophically what and how things are said about teacher motivator to the teachers. Evaluating teachers has immediate impact on the wellbeing of teachers. Educationalist responsible to improve the performance appraisal system and need to

keep necessary level of teachers motivation will have an insight to its impacts on teachers psychological wellbeing; and foster evaluators accuracy here after are having a measure and answer that may help them design interventions. Information is available for practitioners regarding what affects evaluators scoring other than the needed behavior in relation to the teacher's personal characteristic; which evaluator among the three shows no importance on Teachers Performance Appraisal Score (TPAS). And, why the TPAS are incongruence with teacher's self-valued level and teacher's perceived performance. Education leaders can attempt add some self-evaluated portion of the criteria or attempt to some extent match the scores to teachers interest or convince teachers to feel comfort with the score. Results of this research further benefit intervention designers to devise training to teacher performance evaluators to change biased attitudes, load accountability and responsibility. Concerned bodies may also widen their vision to used TPAS beyond the teachers to the school locally.

### Research Hypothesis

1. There is positive correlation among scores of teacher performance evaluators.
2. The mean difference in performance evaluation among the judges teachers' performance.
3. Teachers perceived performance different from the actual teachers' performance.
4. What relationship exists among perceived teaching performance and actual teacher performance?

## RESEARCH METHODS AND DESIGN

Central zone of Tigray if found in Tigray state of northern Ethiopia. The region has 81871 public employees 34,002 (41.5%) are female workers (ECA, 2015). The employee-population ratio is 1:65. This same source indicates that the Education Bureau of the Region (REB) which contains participants of this research has 39,104 teachers of which 14,988 are female teacher. The number of secondary school teachers grade 9-12 are 7039; the teacher student ratio is 30 from a simple computation this will give a total of 5710 in grade 9-10 teachers. In 9-10 there 3473 sections and 171290 students which give section students' ratio of 49. In the region there are 169 (29 preparatory schools) secondary schools and of course there 19 nongovernmental high schools. The average distance to high school (9-10) is 10.41 km. The study population for this study will be all high school (9-10) teachers in all zones. Hence this also is the sample source from which the study unit will be taken. Availability during the data collection time is the eligibility criteria for inclusion and exclusion of participants. Therefore all teachers available at the time of data collection are eligible for inclusion and those who were not will be excluded.

This research used cross sectional design for quantitative and discussion with volunteer and available principals. The population for this study was all 9<sup>th</sup> - 10<sup>th</sup> public high school teachers. From the target population 1954, accessible population-consented teachers in duty during the data collection time is the eligibility criteria for inclusion participants proportional random sample 319 net participants from 20 high schools (with more than 30 teachers) of 12 districts (woreda) in central zone of Tigray state after permission granted from zonal and district authorities to collect data from target population <sup>[17]</sup>.

Central zone is the widest zone of the region which contain highest number of Weredas (12), high schools (26 more) highest student teacher ratio 32 than 1:30 region wide, highest student classroom ratio 52 than the region 49. Sample was the formula

$$N = \frac{z_1^2 * pq}{e^2} + 0.071 \left( \frac{z_1^2 * pq}{e^2} \right) \text{ for complex sample} = 319 \text{ (Sample: 15\% (293+componesation (16) the study population was}$$

randomly taken taking each worked as a strata to keep the proportion of sample from each woreda. This sample size considers assumptions of 95% confidence interval (1.96 z-score), margin of error 5% and normal distribution.

Measurement tools were piloted taken to enhance the reliability of items were followed by good results. For instance, Perceived job performance scale was the lowest reliability of this instrument ( $\alpha=0.6$  with Mean=5.4 and var=0.06) in pilot study by the measures (increasing items and translating to local language) taken alpha was improved to 0.752. Adapted teachers self-reported appraisal of performance (9 items with  $\alpha=0.80$ , Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)) was performed to test the construct validity and measurement model that are included latent variables. Through dimension reduction factor analysis one-dimensional component measured by four items that explain 65% of the variation with Eigen value greater than one was chosen to the analysis. Secondary data from record office of every school, teachers' evaluated performance locally known as BSC and its details. Higher scores of the scale show higher self-efficacy and higher level of self-value on the subject matter.

### Data Analysis Technique

The researcher applied descriptive analysis-explore to checking normality and of linearity of distribution of responses and compute descriptive results.

## RESULTS

The background information of teachers participants from each district presented in **Table 1**. The actual performance appraisal of teacher as evaluated and felled by mainly three evaluators students (15%), parents (10%) and the school-vice principal and units (department head and unit leaders) in the school (75%); This score was collected from the vice principal office/record office/ of each school during the data collection. Teachers who remember detailed results and volunteer to declare

their performance were allowed fill by themselves on the space provided in the questionnaire but confirmed from the record's office for their precision. In this procedure, however details 42 teachers' performance appraisal scores were not collected due to different reasons. The questionnaire included two other self-evaluate appraisal measurements one rating and the other is a scale containing nine items and perceived self-belief in teaching as below average, average, above average and extra ordinary (based on Lehmann & Mehrens, recommendations of self-rating values). The following result was found (**Table 1**).

**Table 1.** District based participants background.

District	Total N	Sex		Age Grouped		perceived Self-belief in teaching performance				Marital status		
		F	M	≤ 35	≥ 36	Below Average	Ave Range	Above Average	Extra Ordinary	Single	Married	Divorced
Tanqua Bergele	27	7	20	24	3	0	4	10	12	11	15	0
Tembyen Abyiadi	30	7	22	28	2	1	2	14	12	7	22	0
w/Leke	23	5	18	19	4	1	1	12	9	7	16	0
Ahforem	43	12	31	31	12	1	8	17	16	13	27	2
M/Leke	30	8	22	24	6	0	9	12	8	12	16	2
N/Adiet	24	4	20	23	1	2	2	5	14	7	16	0
T/ Maychew	21	8	13	19	2	1	4	8	7	6	15	0
Akusum	43	5	31	14	29	1	14	10	15	9	32	1
Adwa	44	11	33	26	18	0	4	21	18	11	27	4
G/Adwa	34	9	25	31	3	2	4	12	12	9	23	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>9</b>

**Table 1** above shows the district based characteristics of respondents. Note background information that does not sum the total participants of the district means there are participants who did not respond for that particular information. For instance, eight participants did not respond to sex among them seven are in district called Akusum and one is from Temben Abyiadi. In general, the male female ratio is 323 and they represent 24.4% of the sample. The age distribution of participants, 235 (73.7%) are below or equal to age of 35. From the table we can see that most teachers are married (67.4%). 121 teachers rated themselves as above average and 123 perceive themselves extraordinary (see **Table 1** above). Teachers who have an experience of 6-10 and 11–15 are 43.6% and 28.3% respectively. The SPSS.20 means comparison analysis revealed very interesting results of the background data.

**Table 2.** Mean difference test for SE.

	df	Sig (2-Tailed)	t-test for Equality of Means		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
			Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Performance appraised by students	309	0	-0.6	0.203	-0.95	-0.1507
Performance appraised by student parent representatives	303	0.3	0.1	0.151	-0.15	0.44472
Performance appraised by school administration	302	0.1	-1.3	0.803	-2.91	0.24996
Performance out of 100	294	0.1	-1.4	0.848	-3.11	0.22795

**Table 2** above is the summarized outputs are as follows. Students evaluate females lower by 3.7% with mean score (13.25) compared to males who gained mean of 13.8 significance level  $F(1,309)=7.34, p < 0.007$ . Hameed et al., reviewed that students may evaluate their female instructors due to the bias they hold against females [18].

Student ratings of teachers may be biased in subtle but significant ways. Studies consistently find that male and female instructors are perceived differently in ways that are consistent with stereotypically gendered expectations of communication and interactive patterns. Similarly the school appraisal evaluations are lesser to females by 1.8%, at  $F(1,304)=2.75, p < 0.099$ . In general, Lehmann and mehrens listed established rapport between the rater and the subject whose performance is evaluated; Gender bias to and expectancy levels are also factors that can affect performance evaluators scoring. In this finding age and experience differently affect performance appraisal score of evaluators.

**Table 3.** Evaluators mean difference test.

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Performance appraised by students	Between Groups	16.96	4	4.24	1.795	0.13
	Within Groups	741.567	314	2.362		

	Total	758.527	318			
<b>Performance appraised by student parent representatives</b>	Between Groups	5.582	4	1.395	1.085	0.364
	Within Groups	395.985	308	1.286		
	Total	401.566	312			
<b>Performance appraised by school administration</b>	Between Groups	554.459	4	138.6	3.95	0.004
	Within Groups	10772.318	307	35.09		
	Total	11326.776	311			
<b>Performance out of 100</b>	Between Groups	386.965	4	96.74	2.538	0.04
	Within Groups	11395.947	299	38.11		
	Total	11782.912	303			

The mean appraisal score that students give to their teachers is lesser when age of the teachers increases though it's not statistically significant but the decrease in appraisal score with increased experience of their teacher is statistically significant at  $F(4,314)=2.66, p \leq 0.033$  (Table 3 above). Figazzol stated that popularity is not meant good teaching. With this regard, the school's appraisal teachers gets larger when the age and experience of the teacher increases, for the age group 18-25 the mean appraisal score was 63 (84.4%) and the mean appraisal score 46-55 is 69 (92%) which is statistically significant at  $F(4,307)=3.5, p \leq 0.004$ . Furthermore among these evaluation appraisals student evaluation's seems more inflated (91.1%) followed by parents). Andrade and Rocha found the same result and justified that teachers develop way how to gain higher performance appraisal such as inflating grades [7].

Correlational analysis on the data indicated that parent evaluated teachers performance showed significant association with student evaluated teachers' performance (BSC) at  $(r=0.24^*, df=312)$  and the performance evaluation by school staff at  $(r=0.162)$ . However, there was no relationship between school made evaluation and student made evaluation. Teachers' self-evaluation on subject matter and scales never matches with none of the evaluating stakeholder (evaluation makers). Teacher's self-evaluated quality on their subject matter and perceived teaching related performance in the school contradict with what the school leadership and students say about teachers. Teachers work experience and age  $(r=-0.168^{**}, -0.183^{**},$  respectively and  $df=312)$  negatively correlated with students evaluation which actually accounts 15% of the total actual performance; but both of them low significant positively correlated  $(r_{sex}=0.17^{**} df=317,$  and  $r_{age}=0.163, df=318)$  with school evaluations that accounts 75% of teachers performance evaluation. Overloaded may be less performed. Workload is found negatively associated  $(r_{wl}=-0.19, df=303)$  with school evaluation. Subsection of the performance (10%) filled by parents never associates with either of work experience, age and workload and performance scales. The actual performance appraisal evaluation looks of two dimensions-students and parent's way of appraising as one and the school side way of evaluation as second. The school evaluation does not go the same way as the other two ways. Preliminary factors analysis revealed that both students and their parents explain (with higher loading and communality) 41% of the variation compared to school evaluated performance that explain 34% of the variation. Either of the two is problematic that further investigation requires.

## DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION

The statistical analysis showed that teachers' average performance score varies with the woreda where the teachers is found. For instance teachers in Tanqua gain  $(79/100=79\%)$  average performance and in Tahtay maychew (95%). One way ANOVA with post comparison confirmed statistically significant variation among woredas at  $F(9,294)=24, p \leq 0.001$ . That is, Tanqua is different giving the lowest of all other 9 woredas and T/maychew giving the highest of all others. While the evaluating instrument is standard for all schools, there is misinterpretation and/or abuse among words. The variation also continues to appear with evaluators (students, parents and the school) of the teacher. Performance appraised by group of people named as the school is more conservative followed by parents then students by (87.7%, 88.6% and 91.2% respectively) though paired sample t test fail to support these mean difference. In addition to that teachers' characteristics are also source of variation. Means that, when evaluators are students; male (significant at  $t(,306)=-2.3, p \leq 0.013$ ), short experienced or newer (sign at  $F(4,311)=2.58, p \leq 0.04$ ) and younger teachers(ns) gain higher evaluation score implying that female, long experienced and older teachers gain lowest evaluation score. Parents seem indifferent with these regards because scores that teachers gain from parents show none of these patterns. The schools favor male  $(64.7/75)$  to females  $(66/75)$  ns teachers as students do but favor experienced (long stayed) and older teachers  $(F(4,306)=4.08, p \leq 0.003)$  unlike students. Either self-evaluation on the subject matter or perceived school related performance correlates with actual performance (BSC) and its components. There seems a tendency self-serving bias (123  $(f=28)$  teachers describe themselves as extra ordinary 120  $(F=36)$  above average 52  $(F=9)$  average. This data has some degree of congruence with students - students also give higher performance appraisal score to extraordinary teachers (significant when compared with above average). Conversely students give lower appraisal score to teachers those who broken their marriage compared to those who are single. The school appraised score also favor to male (females) teachers too with mean difference of 1.3%. But differently favor to experienced teachers in older and more experienced teacher gain more score. There scorer reliability or paired sample correlation weak and not statistically significant except in the case of students and parents. Ababaw found negative correlation between student's evaluation and administration evaluation [19]. These results educate a good lesson to educationalists and educational leaders and other stakeholders as well. Some amongst are the purposes of performance

evaluation- on the top of the habitual one such appraisal is suggested to be linked to schools effectiveness evaluation. The second regards the procedures of performance evaluation. Thirdly the need to reconsider content of the assessment criteria in that includes some components of self-evaluation. Its administration should be planed congested time. Evaluators should be accountable for what they did on teacher and continuous training of evaluators of performance is important. Experience doesn't grant good teaching as sex of the teacher cannot determine quality teaching. Background related differences in appraisal could be related to biases and stereotypes. Attitude changing training may also be needed. Variation among woreda shows difference in focus and uniformity in school leadership Figazzol. Probably experience sharing would be important. Student's contentment with young and relatively newer teachers may indicate that older and long stayed teachers would be exposed to emotional exhaustion that need experience based sensitization.

The difference between the evaluators (the school, students and student parent) is from difference in view. That is students have better information than parents and even school administration what and how the teacher does in the classroom every day. A discussion in with school principals (Nigiste Saba No.1 and Akusum high school) revealed that students are precise in their evaluation to the extent that it could hurt the teacher. Some school took administrative measure to compensate that and even those who have many students under achieved. A discussant from Akusum expressed his objection about the inclusion of students and parents as evaluators and students achievement as criteria.

Informal discussion with teachers reveal there are extra and irrelevant things that schools consider in performance appraisal. Students on the other hand look what the entire school management look together with skills named arts and crafts. Long stay in an organization-specifically schools may mean many things. As stated by lehmann and Mehrens rapport formation is one thing. And the other issue is associated with emotional exhaustion [20-22].

These emotional states are visible to students than supervisors. Results of this research showed that teachers work experience and age ( $r=-0.168^{**}$ ,  $-0.183^{**}$ , respectively and  $df=312$ ) negatively correlated with students evaluation which actually accounts 15% of the total actual performance. This empirical evidence may support the living mantra that exists in teachers. Including parents as teacher performance judges is not unprofessional [23]. Figazzol stated that many countries use parent information in appraising teachers' performance. In the research context it is a point of debate in the education sector. The result of this research showed positive correlation with student's performance score that may mean that the score appraised by parents are influenced by students [24]. Parents know little about teachers as most teachers. There are signs of gender discrimination. This may be may be favoritism and nepotism for familiarity.

### SUMMARY

1. Perceived performance does not significantly predict actual performance appraisal score. But self-evaluation and the perceived performance are significantly correlated.
2. A one dimension scale of perceived performance scale that explains 64% of the variation is used.
3. School appraisal appraised by school administration give more value to long experience and aged teachers than those who are short experienced and younger teachers.
4. Students appraisal scores high for younger and short experienced, teachers who have high (extra ordinary) self-evaluation.
5. Students performance appraisal scores are lesser for teachers those who have broken marriage.
6. Bothe the school administration and students performance appraisal score is lower for female teaches.
7. The variance of performance appraisal score among Words/ towns are significantly different.
8. The correlation between weekly work load and performance is negative. When work load increase teachers performance score decrease.
9. Then score by the school administration and scores by the students and parents evaluators is not correlated.
10. However the evaluation scores by parents and students are positively correlated.

### CONCLUSION

The disparity between self-evaluated and perceived performance and the actual performance appraisal score of the teacher shows that teachers' rejection to what the school leadership, students and parents are saying about their quality. It is undeniable that there is self-serving bias in self-evaluation. The correlation between the self-evaluated level of performance on the subject matter and perceived performance on some selected school related activities supported the existence some extent of some extent of honesty in teacher's self-evaluations. Therefore self-evaluations are important constituents of performance appraisal system. The focus if the evaluators are genuine; or the bias when the evaluators are stereotypic with the aspects of teaches' experience, gender and district based variation message about the performance appraisal system. Experience of teachers adds

some teaching quality on teachers however it would have been supported by students and parents' evaluation. Disagreement of evaluators depict something wrong is there such as gender and experience wise in the system. Students performance appraisal scores are lesser for teachers those who have broken marriage.

Both the school administration and students performance appraisal score downgrade female teaches performance challenges the endeavors by the policy statements. There is enough evidence that evaluators victimize female teachers. Furthermore it is hardly easy totally standardize the demography of schools in different Worde, but the significant variance in performance appraisal score among Words/ towns is not reasonable. Data collected from parents to attribute teachers' performance poorly matches students but no other qualities this evidence through involvement of parents as teacher evaluators in to question.

### RECOMMENDATION

Policy makers and practitioners on the education sector should account the self-evaluation as one component of performance appraisal system. Parents as teacher's evaluators are less important. Words are expected to be near to uniformity in evaluating their teachers otherwise the cost of such differences is not smaller. Training for teacher performance evaluators is needed including contents that help to diminish biased attitudes to experience gender and work places. It is also important for teacher to get some training how to improve performance appraisal score keeping the teachers performance is the performance of the school and education system at large in mind. Teacher's performance should be considered as part and parcel of the school performance indicator.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank all of those who helped to make this project a success. I am grateful to Dr. Amare Sahle for agreeing to supervise the research from a commitment that required a great deal of extra time and effort on his part. I would also like to thank my mother University and members of the department as well as my hosting University of Bahir Dar for their financial support and for the thoughtful, very helpful contributions that they made to the research. I'd also like to acknowledge and thank all the school principals, province and zonal education officers, where this research was conducted for their consent and extensive support for availing participant teachers during the data collection time.

### REFERENCES

1. Ritchie SA and O Malley AL. The role of emotional labor in performance appraisal: Are supervisors getting into the act?. Academy of Annual Meeting Proceedings. 2009;2009:1-6.
2. Messah OB. The Effect of Performance Appraisal Systems on Employees in Kenya Tea Development Agency: A Survey of Selected Tea Factories in Meru County-Kenya. Res J Bus Finance Account. 2011;2.
3. MoCS. Federal democratic republic of Ethiopian, Ministry of Civil service bulletin. 2013.
4. Field A. Discovering statistics Using SPSS, 2nd edtn, Sage publications, London. 2009.
5. Abd Hamid SR, et al. Teaching Quality and Performance Among Experienced Teachers in Malaysia. Australian J Teacher Educ. 2012;37.
6. Figazzol L. The use and misuse of teacher appraisal: An overview of cases in the developed world. Education International. 2013.
7. Andrade EC and Rocha BP. Factors Affecting the Student Evaluation of Teaching Scores: Evidence from Panel Data Estimation. Estudos Economicos (Sao Paulo). 2012;42.
8. Burton S, et al. Reality or perception? The effect of actual and perceived performance on satisfaction and behavioral intention. J Serv Res. 2003;5.
9. Saljooghi B and Salehi K. Developing a Teacher Evaluation Model: The Impact of Teachers' Attitude toward the Performance Evaluation System (PES) on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment with the Mediating Role of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy. Int J of Med Res Health Sci. 2016;5:200-209.
10. Hameed F, et al. Teacher evaluation: the role of gender © Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht. 2014.
11. Lee M, et al. Teachers' emotions and emotion management: integrating-emotion regulation-theory-with-emotional labor-research. Soc Psychol Educ. 2016
12. Hulsheger UR and Schewe AF. On the costs and benefits of emotional labor: A meta-analysis of three decades of research. J Occup Health Psychol. 2011;16, 361-389.
13. Schaufeli and Peeters. Job stress and burnout in correctional officers: A literature review, Int J Stress Manag. 2000;7.
14. Lazanyi K. Who Benefits From Emotional Labor? Applied Studies in Agribusiness and Commerce – Agroiinform Publishing House, Budapest. 2010.

15. Lazanyi K. Organizational Consequences Of Emotional Labor In Mangement Applied Studies in Agribusiness and Commerce – APSTRACT Agroinform Publishing House, Budapest PHD Summaries.
16. Lin SP, et al. The Mediation Effect of Emotional Experience between Emotion Labor and Job Engagement. *Universal J Manag.* 2015;3:491-496.
17. Mekele T. Tigray Regional Educational Bureau statistics (TREB). 2016.
18. Salilih SZ and Abajobir AA. Work-related stress and associated factors among nurses working in public hospitals of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. *Workplace Health Saf.* 2014;62:326-32.
19. Ababaw B. Factors that Affect Teachers' Performance Appraisal at Bahir Dar Polytechnic College. *Int J Emerg Trends Sci Techn.* 2016;3:4316-4323.
20. Grandey AA. Emotion Regulation in the Workplace: A New Way to Conceptualize Emotional Labor. *J Occup Health Psychol.* 2000;5:95-110.
21. Hochschild AR. *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling.* University of California press, Berkle. 1983.
22. Morris AJ and Feldman DC. The dimensions, antecedents and consequences of emotional labor *Academy of Management Review.* 1996;21: 98-101.
23. Ethiopian Ministry of Education. *Guidance of School Administration.* Ethiopia: A.A. Ministry of Education. 1997.
24. Ethiopian Statistics Agency (ESA-2015) *Annual report Addis Ababa Ethiopia.* 2015.