

# Influence of Procedural Fairness on Implementation of Performance Appraisal Practices in Public Secondary Schools in Cherangany Sub-County

Benson Chege Njuguna & Kitainge Kisilu  
University of Eldoret, Kenya

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2023.70627>

Received: 18 March 2023; Accepted: 27 March 2023; Published: 21 June 2023

## ABSTRACT

This study sought to establish the influence of procedural fairness on implementation of performance appraisal practices in public secondary schools in Trans Nzoia County. The study was guided by 'goal-setting and Vrooms expectancy theories respectively. The study used concurrent triangulation design. The target population was 2340 respondents comprising of 242 principals and 2098 teachers from 242 public secondary schools. The sample size was 342 comprising of 35 Principals and 307 teachers' respondents. Stratified, simple random and purposive sampling was used to select respondents. This sample of was drawn from 243 public secondary schools in Trans Nzoia County. Questionnaire were used to provide information and opinions from teachers and interviews from the principals. There was a significant influence of procedural fairness on implementation of performance appraisal practices ( $r=0.543$ ,  $p=0.00$ ). The procedural justice had significant influence on the implementation of performance appraisal practices. The study concludes that there was significant influence of procedural justice, on implementation of performance appraisal practices. The study recommends that TSC needs to develop and conduct continuous induction courses on performance appraisal for principals, deputy principals, heads of departments and teachers in order to demystify purpose of teachers' performance appraisal in schools. Enhanced awareness can change the attitude that, teachers' appraisals are aimed at aiding only the school management.

**Key words:** Procedural, Fairness, Implementation, Performance, Appraisal, Practices

## INTRODUCTION

When employees are subjected to ongoing evaluation and appraisal, an organization's success and subsequent productivity can be achieved. According to Kampkotter (2015), performance evaluation (PA) is one of the most important functions in human resource management. It is the process by which subordinates' expectations and goals are defined, communicated, reviewed, and evaluated by comparing them to established standards (Warokka, Gallato, & Moorthy, 2012; 2016 (Dessler & Varkkey). According to Zhang (2017), teacher evaluations lose their connection to the process of teaching improvement and teacher professional development. Instead, they become merely a routine activity.

According to Cropanzano, Bowen, and Gillilan (2007), the relationship between employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment and the fairness or organizational justice of performance appraisal processes and practices makes this aspect of the process extremely significant for businesses. According to Sudin (2011), organizational justice is a personal assessment of the moral and ethical standing of managerial behavior. Organizations and employees alike stand to gain significantly from organizational justice.

According to Cropanzano, Bowen, & Gillilan (2007), these include increased trust and commitment, enhanced job performance, more helpful citizenship behaviors, enhanced customer satisfaction, and decreased conflict.

Warokka et al. state that (2012) authoritative equity scientists partition the idea of reasonableness into three essential sorts the principal ordinarily acknowledged kind of equity is alluded to as “distributive” equity. The fairness of a decision’s outcomes is the primary consideration from a distributive-oriented perspective. The second type of procedural justice is concerned with the fairness of the process that led to the outcome. In the last twenty years, these two areas have served as the foundation for the majority of organizational justice research (Byrne & Cropanzano, 2001). According to those studies, if people believe that the method by which distribution decisions were made was fair, they will accept some unfairness in distribution. “Interactional” justice is a common name for a third kind of justice.

According to Bies & Moag (1986), a number of academics defined interactive-oriented justice as the fairness of an individual’s interpersonal treatment at the hands of an authority figure during the implementation of organizational processes and the distribution of outcomes. The interactional equity idea has been incorporated as a relational part of procedural equity. In addition, it serves as a distinct concept alongside distributive justice and procedure-oriented justice (Skarlicki & Folger, 1997). In 2007, Robbins and Judge reexamined their findings and emphasized that distributive, procedural, and interactional **justices are** the three distinct aspects of organizational justice.

According to Ikramullah et al., employees’ perceptions of fairness are influenced by one or more of their perceptions regarding the various organizational outcomes that they receive from the organization (distributive justice), the procedures used to make those decisions (procedural justice), and the treatment that they receive from the organization or agents, i.e. managers (interpersonal justice). Additionally, employees’ perceptions of fairness are influenced by the fact that all the necessary information related to various outcomes is provided within 2011). According to Ikramullah et al., “fairness perceptions of performance management practices have implications for both the employees and the organization.” (2011). The degree to which employees perceive an organization’s processes, relationships, exchanges, and outcomes to be fair is what is meant by the term “organizational justice.” It basically refers to how an organization and its employees are perceived to be treated fairly (Shalhoop, 2003). Since individual and organizational outcomes have been found to be linked to employees’ perceptions of fairness (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005), organizational researchers have focused on fairness over the past ten years. Cawley and others, In their meta-analytic review, (1998) also argued that PAs have a significant impact on organizational justice. According to Dijke & Cremer (2016), researchers have predicted that justice will have a positive effect on employee attitudes like satisfaction. The long-term efficacy of PA procedures is directly influenced by these employees’ perceptions of justice.

The first aspect of organizational justice, distributive justice, deals with fairness in relation to perceived outcomes. The social exchange theory, also known as equity theory, serves as its foundation. It is about how employees see their rewards in relation to the efforts they put in compared to those of other employees. Social exchanges are perceived as fair when employees believe their rewards are proportional to their efforts (Adams, 1965; Johnson, 1961; 1990 Greenberg; Dusterhoff and others, 2014). The employees’ perceptions of the fairness of the procedures used to determine their outcomes or appraisals are the second dimension of organizational justice. It basically refers to the employees’ perception that fair procedures are followed when making decisions about pay, rewards, and appraisals (Thibaut & Walker, 1975; 1980, Leventhal). Another model of organizational justice is the three-factor distributive, procedural, and interactional justice model, in addition to the two-factor procedural-distributive model previously mentioned. The term “interactional justice” refers to perceptions of justice that arise from interactions between raters and ratees when PAs are implemented (Bies & Moag, 1986; (1987, Bies and Shapiro) Interactional justice has been studied as part of procedural justice or as a separate idea. While some researchers see it as a component of procedural justice, others see it as a distinct type of justice; However, the issue is still up for further discussion.

According to Greenberg's (1993) four-factor model of organizational justice, interpersonal (INTJ) and informational (INFJ) justice are two distinct dimensions of organizational justice. Interpersonal justice is the way employees are treated, or the degree to which they are treated with respect, dignity, and courtesy. Informational justice, on the other hand, is about explaining why something happened. Colquitt, (2001) also provides support for this four-factor model, which includes distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice. Colquitt and other, According to them (2001), the primary reason for distinguishing between justice types is the connection between them and particular organizational attitudes.

According to Cook & Crossman (2004), although a lot of research has been done on various aspects of PA, little research has been done on fairness perceptions that influence the way teacher performance appraisal practices are used. According to Jawahar (2007), more research is needed into how perceptions of justice affect a variety of individual and organizational outcomes. to test the effects of employees' perceptions of PA fairness. Thurston and Mc Nall (2010) utilized perceptual, emotional and social build model which is steady with the authoritative reception model proposed by (Hulin et al., 1985) as well as Organ (1995). By developing a specific scale, they applied this interactive framework specifically to the PA context. The authors identified procedural, distributive, interpersonal, and informational dimensions of organizational justice as four distinct but highly correlated dimensions. The findings of their study back up earlier claims made by Colquitt et al., (2001) to separate the four dimensions of justice.

The appraisal system was implemented in Kenya in 2006 with the intention of increasing public service effectiveness and efficiency (Kamiti, 2014). According to Nyatera's (2011) study, head teachers lacked the expertise necessary to carry out teacher evaluations. Teachers were so demoralized by the exercise's execution that the process was viewed negatively. The study suggested that appraisers receive extensive training to help the appraisee have a positive experience with the process. According to research, principals and other school designated appraisers in Kenya receive very little training on how to manage the TPA process. In Kenya's public schools, especially school managers, conducting teacher evaluations is an essential management activity. Tenable instructor execution examination anyway requires a viable arrangement of evaluation. Oyaro (2016) found that the practices of teacher performance evaluation in Kenya's public secondary schools have flaws that must be fixed right away if teacher performance evaluation is to be used to improve education quality in Kenya. To address shortcomings in teacher performance evaluation, TSC has implemented some new approaches. Since performance evaluations are meant to foster professional growth among teachers, it's important to find out what teachers think about the fairness of the system's implementation. An employee may be dissatisfied with the organization's appraisal system if the system is unfair. Teachers' perceptions of what constitutes fair and unfair performance evaluation practices are poorly understood.

## **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

In many nations, a teacher management system that incorporates teacher performance evaluations as a means of increasing accountability and ensuring high-quality instruction is gaining traction across all sectors. In numerous nations, efforts have been made to assess teacher performance. According to Jonyo & Owuor (2017), teachers in Kenya have not been left behind in the performance evaluation process. According to Kanisa and Makokha (2017), teacher performance evaluation has only recently become a significant issue in Kenya. Even though it is already well-established in developed nations like the United States, Australia, and New Zealand. According to Jonyo and Owuor (2017), teachers in Kenya and other developing nations have traditionally been evaluated inconsistently using impulsive methods and inaccurate data.

A new policy framework for evaluating teachers was developed and implemented in January 2016 through TSC, the constitutionally mandated teacher management agency. The primary objective of the appraisal policy is to establish training requirements to address the identified performance gaps and to provide crucial

information for coherent, effective, and efficient decision-making regarding teacher performance. Even though the TSC has put a lot of effort into putting this teachers' performance appraisal policy into action successfully since 2016, there has been a long debate between the TSC and teachers' unions about whether or not the Teachers' appraisal and development policy improves teacher management systems in Kenyan schools.

KNUT (2017) argued that the teacher appraisal policy constitutes high stake teacher supervision, which is so cumbersome for teachers and takes teachers away from being a teacher who should spend a lot of time teaching. In contrast, TSC (2017) gave a success report based on compliance status, effective time management by teachers, improved financial management, and supervision of teachers. In Kenya's public schools, the TSC and teachers' unions have been at odds for years over how to implement the new teacher's appraisal policy. The implementation of TPAD has been cited as a contentious issue between teachers, their union, and the TSC in court battles.

Educators' exhibition examination is quite a significant capability of execution the executives cycle in open optional schools in Kenya. TPAD has the potential to boost teacher productivity, accountability, and workplace efficiency when implemented correctly, thereby enhancing student performance and the school as a whole. In spite of these obvious advantages, Nyatera (2011) found that teachers in public secondary schools in Kenya had negative perceptions of their performance evaluations. Public school teachers have consistently criticized their performance evaluation system for a number of flaws, the majority of which are related to the policy implementation process.

In a public secondary school, Gichuki (2010) conducted research on teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of the performance appraisal system. The study found that TSC, the employer of teachers, had difficulty communicating performance feedback to both the appraisee and the appraisers. By examining teacher perceptions of the fairness of the performance appraisal system in Kenya's public secondary schools, this study sought to close the existing gap.

## LITERATURE

REVIEWING past performance, rewarding past performance, setting goals for future performance, and employee development are all part of PA, according to Sapra (2012). Its purpose is to compile, document, and provide feedback to identify improvement areas based on comparison results for reward allocation. According to Dusterhoff, Cunningham, & MacGregor (2014), PA is also regarded as an essential component of a strategic approach to management because it is instrumental in connecting an employee's competencies and behavior to the organization's strategic goals. In addition, PA has emerged as an essential and extremely significant human resource practice in order to maintain an organization's competitiveness.

Bayon (2013) says that companies use a tool called a performance appraisal to see how well employees are doing in relation to certain predetermined criteria and the goals of the company. Bokor, Danku, Dordor, and Solgo assert this. The continuous process of identifying, measuring, and evaluating each employee's performance in order to determine the areas in which improvement is required is known as performance appraisal. Employee motivation, commitment, and satisfaction rise as a result of the information gleaned from performance evaluations.

According to Kisang & Kirai (2016), providing employees with clear feedback regarding their performance is one of the most crucial conditions in appraisal. Ademola (2017) says that performance reviews are good for both the company and its employees because they are thought to help employees stay with the company, encourage their professional development, and increase their commitment to the company, all of which help the company grow. Grote (2011) asserts that organizations will fail and employees will perform poorly as a result of inconsistent and inappropriate performance evaluations. According to Kanisa and Makokha (2017), the success of the organization will depend on the effective and efficient evaluation of each employee.



Despite PAs' widespread use and utility, managers and employees alike are concerned about their utility and are most dissatisfied with the procedure (Adler et al., 2016). In a variety of settings, a survey of managers and employees reveals dissatisfaction with the PA procedure. According to Culbertson, Henning, & Payne (2013), employees perceive formally implemented PA as of little value, which can also demotivate high performers in the organization. According to Wilkie (2015), a number of Fortune 500 companies abandoned the performance evaluation process on the grounds that it was ineffective. (2015 Meinert). Studies on private sector organizations in Pakistan, for instance, have shown that employees have little faith in the PA process and think it is "inadequate" (Qureshi, 2005; Sarwar and Aslam, 2010). According to a literature review, researchers and practitioners alike have expressed concern about PAs' effectiveness in determining the system's usefulness for employee performance evaluations in light of widespread criticism (Darehzereshki, 2013; Iqbal and co., 2015).

Reception of execution evaluation as an administration device in instructive foundations upgrades responsibility and a manual for fulfillment of defined objectives and thus improvement in execution (Kenyatta, 2016). Midimo (2017) says that employee performance reviews help employees improve their individual weaknesses and develop a more productive work ethic. They also give corrective feedback on accomplishments, provide direction, and support performance improvement. It serves as a visible means by which employees can be held accountable to the employer and stakeholders.

The profession of teaching is well-known for its capacity to impart knowledge, skills, and change people's attitudes in the service of human development. Teachers at the school level are responsible for this overwhelming task, and their efforts are managed to ensure that they provide the best possible environment for the child's development (Asira, 2011). The approaches to teacher management are increasingly emphasizing the importance of measuring teachers' performance. Teachers' performance evaluation results, according to Gichuki (2015), "can provide organizations with useful information that is used by the human resource department to make decisions relating to employees' promotion, transfer, and training, among other things."

Research on performance evaluations has traditionally focused on a measurement-centered approach (job performance measurement, appraisal formatting, and rater bias), whereas the current focus is on a more context-centered approach (motivation, communication, and social process with interaction between employees and supervisors, as well as employees and organizations) (Zheng, Zhang & Li, 2012). Teacher evaluation is seen as an important tool by educational researchers for improving educational quality (Zhang, 2017; 2014 by Hallinger, Heck, and Murphy; Zhang and Ng (2011)), which is thought to have the capacity to encourage instructional improvement and facilitate teacher professional development.

Cawley, Keeping, and Levy (2008) claim that employees' perceptions of fairness have a significant impact on the outcomes they receive from an organization, including access to information, fair treatment, and decision-making procedures. Additionally, according to Thomas and Bretz (2011), some organizations are ultimately concerned with the appraisal systems' perceived fairness. According to Thomas & Bretz (2011), procedural fairness entails both a proper evaluation of the processes that determine the outcomes (distributive fairness) and an evaluation of the outcomes themselves.

Positive perceptions can only be achieved through the application of rules that are regarded as fair and consistent, as well as the appropriate awarding of rewards based on merit without regard to personal bias.

According to Lind & Tyler (2005), procedural fairness is defined as assessing the objectivity and reasonableness of social standards that govern how decisions are made and how employees of an organization are treated by supervisors and other stakeholders. It's important to note that this idea goes much further than previous ones, which suggested that those who will be impacted by those choices should

contribute the most important aspects of extraordinary procedural fairness. Procedural fairness, as defined by Lind and Tyler (2005), includes ethicality, correctness, consistency, and information accuracy as well as other values.

Both result-based and non-result-based effects are included in procedural fairness, and both hypotheses are required to clarify their effects. The effects that are result-based and can be attributed to the utilization of fair procedures primarily with the intention of achieving fair outcomes can be clarified using Lind and Tyler (2005)'s self-interest model. Alternately, the group value concept (Lind & Tyler, 2005) can be helpful for elucidating the emotional effects that go far beyond the achievement of fair outcomes. The positive attitude that an individual may have toward the organization and its leaders as a result of organizational practices that raise the person's dignity as a full-status member are examples of these effects. In its most literal sense, this kind of fairness takes into account the honesty and openness of the procedures and processes by which decisions are made. According to Cropanzano, Bowen, and Gilliland (2007), this kind of fairness is very important for an organization to maintain its legitimacy.

A significant predictor of the outcome at the organizational level is procedural justice. Colquitt and others, (2001) contend that procedural justice has a significant impact on how the appraisal system is evaluated in general. Procedural justice had a significant impact on PA system satisfaction, according to Jawahar (2007), who hypothesized a relationship between the two. According to Thurston & Mc Nall (2010), employees' satisfaction with the PA system was linked to their perceptions of procedural justice. Their evidence suggests that employees' satisfaction with the PA system is better predicted by procedural justice. In the Mexican context, Selvarajan & Cloninger (2012) hypothesized a connection between procedural justice and employee satisfaction with the appraisal system. Procedural justice has a positive impact on appraisal satisfaction, according to their study's findings. Taneja, Srivastava, and Ravichandran (2015) hypothesized that satisfaction with the PA system might be improved by procedural justice. According to Day (2011), procedural justice is demonstrated by the organization's perceived fairness of policies, procedures, process and decision control, and the application of rules. This demonstrates that the organization values the trustworthiness of its employees and management. Kumar and Aggarwal-Gupta, (2010). When procedures are impartial, applied consistently, based on accurate information that is applicable to righteous standards, and there is a procedure for reviewing poor decisions, procedural justice is achieved (Day, 2011; Kumar and Aggarwal-Gupta, 2010). The outcomes will be more palatable if the procedure is regarded as equitable (Wang & Nayir, 2010).

According to Wang & Nayir (2010), the majority of the research that has been done on procedural justice has focused on employees' perceptions of how they were treated by supervisors and businesses. However, there has been little research on the role that managers play in procedural justice. According to Geeta et al., employees' perceptions of procedural justice are linked to higher levels of organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Procedural justice was found to be a key factor in the success of organizational change efforts. (2011). Al-Zu'bi (2010) claims that procedural justice has gradually gained prominence due to procedures' greater influence over outcomes than the outcome itself.

In the context of a performance evaluation, the people rating the employees are required to provide them with performance standards. The purpose of using these standards is to explain why it is essential that they meet them and to provide adequate and consistent feedback on their performance. According to Taylor, Tracy, Renard, Harrison, & Carroll (2012), employees are more likely to accept and be satisfied with assigned performance ratings if they have been given adequate notice of the appraisal and given the opportunity to participate in the process. A formal appraisal dialogue in which employees are informed about their performance ratings and how the appraiser arrived at the ratings is crucial to the fair hearing principle. Throughout the course of the rating procedures, the appraisers are expected to keep an eye on how well the employees are doing their jobs and have sufficient knowledge of them. The employee ought to then

be given the chance to evaluate themselves and challenge any ratings that their supervisors have given them that they believe are unfair.

Erdogan (2012) argued that the involved employee ought to be permitted to contribute and offer explanations prior to the determination of assigned ratings. From the perspective of due process, evidence-based judgment also influences perceptions of fairness. Evidence-based judgment necessitates applying the principles of honesty by supervisors and establishing consistent performance benchmarks for all employees without skewing the results through corruption and prejudice. Employers of labor should make it a priority to give their employees the option to appeal unsatisfactory performance ratings, explain the ratings to them, and reward them accordingly. According to Poon (2014), effective performance evaluation methods and training for appraisers can greatly reduce the issue of rating bias.

Communication between a supervisor and a subordinate creates a space where the employee's thoughts and ideas are valued. Additionally, it enhances the employer's hands-on approach and shows respect for the employee's opinions and input (Folger, 2011). In other words, employees' perceptions of their appraisal system improve as a result of communication. Past examination discoveries (Eniye, 2007; According to Desalegn (2010), unfair practices in performance appraisal include inconsistent communication of appraisal feedback to employees, ambiguity regarding the purpose of the evaluation, inconsistency in the timing of the evaluation, a lack of opportunity to improve their work, and the inability to make suggestions regarding the appraisal system. However, there have been few studies on how teachers' perceptions of procedural fairness influence performance evaluation and teachers' performance.

### **A. Goal-setting theory**

Locke's goal-setting theory suggests that individual employees establish goals which motivate them to achieve higher performance (Salaman, Storey & Billsberry, 2005). The goal-setting theory suggest that employee performance behaviours are likely to change depending on the goals of the task to be performed. Through goal-setting, employees are likely to benefit by having enhanced focus on a particular task or objective; increased efforts; enhanced persistence on the task; and, stimulation of creativity and innovativeness in a four-stage process.

The first stage involves setting of SMART goals (specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound) by management. At the second stage, the management enlists participation of employees in the process of setting goals and to adopt the goals as their own. During the third stage, management provides appropriate support and resources to employees for goal-achievement. Lastly, in the fourth stage the management provides timely employee performance appraisal feedback. The goal-setting theory is applied in performance appraisal which entails five stages notably: Establishment of performance standards, communication of performance standards, measurement of actual performance, comparison of actual and anticipated performance and initiating corrective action where necessary (Surbhi, 2015). The goal-setting theory emphasizes that employees are able to modify their goals depending on their performance. If employees clearly understand performance appraisal framework, they are likely to be engaged in the appraisal process in a productive manner that enhances their professional development and student learning outcomes. The contribution of teachers to student learning outcomes can be determined using the performance appraisal ratings. Performance appraisal starts with establishment of performance standards followed by communication of performance expectations, measurement of actual performance, comparison of actual performance with anticipated performance and ends with initiation of corrective action where necessary (Surbhi, 2015). Performance appraisal embraces the four stages of Locke's (1968) goal-setting theory notably setting of goals; enlisting acceptance and participation of employees; providing appropriate support and resources; and lastly, providing timely employee performance appraisal feedback (Okumbe, 1999).

TPAD framework envisages dissemination of prompt and appropriate feedback that helps to direct the teachers' efforts as a motivator or as a pointer to performance gaps that require improvement through continuous professional development. Moreover, the TPAD framework is not clear whether teacher experience in terms of number of years spent in teaching or experience in terms of additional competence acquired during the teaching service significantly determine student learning achievement. According to Muhammad (2013), a person works better when he/she knows how he is working. A person gets feedback about his performance which helps him to relate his work to the organizational objectives.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was based on pragmatic philosophical research paradigm whose approach applies pluralistic means of acquiring knowledge about a phenomenon (Morgan, 2007). Creswell (2013) supports this and argues that, pragmatism makes it possible to work within the positivist and interpretivist approach. Pragmatism is generally regarded as the philosophical partner for the mixed methods approach. Pragmatic research philosophy is suitable for this study because it allowed the researcher to use whatever combination of methods necessary to find answers to research questions. According to Mertens (2005), a mixed method is one in which both quantitative and qualitative methods are used to answer research questions in a single study or a multiphase study. The study adopted descriptive survey research design. This design was appropriate because it gives conclusive results among the research variables. The study was carried out in Trans-Nzoia County. The county has an area of 2,469.9 km<sup>2</sup> and is divided into five administrative sub counties namely; Trans Nzoia west/Saboti, Trans Nzoia East, Kiminini, Endebes and Kwanza. The population of the county was 818,585. The secondary school age cohort is 104, 473 with 69, 998 enrolled (CDE's office, Trans Nzoia County). Trans Nzoia is a county with rich socio-economic endowment basically hinged on maize production and other agricultural activities. There is also notable variation in how schools perform KCSE.

Target population was all secondary school teachers in Trans-Nzoia County, while the target population consists of the 242 public secondary schools in Trans-Nzoia County. The target population was 2340 respondents comprising of 242 principals and 2098 teachers from 242 public secondary schools. The sample size was drawn from 2340 respondents comprising of 242 principals and 2098 teachers from 242 public secondary schools in Trans-Nzoia County. Yamane (1967) provides a simplified formula for calculating the sample size of the respondents. From the target population of 2340 respondents, the researcher used proportionate sampling to select 342 respondents. The study applied stratified sampling to create strata comprising of five Sub counties. The strata ensured representation of subjects by school type in the sample. Purposive sampling was used to select principals in national and extra county school in the sample. Principals were selected using stratified random sampling after establishing the number of schools per category in each sub-county. Teachers sampled through proportionate simple random sampling to ensure representation in the sample of teachers from different school strata. The sampling technique gave employee in the population an equal probability of being in the sample

The study used both primary and secondary data using questionnaire, interviews and document analysis. The study used questionnaire to collect primary data from respondents. The questionnaire contained close ended questions based on study objectives. The questionnaire employed the five –point Likert scale where 1 represents Strongly Disagree 2 represents Disagree 3 represents Neutral 4 represent Agree and 5 represents Strongly Agreed. Principals were guided through a scheduled interview in order to get an in-depth opinion about the use of TPAD in their schools. The collected data was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics with the help of statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). Data collected from the field were cleaned, coded, and analyzed using descriptive statistics and Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS V. 26). Results were presented in the form of frequency and percentages. Correlation analysis was done to determine relationship between variables.



## RESULTS

### 1. Teacher Performance Appraisal Practices

The dependent variable was the application of Teacher Performance Appraisal Practices in public secondary schools in Trans Nzoia County was examined using various statements as in Table 1. Majority of the respondents disagreed 98 (65%) on the statement that performance appraisal enabled teachers to improve their professional knowledge and its application e.g. maintenance and use of approved professional documents, with 24% agree and 11 % were undecided.

The findings indicated that the performance appraisal feedback does not enable teachers to improve their professional knowledge and its application in maintenance and use of approved professional documents. Majority of the respondents 96 (64%) tended to disagree that performance appraisal feedback enhanced teachers' ability to manage teaching time e.g. punctuality at duty station and lesson attendance, although 9.3% were undecided and 27% agreed with the same statement. This implies that performance appraisal feedback does not always enhance teachers' ability to manage teaching time e.g. punctuality at duty station and lesson attendance.

Majority of the respondents disagreed 86 (57%) on the statement performance appraisal feedback enhanced teachers' innovativeness and creativity at work e.g. integration of ICT in teaching and learning, with 20% agreeing and 22% were undecided. The findings indicated that the performance appraisal feedback does not enhance teachers' innovativeness and creativity at work. Majority of the respondents 85 (57%) tended to disagree that performance appraisal feedback enhanced teachers' knowledge on learner protection, safety, discipline and teachers conduct e.g. compliance with children's act although 16% were undecided and 27% disagreed with the same statement. This implies that performance appraisal feedback does not always enhance teachers' knowledge on learner protection, safety, discipline and teachers conduct.

**Table 1: Teacher Performance appraisal practices**

	SA		A		UD		D		SD	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Enabled teachers to improve their professional knowledge and its application e.g. maintenance and use of approved professional documents etc	8	5.3	28	18.7	16	10.7	45	30	53	35.3
Enhanced teachers' ability to manage teaching time e.g. punctuality at duty station and lesson attendance	12	8	28	18.7	14	9.3	44	29.3	52	34.7
Enhanced teachers' innovativeness and creativity at work e.g. Integration of ICT in teaching and learning	8	5.3	22	14.7	34	22.7	52	34.7	34	22.7
Enhanced teachers' knowledge on learner protection, safety, discipline and teachers conduct e.g. Compliance with Children's Act	16	10.7	25	16.7	24	16	50	33.3	35	23.3
Enhanced teachers' involvement in promotion of co-curricular activities e.g. Sports, music, drama etc.		0	27	18	33	22	31	20.7	59	39.3
Enabled teachers to engage in their own professional development e.g. Enrolment in teacher professional development courses etc		0	32	21.3	29	19.3	25	16.7	64	42.7
Facilitated teachers to collaborate with parents, guardians and other education stake holders to promote education	12	8	70	46.7	18	12	35	23.3	15	10
Helped maintain records of teaching and learning performance for decision making	14	9.3	61	40.7	40	26.7	26	17.3	9	6

Most of the respondents 90 (60%) disagree with the statement performance appraisal feedback enhanced teachers' involvement in promotion of co-curricular activities e.g. sports, music and drama, with 18% agreeing and 22% were undecided. This indicated that performance appraisal feedback does not always enhance teachers' involvement in promotion of co-curricular activities. Most of the respondents 89 (59%) disagreeing with the statement that appraisal has enabled teachers to engage in their own professional development e.g. Enrolment in teacher professional development courses, with 21% agreed and 19% were undecided. This indicated that performance appraisal does not enable teachers to engage in their own professional development.

Most of the respondents 82 (55%) agree with the statement that appraisal has facilitated teachers to collaborate with parents, guardians and other education stake holders to promote education, with 33% disagreeing and 12% were undecided. This indicated that performance appraisal does not facilitated teachers to collaborate with parents, guardians and other education stake holders to promote education. Most of the respondents 75 (50%) agree with the statement that appraisal has helped maintain records of teaching and learning performance for decision making, with 23% disagreeing and 27% were undecided. This indicated that performance appraisal does not helped maintain records of teaching and learning performance for decision making.

The performance appraisals have not enabled teachers to improve their professional knowledge and its application, enhanced teachers' ability to manage teaching time and enhanced teachers' innovativeness and creativity at work. Performance appraisal feedback have not enhanced teachers' knowledge on learner protection, safety, discipline and teachers conduct, teachers' involvement in promotion of co-curricular activities, enabled teachers to engage in their own professional development courses. Most of the respondents agree that appraisal has facilitated teachers to collaborate with parents, guardians and other education stake holders to promote education and have helped maintain records of teaching and learning performance for decision making.

From the interview schedule one of the principals stated that: The teacher's perceptions of fairness of the appraisal practices are very critical aspects that contribute to effectiveness of the performance appraisal process. In scenarios where the performance practices are seen to be partial and teachers become dissatisfied with the process"

On the overall rating of processes adherence of TPAD programmes at various levels in public secondary schools in Trans Nzoia County, most of the teachers rated the adherence at school level and TSC Headquarter to be effective, while the sub-county and County Level to be moderately effective. These findings agree with Welsberg, Sexton, Mulhern and Keeling (2009) who found out that PA makes the teachers to lack what to improve on due to unawareness caused by a lack of feedback.

It concur with Donalson and Donalson (2012) that teachers need constructive feedback from skilled practitioners in order to improve their teaching. The findings agree with Teacher Service Commission (2016) which pointed out at the inception of the performance and appraisal tool, that, innovation and creativity in teaching is demonstrated by preparing teaching/ learning aids and ICT integration in teaching and learning. These findings concur with those of Kanyi (2011) who asserted that inadequate content, shallow coverage and lack of infrastructures were negative effects of digital content utilization in secondary schools in Kenya.

These findings agree with the Teacher Services Commission (2016) which suggested that a teacher's performance and appraisal tool be set up so as to maintain collaborative relationships with the school stakeholders and the society at large. As such the study concludes that collaboration of parents has a positive influence on teacher's job performance. These findings concur with those of Obi (2003) who observed that PTA ensures quality standards and academic excellence through engagements with school board of management in Nigeria.

### Teachers’ perceptions of the procedural fairness

The respondents were asked to rate on a five-point Likert scale their level of agreement on several statements describing the perceptions of the procedural fairness in the current teachers’ implementation of performance appraisal practices and their response were summarized in Table 2. From the study, majority of the teachers 105 (69%) agreed that TPAD tools are valid and reliable in determining teacher’s rewards and sanctions like promotion, demotion and salary increment, with 9 (6%) undecided and 37 (24%) disagreeing. Most of the teachers 80 (53%) agreed that teachers’ input was considered during formulation and implementation of TPAD policy, while 48 (32%) disagreeing and 22 (14%) undecided.

Majority of the teachers 75 (50%) agreed that TPAD covers all the teacher’s performance indicators in the school, with 46 (31%) disagreeing and 32 (21.3%) were undecided. Majority of the teachers 103 (69%) agreed that the performance appraisal is a true reflection of teacher’s competence in school, with 33 (22%) disagreeing and 14 (9.3%) were undecided. At least 72 (48%) agreed that there has been professional development in regard to the identified gaps, with 48 (32%) disagreeing and 30 (20%) undecided.

**Table 2 Perceptions of teachers in respect to procedural fairness of TPAD policy**

	SA		A		UD		D		SD	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
There is a pre-appraisal conference involving all staff to set performance targets	15	10	25	16.7	21	14	65	43	24	16
Performance appraisal is a true reflection of teacher’s competence in school.	57	38	46	30.7	14	9.3	25	17	8	5.3
Observation debriefing reflects a use of multiple data source in conducting my appraisal	12	8	34	22.7	51	34	44	29	9	6
There was no clear TPAD cycle policy in the school	8	5.3	20	13.3	17	11	80	53	25	16.7
TPAD helps to identify teachers training needs	25	16.7	33	22	24	16	45	30	23	15.3
There has been professional development in regard to the identified gaps	32	21.3	40	26.7	30	20	36	24	12	8
TPAD tools are valid and reliable in determining teacher’s rewards and sanctions like promotion, demotion and salary increment.	61	40.7	43	28.7	9	6	25	17	12	8
Classroom observation by appraiser is usually fair and objective	10	6.7	30	20	17	11	70	47	23	15.3
My appraiser applies non-consistent performance standards with all other teachers in the school.	12	8	26	17.3	22	15	72	48	18	12
TPAD system does not requires continuous review	10	6.7	11	7.3	6	4	61	41	62	41.3
Teachers input was considered during formulation and implementation of TPAD policy	45	30	35	23.3	22	15	30	20	18	12
TPAD covers all the teacher’s performance indicators in the school	33	22	42	28	29	19	32	21	14	9.3
My overall appraisal ratings are not influenced by a singular weakness in performance.	16	10.7	28	18.7	32	21	58	39	16	10.7

Majority of the teachers 89 (59%) disagreed that there is a pre-appraisal conference involving all staff to set performance targets, with 40 (27%) agreeing and 21(14%) were undecided. Most of the teachers 105 (70%) disagreed that there was no clear TPAD cycle policy in the school, with 28 (19%) agreeing and 17 (11.3%) undecided. At least 68 (45%) of the teachers disagreed that TPAD helps to identify teachers training needs, with 58(38.7%) agreeing and 24(16%) were undecided. At least 51(34%) of the teachers were undecided that observation debriefing reflects a use of multiple data source in conducting their appraisal, with 36 (31%) agreeing and 53 (35%) disagreed.

Majority of the teachers 93(62%) disagreed that classroom observation by appraiser is usually fair and objective, while 40 (27%) agreed and 17 (11.3%) were undecided. Majority of the teachers 90 (60%) disagreed that their appraiser applies non-consistent performance standards with all other teachers in the school, while 38 (25%) agreed and 22 (15%) were undecided. This indicated that appraiser applies consistent performance standards with all other teachers in the school.

Majority of the teachers 123 (82%) disagreed that TPAD system does not requires continuous review, with 6 (4%) undecided and 21 (14%) agreeing. This implies that TPAD system requires continuous review. At least 74 (49%) disagreed that the overall appraisal ratings are not influenced by a singular weakness in their performance with 44 (29%) agreeing and 32 (21.3%) undecided. this implies that overall appraisal ratings are influenced by a singular weakness in my performance.

On teachers' perceptions on the procedural fairness in the implementation of performance appraisal practices in public secondary schools Trans Nzoia County, Kenya, majority of the teachers agreed that the performance appraisal is a true reflection of teacher's competence in school. TPAD tools were valid and reliable in determining teacher's rewards and sanctions like promotion, demotion and salary increment. Most of the teachers agreed that teachers' input was considered during formulation and implementation of TPAD policy and TPAD covers all the teacher's performance indicators in the school.

From the study the findings indicated that TPAD system requires continuous review, there was decimal pre-appraisal conference involving all staff to set performance targets, there was clear TPAD cycle policy in the school. TPAD appraisal tool is essentially standardized for all teachers, classroom observation tool is also very objective, and TPAD should ideally be reviewed continuously. Their responses should there be consistent i.e. majority should agree that there exists this pre-appraisal conference. TPAD sometimes helps to identify teachers training needs, observation debriefing reflects a use of multiple data source in conducting their appraisal and the overall appraisal ratings are never influenced by a singular weakness in their performance.

From the study the findings indicated that TPAD system requires continuous review, there was decimal pre-appraisal conference involving all staff to set performance targets, there was clear TPAD cycle policy in the school. TPAD appraisal tool is essentially standardized for all teachers, classroom observation tool is also very objective, TPAD should ideally be reviewed continuously. Their responses should there be consistent i.e. majority should agree that there exists this pre-appraisal conference. Sometimes the TPAD helps to identify teachers training needs, observation debriefing reflects a use of multiple data source in conducting their appraisal and the overall appraisal ratings are never influenced by a singular weakness in their performance.

## Correlation Results

The researcher conducted correlation analysis in order to establish the relationship between variables. To achieve this Pearson's correlation product moment was carried out because all the variables were in interval scale and results presented in Table 3.



**Table 3 Correlation Results**

		TPAD	Procedural
TPAD	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
Procedural	Pearson Correlation	.543**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**1. Listwise N=312**

Findings of the study showed that there was a significant influence of procedural fairness on implementation of performance appraisal practices ( $r=0.543$ ,  $p =0.00$ ). This implies that an increase in procedural fairness there was an improved implementation of performance appraisal practices. This finding agrees with Cropanzano, Bowen and Gillilan (2007) that procedural justice establishes certain principles specifying and governing the roles of participants within the decision-making process. Procedural justice seems to be essential to maintaining institutional legitimacy. Also concurs with Lemons and Jones (2001) that procedural justice refers to the perceived fairness or equity of the procedures used in making decisions regarding the distribution of rewards, such as promotion.

From the interviews one of the principals stated that; “during the evaluation process, the absence of fair procedures increases distress because the results of performance appraisal are essentially outside the control of the employee.

This agrees with Boswell and Boudreau (2000) observe that the attitude of employees about the performance appraisal practices determines the effectiveness of the appraisal process. It concurs with Belanger, McNally, and Flint (2006) that there are positive relationships between perceptions of privacy and procedural justice. Perceptions of procedural justice are high if there are standards to insure the results of monitoring are accurate; and that the organization has appeal procedures to correct unreasonable outcomes. This finding supports Grobler (2011) who noted that the appraisal of teachers is a function that involves human decision-making by judging the effectiveness of a particular work performance making use of reports that compare the actual work performance with set performance benchmarks.

**CONCLUSION**

The performance appraisal is a true reflection of teacher’s competence in school, TPAD tools were valid and reliable in determining teacher’s rewards and sanctions like promotion, demotion and salary increment. Teachers’ input was considered during formulation and implementation of TPAD policy and TPAD covers all the teacher’s performance indicators in the school. TPAD appraisal tool is essentially standardized for all teachers, classroom observation tool is also very objective, TPAD should ideally be reviewed continuously.

The study concludes that there was significant influence of procedural justice, on implementation of performance appraisal practices. A rise in procedural justice, led to an increase in implementation of performance appraisal practices. Teachers’ efforts in school have been recognized and fairly rewarded by the school and TSC and incentive scheme for those who have exemplary appraisal rating. TPAD policy has clear mechanisms to recognize and reward teachers commensurately both in school and from TSC. The teachers receive the appraisal outcome they deserve.

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study recommends that TSC needs to develop and conduct continuous induction courses on performance appraisal for principals, deputy principals, heads of departments and teachers in order to demystify purpose of teachers' performance appraisal in schools. Enhanced awareness can change the attitude that, teachers' appraisals are aimed at aiding only the school management.

## REFERENCES

1. Adams, J. S. (1965), Inequity in social exchange, In L. Berkowitz (ed.) *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 2: 267-299, New York: Academic Press.
2. Ademola, S. (2017). Impact of performance appraisal on employee performance. *International journal of economics and business management* 3 (1) 80-90.
3. Adler, S., Campion, M., Colquitt, A., Grubb, A., Ollander-Krane, R., & Pulakos, E. D. (2016). Getting Rid of Performance Ratings: Genius or Folly? A Debate. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 219-252.
4. Aggarwal-Gupta, M. & Kumar, R. 2010. Look who's talking! Impact of communication relationship satisfaction on justice perceptions. *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers*, 35(3):55-65.
5. Aguinis, A. (2009). *Performance management*. (2nd edn.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
6. AL-ZU'BI, H.A. (2010). A study of relationship between organisational justice and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12):102-110.
7. Asira, G. (2011). Teachers' perception about performance appraisal system in the Oftinso Municipality Education Directorate. Unpublished Master of Education thesis. University of cape coast.
8. Aslam, H. D., & Sarwar, S. (2010). Improving Performance Management Practices in IT Firms of Pakistan. *Journal of Management Research*, 2(2).
9. Bayon, S. (2013). The origin, concept and value of performance appraisal. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 1(3), 111-123.
10. Belanger, I., McNally, J., & Flint, D. (2006). Models of the effects of monitoring perception of trust, organizational justice and organizational outcomes. *The Business Review*, 6(1), 51-55.
11. Bies, R. J. (1987). The predicament of injustice: The management of moral outrage. *Research in organizational behavior*.
12. Bies, R.J. and Moag, J.S. (1986), "Interactional justice: communication criteria of fairness", in Lewicki, R.J., Sheppard, B.H. and Bazerman, M.H. (Eds), *Research on Negotiations in Organizations*, JAI, Greenwich, CT, pp. 43-55.
13. Bokor, J. M., Danku, S.W., Dordor, F. & Soglo, N. Y. (2015) performance appraisal in the Ghana Education servicer. *International journal of managerial studies and research* 3 (6) 117-133.
14. Cawley, B. D., Keeping, L. M., & Levy, P. E. (1998). Participation in the Performance appraisal process and employee reactions: A meta-analytic review of field investigations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(4), 615-633.
15. Cawley, B.D., Keeping, L.M. & Levy, P.E. (2008). Participation in the performance appraisal process and employee reactions: A meta-analytic review of field investigations.
16. Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: a construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386-400.
17. Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? An Historical Overview. In J. Greenberg, & J. A. Colquitt, *The handbook of Organizational Justice* (pp. 3-56). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
18. Cook, J., & Crossman, A. (2004). Satisfaction with performance appraisal system. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(5), 526-542.

19. Creswell, J. W. (2003). A framework for design. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*, 9-11.
20. Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating*. W. Ross MacDonald School Resource Services Library.
21. Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., and Gilliland, S. W. (2007), The Management of Organizational Justice, *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34-48
22. Culbertson, S.S., Henning, J.B., & Payne, S.C. (2013). Performance appraisal satisfaction. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 12(4), 189–195. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000096>
23. Darehzereshki, M. (2013). Effects of performance appraisal quality on job satisfaction in multinational companies in malaysia. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems*.
24. Day, N.E. 2011. Perceived pay communication, justice and pay satisfaction. *Employee Relations*, 33(5): 476-497.
25. Desalegn, A. (2010). Human resource development practices: enhancing employees' satisfaction: A case study of Ethiopian Electric Power Corporation.
26. Dessler, G., & Varkkey, B. (2016). *Human Resource Management*. US: Prectice Hall.
27. Dijke, M. V., & Cremer, D. D. (2016). Justice in the Work Setting. In C. Sabbagh, & M. Schmitt, *Handbook of Social Justice Theory and Research* (pp. 315-332). New York: Springer Science + Business Media.
28. Dusterhoff, C., Cunningham, J. B., & MacGregor, J. N. (2014). The effects of performance rating, leader-member exchange, perceived utility, and organizational justice on performance appraisal satisfaction: Applying moral judgement perspective. *Journal of business ethics*, 119, 265-273.
29. Eniye, D. (2007) "Assessment of employees' performance appraisal practices? case study of Bank of Abyssinia", Addis Ababa University.
30. Erdogan, B. (2002). Antecedents and Consequences of Justice Perceptions in Performance Appraisals. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(2002) 555-578.
31. Folger, R. (2011). *Rethinking equity theory: a referent cognitions model*. New York: Plenum Press.
32. Geeta, R., Pooja, G. & Renu, R. 2011. Effect of justice perception on managerial effectiveness. *IUP Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 10(2):7-20.
33. Gichuki (2010), Teachers Perceptions of Performance Appraisal System Effectiveness in Public Secondary Schools in Naivasha and Gilgil District, Nakuru County. Unpublished Work.
34. Gichuki, M. G. (2015). Teachers' Perception of the Performance Appraisal System Effectiveness in Public Secondary Schools in naivasha and Gilgil Districts, Nakuru County. Nairobi: Kenyatta University.
35. Gilliland, S. W., & Langdon, J. C. (1998). Creating performance management systems that promote perceptions of fairness. *Performance appraisal: State of the art in practice*, 209-243.
36. Greenberg, J. (1990), Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 16, Issue 2, pp. 399-
37. Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organisational justice. In R. corpanzano, *Justice in the Workplace: approaching Fairness In Human Resource Management* (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
38. Grobler, U. (2011). Enhancing school based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional and academic learning. *American Psychologist*, 58, 466-474.
39. Grote, R. C. (2011). *How to be good at performance appraisals: Simple, Effective, Done Right*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
40. Hallinger, P., Heck, R. H., & Murphy, J. (2014). Teacher evaluation and school improvement: An analysis of the evidence. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 26(1), 5-28.
41. Homans, C. C. (1961). *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, and World.

42. Hulin, C., Roznowski, M., & Hacya, D. (1985). Alternative opportunities and withdrawal decisions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 233-250.
43. Ikramullah, M., Shah, B., Hassan, F. S., Zaman, T., & Khan, H. (2011). Fairness Perceptions of Performance Appraisal System: An Empirical Study of Civil Servants in District Dera Ismail Khan, Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(21).
44. Iqbal, M. Z., Akbar, S., & Budhwar, P. (2015). Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal: An Integrated Framework. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 17, 510-533.
45. Jawahar, I.M. (2007). A model of organizational justice and workplace aggression. *Journal of Management*, 28(6), 811-834.
46. Jonyo, D. O. and Jonyo, B. O. (2017) Management in Kenyan Public Schools: Implications and Challenges. *European Journal of Educational Sciences*, EJES September 2017 edition Vol.4, No.3
47. Jonyo, O. D. & Owour, J. (2017). Teacher management emerging issues *European journal of Science Education* 4(1) 1857-6036.
48. Kamiti, R.K. (2014). The effect of performance appraisal system on civil servants motivation. Unpublished dissertation, University of Nairobi.
49. Kampkotter, P. (2015). Performance Appraisals and Job Satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-25.
50. Kanisa, N.O. & Makokha, E.N. (2017). Effect of performance appraisal on organizational performances. *European Journal of Business and management*, 9 (26) 95-101.
51. Kanyi, J. (2011) the effect of digital content utilization on teaching and learning in Kenyan Secondary schools, Unpublished research project for master in information systems: University of Nairobi
52. Kenyatta, O. J. (2016). The Relationship Between Teachers' Attitude Towards Performance Appraisal And Their Commitment To Service In Public Secondary Schools In Rachuonyo South Sub-County, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, University Of Nairobi).
53. Kirai, M. & Kisang, F. (2016). Effects of performance appraisal on employee motivation. *The strategic journal of business & change management*, 3(4) 521-542.
54. Lemons, D. A. and Jones, C. A. (2001), Procedural justice in promotion decisions: Using perceptions of fairness to build employee commitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16(4), 268-280.
55. Leventhal GS. (1980). What should be done with equity theory?, In Gergen KJ, Greenberg MS, Willis RH (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55), New York Plenum Press
56. E. A. & Tyler, W. (2005). *Justice in social relations*. New York: Plenum. Longhurst, R. (2010). Semi-structured Interviews and Focus Groups. *Key Methods in Geography*, 103.
57. Ling, S. W., (2005). Teachers' perceptions of the appraisal system in Hongkong secondary School in relation to professional development. Unpublished Master of Education dissertation, university of Hong Kong.
58. Locke, S. B. (1968). Experimental control of onion white rot by means of soil chemicals. *Plant Dis. Repr*, 52(4), 272-276.
59. Long, C. S., Kowang, T. O., Ismail, W. K., & Rasid, S. Z. (2013). A Review on Performance Appraisal System: An Ineffective and Destructive Practice? *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 14(7), 887-891.
60. Meinert, D. (2015). Is it time to put the performance review on a PIP? *HR Magazine*, 60(3), 1-12.
61. Midimo, L. (2017). Teachers' response to appraisals; the case of secondary schools in Nyeri County. Unpublished MBA project.
62. Morgan, D. L. (2007). Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods. *Journal of mixed methods research*, 1(1), 48-76.
63. Muhammad F. K., (2013). Role of Performance Appraisal System on Employees Motivation *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)* e-ISSN: 2278-487X. Volume 8, Issue 4 (Mar. – Apr. 2013), PP 66-83 [www.iosrjournals.org](http://www.iosrjournals.org)
64. Nyatera, V. O. (2011). Headteachers and Teachers perceptions regarding staff Performance appraisal. Unpublished Master of Education thesis, Kenyatta University.
65. Obi, E. (2003). *Educational Management and Practice*. Enugu: Jamoe Enterprises(Nig).



66. Okumbe, J. (1999). A (2001). Human Resource Management. Nairobi: Nairobi University Press. Republic of Kenya.
67. Organ, D. W. (1995). The subtle significance of job satisfaction. In B. M. Staw, Psychological Dimensions of Organizational Behavior (pp. 108-113). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
68. Oyaro C. (2016). Factors influencing teachers' attitudes towards performance Unpublished MBA, Dissertation University of Nairobi.
69. Qureshi, Z. I. (2005). Performance Challenges at Masood Textile Mills. Asian Case Research Journal, 9(1), 61-81.
70. Salaman, G., Storey, J., & Billsberry, J. (2005). Strategic human resource management: defining the field. Strategic human resource management, 1-11.
71. Sapra, N. (2012). Current trends in performance appraisal. International Journal of Research in IT & Management, 2(2), 1203-1211.
72. Selvarajan, T. T., & Cloninger, P. A. (2012). Can performance appraisals motivate employees to improve performance? A Mexican study. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 23(15), 3063-3084.
73. Shalhoop, J. H. (2003). Social exchange as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and workplace outcomes, unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Akron, Akron, OH.
74. Skarlicki, Daniel P., and Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(3), 434-443
75. Sudin, S. (2011). Fairness of and Satisfaction with Performance Appraisal Process. Journal of Global Management, 2(1) 66-83.
76. Surbhi S. (2015). Difference between developed countries and developing countries. [Internet: <http://keydifferences.com/difference-between-developed-countries-and-developing-countries.html#ixzz4ilkUHOxg>; downloaded on 2017-05-27.]
77. Taneja, S., Srivastava, R., & Ravichandran, N. (2015). Consequence of Performance Appraisal Justice Perception: A study of Indian Banks. The IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior, XIV (3), 33-46.
78. Taylor, E. S., & Tyler, J. H. (2012). The effect of evaluation on teacher performance. American Economic Review, 102(7), 3628-51.
79. Teachers Service Commission (2016). Teacher Performance Appraisal and Development TSC website.pdf. (Accessed on 20th May, 2019).
80. Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). Procedural justice: a psychological analysis. Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum
81. Thomas, S.L. & Bretz, R.D. (2011). Research and practice in performance appraisal: evaluating employee performance in America's largest companies. SAM Advanced Management Journal, 69, 28-34.
82. Thurston, P.W & Mc Nall, L. (2010). Justice perceptions of performance appraisal practices. Journal of managerial Psychology, 25(3): 201-288
83. TSC (2017), A Report on the Implementation of the PC/TPAD, by CSOs & TSC (2017), A Report on the Implementation of the PC/TPAD, by CSOs & CDs KTIC/TPAD/V.1/6(62)
84. TSC (2017), Strengthening of PC & TPAD at Institutional Level, Circular No.14/ADM/192A/Vol. IX TSC Annual Report (2015-2016)
85. Wang, K.Y. & Nayir, D.Z. (2010). Procedural justice, participation and power distance: Information sharing in Chinese firms. Management Research Review, 33(1):66-78.
86. Warokka, A., Gallato, C.G., & Moorthy, T. (2012). Organizational justice in performance appraisal system and work performance: Evidence from an emerging market. Journal of Human Resources Management Research. 2012, 1-18.
87. Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). The widget effect: our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness. Education digest: Essential readings condensed for quick review, 75(2), 31-35.
88. Wilkie, D. (2015). Is the annual performance review dead? Retrieved 2018, from <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/employee-relations/pages/performance-reviews-are-dead.aspx>

89. Zhang, F. (2017). *The value of intellectual styles*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.10.1017/9781316014561 [Google Scholar]
90. Zhang, X. F., & Ng, H. M. (2011). A case study of teacher appraisal in Shanghai, China: In relation to teacher professional development. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 12(4), 569-580.
91. Zhang, X. F., & Ng, H. M. (2017). An effective model of teacher appraisal: Evidence from secondary schools in Shanghai, China. *Educational management administration & leadership*, 45(2), 196-218.