

## **Influence of Distributive Fairness on Performance Appraisal practices in Public Secondary Schools in Cherangany Sub-County**

### **ABSTRACT**

**Aims:** Teachers' performance appraisal has been an integral component of teacher management system in Kenya. As such its application is critical in ensuring quality delivery. This study therefore sought to establish the influence of distributive fairness on implementation of performance appraisal practices in public secondary schools in Cherangany Sub-County.

**Study Design:** The study used concurrent triangulation design.

**Place and Duration of the Study:** Public secondary schools in Cherangany Sub-County.

**Methodology:** The study included 187 respondents. Of these there were 37 (25 male and 12 female principals having an age range of 35 – 51 years). In addition 150 (80 male and 70 female teachers) were included. Stratified, simple random and purposive sampling was used to select respondents. Questionnaire was used to collect information and opinions from teachers and interviews from the principals.

**Results:** There was a significant positive influence of distributive fairness on implementation of performance appraisal practices ( $r = 0.51$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). Therefore, the more distributive fairness led to an increase in implementation of performance appraisal practices.

**Conclusion:** The results indicated positive influence of distributive fairness in the implementation of performance appraisal practices in public secondary schools in Cherangany Sub-County. To change the negative influence from the teachers, the study recommends use of a combination of methods in collection of performance appraisal data such as peer observation, self-evaluation, 360-degree assessment, verbal discussions and external assessment. The teachers should however be involved in selection of the preferred appraisal methods.

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

### **1. Introduction**

One of the most important functions of human resource management is performance evaluation (PA), in which subordinates' expectations and goals are defined, communicated, reviewed, and evaluated against established standards [2]. Teacher evaluation loses its connection to the process of teaching improvement and teachers' professional development [3] and becomes a meaningless rite of passage. Educators' presentation evaluation has been a fundamental part of educator the executives framework in numerous nations for more noteworthy responsibility and quality conveyance.

Decency or authoritative equity in execution evaluation cycle and practices is critical for associations due to its relationship with workers' work fulfillment and hierarchical responsibility [3].

According to [5], researchers in organizational justice categorize fairness into three main categories: The term "distributive" justice is used to describe the first type of justice that is generally accepted. 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 [6]. 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.

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 that are used to make those decisions (procedural justice), and the treatment that they receive from the organization or agents, such as managers (interpersonal justice), as well as the fact that an organization provides all of the necessary information related to various outcomes [7]. Fairness perceptions of practices in performance management have ramifications not only for the organization but also for the employees [7].

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." Since individual and organizational outcomes have been found to be linked to employees' perceptions of fairness, organizational researchers have focused on fairness over the past ten years [8].

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 deemed fair when employees perceive that their rewards are proportional to their efforts [9]. The employees' perceptions of the fairness of the procedures used to determine their outcomes or appraisals are the second dimension of organizational justice. 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.

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 that are used to make those decisions (procedural justice), and the treatment that they receive from the organization or agents, such as managers (interpersonal justice), as well as the fact that an organization provides all of the necessary information related to various outcomes [7]. Fairness perceptions of practices in performance management have ramifications not only for the organization but also for the employees [7].

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." Since individual and organizational outcomes have been found to be linked to employees' perceptions of fairness, organizational researchers have focused on fairness over the past ten years [8].

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 deemed fair when employees perceive that their rewards are proportional to their efforts [9]. The employees' perceptions of the fairness of the procedures used to determine their outcomes or appraisals are the second dimension of organizational justice. 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.

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 that are used to make those decisions (procedural justice), and the treatment that they receive from the organization or agents, such as managers (interpersonal justice), as well as the fact that an organization provides all of the necessary information related to various outcomes [7]. Fairness perceptions of practices in performance management have ramifications not only for the organization but also for the employees [7].

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." Since individual and organizational outcomes have been found to be linked to employees' perceptions of fairness, organizational researchers have focused on fairness over the past ten years [8]. 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 deemed fair when employees perceive that their rewards are proportional to their efforts [9]. The employees' perceptions of the fairness of the procedures used to determine their outcomes or appraisals are the second dimension of organizational justice. 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.

Human beings have a tendency to arbitrarily, naturally, and formally evaluate the performance of both themselves and another employee who works with them, as demonstrated in [22]. Due to their inaccuracies, these judgments are illegal and may cause serious issues at work, which may have a negative impact on employee motivation. As a result, organizations should implement structured performance evaluations to prevent employees from being unfairly judged. Teachers revealed, according to [23], that performance evaluation is a costly procedure that necessitates financial resources for training design, preparation, and implementation. The majority of teachers observed did not consider the basic school's appraisal process to be fair in terms of their perception of it. Because the feedback did not accurately reflect the staff's performance, it was only intended to harm them. The appraisal process was seen as a waste of time by the majority of teachers because it had no connection to their professional development. [24] A study on teacher evaluations in Botswana's secondary schools found that private and public institutions used performance evaluation data to guide future assignments for employees. Because it would enable them to acquire additional knowledge, skills, and confidence necessary for proper service delivery, they noted that an efficient performance evaluation system is improvement-oriented. However, the study found that teachers' perceptions of the study's attitude toward checking teachers' competencies and paying them based on performance and disciplinary measures determined by the appraisal instrument were negative.

In addition, the Ethiopian evaluation procedure changed its intention to improve teacher performance, as noted in [25]. As per this review, the job of educator execution evaluation was viewed as simple way of talking. The procedure suggested that there was a significant gap between teacher performance evaluation theory and practice. A teacher's individual competencies, performance, and professional needs are evaluated during a teacher's performance evaluation by either the principal, deputy principal, or senior teacher [25]. The process could also be thought of as one of those interventions that lead to professional development through in-service training. It focuses on improving teachers' knowledge, skills, and confidence for better performance, which is good for the school as well as the teacher [24].

In South Africa execution evaluation is principally used to give criticism on lacking execution, perceive extraordinary execution and distinguish preparing requirements of workers [26]. In any case, in South Africa, nature of educating is by and large poor regardless of endeavors of government and the confidential area (CDE, 2015). The integrated Strategic Planning Framework for Teacher Education and Development (ISPFTED, 2011-2021), also known as the "Plan," separates teacher development appraisal from salary progression appraisal. Teachers and the government could not agree on how to put the appraisal system into action (CDE, 2015). In Uganda because of their authoritative culture which is progressive and

unbending, open conversation among chief and staff part tend not to occur during the examination cycle [27]. Given the information presented, the study's objective was to determine how distributive fairness affected the implementation of performance evaluation practices in Cherangany Sub-County public secondary schools. Implementation of performance appraisal practices in public secondary schools in Cherangany Sub-County was used to test this null hypothesis, which found that there was no significant correlation between distributive fairness and implementation.

## **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

The pragmatic philosophical research paradigm, which employs pluralistic means of acquiring knowledge about a phenomenon, served as the foundation for this study. [13] Backs this up and argues that pragmatism allows one to work within an interpretivist and positivist framework. Realism is by and large viewed as the philosophical accomplice for the blended strategies approach. Even minded research reasoning is appropriate for this study since it permitted the scientist to utilize whatever blend of techniques important to track down replies to explore questions. [29] defines a mixed method as a study that employs both quantitative and qualitative approaches to answer research questions in one or more phases.

The review embraced elucidating overview research plan. Because it yields conclusive results for each of the research variables, this design was appropriate. The review was done in Cherangany Sub-Region. The county is 556.9 km<sup>2</sup> in size. The socioeconomic well-being of Cherangany Sub-County is largely dependent on the cultivation of maize and other agricultural products. There is likewise remarkable variety in how schools perform Kenya Authentication of Optional Training (KCSE).

The 71 public secondary schools in Cherangany Sub-County and all secondary school teachers in Trans-Nzoia County were the target population. The objective populace was 539 respondents containing 71 chiefs and 468 instructors from 71 public auxiliary schools. The example size was drawn from 468 respondents containing 71 administrators and 468 educators from 71 public auxiliary schools in Trans-Nzoia Area. A simplified formula for determining the respondents' sample size is provided by Yamane (1967). The researcher used proportionate sampling to select 86 respondents from the target population of 539.

Five Subcounties were divided into strata using stratified sampling in the study. The strata made sure that the sample would have subjects from each kind of school. Purposive examining was utilized to choose chiefs in public or additional region school in the example. After determining the number of schools in each category, stratified random sampling was used to select the principals. Educators tested through proportionate basic arbitrary examining to guarantee portrayal in the example of instructors from various school layers. The study used questionnaires, interviews, and document analysis to collect both primary and secondary data. The sampling method ensured that every employee in the population had the same chance of being included in the sample. Primary data from respondents was gathered through the use of a questionnaire in the study. The survey contained close finished questions in view of study goals. The four-point Likert scale was used in the questionnaire, with 1 denoting Strongly Disagree, 2 denoting Disagree, 3 denoting Agree, and 4 denoting Strongly Agreed. Directors were directed through a meeting to hear a top to bottom point of view about the utilization of TPAD in their schools. The instrument was operated in the county that was nearby. Part half procedure to gauge unwavering quality was utilized. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was then used to calculate a correlation between the scores obtained by administering the two halves. A connection coefficient of 0.85 was gotten. The gathered information were investigated utilizing engaging and inferential insights with the assistance of factual bundle for sociologies (SPSS). Results were introduced as recurrence and rates. At a significance level of  $p < 0.05$ , correlation analyses were carried out to ascertain the relationship between the variables.

## **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **3.1 Teacher Performance Appraisal Practices**

Teacher Performance Appraisal Practices in public secondary schools in Cherangany Sub-County was examined and results presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Teacher Performance appraisal practices**

	SA		A		D		SD	
	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	30	20.0	48	32.0	52	34.7
Enhanced teachers' ability to manage teaching time e.g. punctuality at duty station and lesson attendance etc	12	8.0	30	20.0	44	29.3	52	34.7
Enhanced teachers' innovativeness and creativity at work e.g. Integration of ICT in teaching and learning etc	8	5.3	24	16.0	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	26	17.3	50	33.3	38	25.3
Enhanced teachers' involvement in promotion of co-curricular activities e.g. Sports, music, drama etc.		0.0	28	18.7	30	20.0	60	40.0
Enabled teachers to engage in their own professional development e.g. Enrolment in teacher professional development courses etc		0.0	32	21.3	26	17.3	66	44.0
Facilitated teachers to collaborate with parents, guardians and other education stake holders to promote education	15	10.0	70	46.7	36	24.0	15	10.0
Helped maintain records of teaching and learning performance for decision making	14	9.3	66	44.0	26	17.3	9	6.0

According to the findings, teachers are unable to improve their professional knowledge and its application in the maintenance and use of approved professional documents thanks to the feedback provided in performance evaluations. Greater part of the respondents 52 (34.7%) would in general unequivocally differ that presentation evaluation criticism upgraded educators' capacity to oversee showing time for example reliability at obligation station and illustration participation, albeit 12 (8%) were unsure and 8 (5.3%) emphatically concurred and 30 (20%) concurred with a similar assertion. This suggests that teachers' ability to manage teaching time, such as being on time to their duty station and attending lessons, is not always improved by performance evaluation feedback.

52 (34.7%) of respondents disagreed with the statement that performance evaluation feedback increased teachers' innovativeness and creativity at work, such as the integration of ICT into teaching and learning. Twenty-four (16%) agreed, and twenty-two (11.34%) were undecided. According to the findings, teachers' innovativeness and creativity at work are not enhanced by the feedback provided in performance evaluations. Although 54 (17.3%) were undecided and 26.6% disagreed with the same statement, the majority of respondents (53.3%) tended to disagree that performance evaluation feedback enhanced teachers' knowledge of learner protection, safety, discipline, and teachers' conduct, such as compliance with the Children's Act. This suggests that exhibition evaluation input don't necessarily in all cases improve educators' information on student security, wellbeing, discipline and educators direct.

The majority of respondents, 60 (40%), disapprove of the statement that performance evaluation feedback increased teachers' involvement in promoting co-curricular activities like sports, music, and drama, with 28 (18.7%) agreeing and 32 (21.3%) not sure. This indicated that teachers' involvement in promoting extracurricular activities is not always enhanced by performance evaluation feedback. A large portion of the respondents 66 (44%) can't help contradicting the explanation that evaluation has empowered educators to participate in their own proficient improvement for example Enrolment in educator proficient advancement courses, with 32 (21.3%) concurring and 17.3% unsure. This indicated that teachers cannot participate in their own professional development through performance evaluation.

The majority of respondents (70, or 46.7%) concur with the statement that evaluation has made it easier for teachers to work with parents, guardians, and other stakeholders in education to promote education, while 36, or 24%, disagree. This indicated that teachers' collaboration with parents, guardians, and other stakeholders in education to promote education is hindered by performance evaluation. The majority of respondents, 66 (44%) concur with the statement that evaluation has assisted in maintaining records of teaching and learning performance for decision-making purposes, while 26 (17.3%) disagree. This indicated that performance evaluation does not aid in decision-making by keeping records of teaching and learning performance.

Teachers' ability to manage their teaching time, their innovativeness and creativity at work, and their professional knowledge and application have not been enhanced by performance evaluations. Teachers' knowledge of learner protection, safety, discipline, and conduct, their participation in the promotion of co-curricular activities, and their ability to participate in their own professional development courses have not been improved by performance appraisal feedback. The majority of respondents agree that evaluation has made it easier for teachers to work with parents, guardians, and other stakeholders in education to promote education and has helped keep records of teaching and learning performance for decision-making.

From the meeting one of the chiefs expressed that: The teacher's perceptions of the fairness of the appraisal procedures are crucial to the performance evaluation process's effectiveness. On the overall rating of processes adherence of TPAD programmes at various levels in public secondary schools in Trans Nzoia County, the majority of teachers rated the adherence at school level and TSC Headquarter to be effective, while the sub-county and County Level adherence was rated to be moderately effective. This is the case in situations where the performance practices are perceived to be partial and teachers become dissatisfied with the process. These discoveries concur with (30) who figured out that Dad makes the instructors to need what to enhance because of ignorance brought about by an absence of input. It agrees with (31) that skilled practitioners' constructive feedback is necessary for teachers to improve their teaching. The findings are in line with those of the Teacher Service Commission (2016), which stated at the beginning of the performance and evaluation tool that preparing teaching/learning aids and incorporating ICT into teaching and learning demonstrate innovation and creativity in teaching.

These results are in line with the Teacher Services Commission's (2016) recommendation that a teacher performance and evaluation tool be created to foster cooperative relationships with school stakeholders and the general public. As a result, the study concludes that teacher performance benefits from parent collaboration. These results are in line with those of [32], who observed that PTA engages with Nigeria's school board of management to guarantee quality standards and academic excellence.

### **3.2 Influence of distributive fairness in the implementation of performance appraisal practices**

The respondents were asked to rate on a five-point Likert scale their level of agreement on several statements describing their perceptions of distributive fairness in the implementation of performance appraisal practices in public secondary schools in Cherangany Sub-County and their response were summarized in Table 2.

The findings indicated that majority of the teachers 42 (28%) felt that other teachers may not be receiving the appraisal outcome they deserve. On the other hand a few 18 (12%) felt that other teachers were receiving the appraisal they deserved. These results indicate that the appraisal practices may not be practices as they should. Further findings indicated that 39 (26%) of the teachers strongly agreed that their efforts in the school had been recognized and fairly rewarded by the school and TSC (Teachers Service Commission), 42 (28%) agreed, 34 (22.7%) disagreed while 11 (7.3%) strongly disagreed. The findings shows that majority of the teachers felt that their efforts had been rewarded fairly.

In regard to rewarding teachers whose appraisal ratings are low and are unfairly rewarded 13 (8.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed, 38 (25.3%) agreed, 24 (16%) disagreed while 13 (8.7%) strongly disagreed. These results show that the perception of teachers is that they should be awarded in regard to whatever they score in the appraisal in order to reflect the fairness that TPAD espouses.

Table 2 further indicated that 40 (26.7%) of the teachers indicated that there is an incentive scheme for those who have exemplary appraisal rating, 52 (34.7%) agreed, 18 (12%) disagreed while 8 (5.3%). Further information indicated that 41 (27.3%) of the respondents strongly agreed that there is meritocracy in promotions and only those who deserve get it according to performance appraisal, 50 (33.3%) agreed while 21 (14%) disagreed and 16 (10.7%) strongly disagreed. These data indicates that the well-deserved teachers as per the TPAD were promoted.

In regard to POYA, TOYA & iTOYA reward schemes in the school and region in relation to their distribution 32 (21.3%) of the teachers strongly agreed that they well distributed, 43 (28.7%) agreed on the other hand 33 (22%) disagreed while 15 (10%) strongly disagreed. It is important to mention that this reward scheme is based upon the TPAD appraisal thus the perceptive distribution indicated that there is fairness.

**Table 2 Influence of distributive fairness of TPAD**

	SA		A		D		SD	
	Freq	%	Fre	%	Fre	%	Fre	%
In general, I have been receiving the appraisal outcome I deserve	22	14.7	41	27.3	52	34.7	12	8.0
Other teachers in my school have been receiving the appraisal outcome they deserve	18	12.0	37	24.7	42	28.0	8	5.3
My efforts in this school have been recognized and fairly rewarded by the school and TSC	39	26.0	42	28.0	34	22.7	11	7.3
Teachers whose appraisal ratings are low are not unfairly rewarded	13	8.7	38	25.3	24	16.0	13	8.7
There is an incentive scheme for those who have exemplary appraisal rating.	40	26.7	52	34.7	18	12.0	8	5.3
The is meritocracy in promotions and only those who deserve get it according to performance appraisal	41	27.3	50	33.3	21	14.0	16	10.7
The POYA, TOYA & iTOYA reward schemes in my school and region are fairly distributed.	32	21.3	43	28.7	33	22.0	15	10.0
The TPAD policy has clear mechanisms to recognize and reward teachers commensurately both in school and from TSC	43	28.7	46	30.7	21	14.0	14	9.3

The majority of teachers in public secondary schools in Trans Nzoia County agreed that their efforts have been recognized and fairly rewarded by the school and TSC, and there was an incentive scheme for those who have an exemplary appraisal rating, according to the findings. Perceptions of distributive fairness in the performance appraisal and development policy were also found. The greater part of the educators concurred that there was meritocracy in advancements and just the people who merit make it accord to execution evaluation and TPAD strategy has clear systems to perceive and remunerate instructors similarly both in school and from TSC. Some of the time the POYA, TOYA and iTOYA reward plans in school and area were genuinely circulated, educators have been getting the examination result they merit. Employees' perceptions of the rater's goals may play a role in determining whether an evaluation is fair or unfair.

### 3.3 Correlation Results

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

**Table 3 Correlation Results**

		TPAD	Distributive
TPAD	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
Distributive	Pearson Correlation	.506**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	

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

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The majority of teachers in public secondary schools in Trans Nzoia County agreed that their efforts have been recognized and fairly rewarded by the school and TSC, and there was an incentive scheme for those who have an exemplary appraisal rating, according to the findings. Perceptions of distributive fairness in the performance appraisal and development policy were also found. The greater part of the educators concurred that there was meritocracy in advancements and just the people who merit make it accord to execution evaluation and TPAD strategy has clear systems to perceive and remunerate instructors similarly both in school and from TSC. Some of the time the POYA, TOYA and iTOYA reward plans in school and area were genuinely circulated, educators have been getting the examination result they merit. Employees' perceptions of the rater's goals may play a role in determining whether an evaluation is fair or unfair.

### 4. Conclusion

The distributive justice had a significant influence on implementation of performance appraisal practices. The distributive justice is more closely related to specific, person-referenced outcomes such as performance evaluation. The appraiser gives the same ratings to all teachers in order to avoid resentment. The teachers had academic qualification differences never affect appraisal rating and there was no appraiser treatment differently during the appraisal process.

### 5. Recommendation

To change the negative perceptions from the teachers, the study recommends use of a combination of methods in collection of performance appraisal data such as peer observation, self-evaluation, 360-degree assessment, verbal discussions and external assessment. The teachers should however be involved in selecting of the preferred appraisal methods. The

study suggests that there is need to organize in-service training for the school administrators to equip them with requisite skills, knowledge and attitude relevant to performance appraisal process as a way of improving the current teachers' perceptions about appraisals.

### **Ethical Approval**

Research permit was sought from the National Commission for Science, Technology & Innovation (NACOSTI). Upon being granted permission the researcher visited the County Education offices where authorization was granted to visit individual schools.

### **Consent**

As per international standard or university standard, respondents' written consent has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

### **References**

1. Kampkotter P. Performance Appraisals and Job Satisfaction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1-25: 2015.
2. Dessler G, Varkkey B. *Human Resource Management*. US: Prectice Hall: 2016
3. Zhang LF. *The value of intellectual styles*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; 2017
4. Cropanzano R, Bowen DE, Gilliland SW. The Management of Organizational Justice, *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34-48; 2006
5. Warokka A, Gallato CG, Moorthy T. Organizational justice in performance appraisal system and work performance: Evidence from an emerging market. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*. 2012, 1-18: 2012
6. Byrne ZS, Cropanzano R. The history of organizational justice: The founders speak. *Justice in the workplace: From theory to practice*, 2(1), 3-26: 2001
7. Ikramullah M, Shah B, Hassan FS, Zaman T, Khan H. 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): 2011
8. Colquitt JA, Greenberg J, Zapata-Phelan CP. What is organizational justice? An Historical Overview. In J. Greenberg, & J. A. Colquitt, *The handbook of Organizational Justice* (pp. 3-56). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. 2001
9. Dusterhoff C, Cunningham JB, MacGregor JN. 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: 2014
10. Bies RJ, Moag JS. "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 : 1986
11. Thurston PW, McNall L. Justice perceptions of performance appraisal practices. *Journal of managerial Psychology*, 25(3): 201-288; 2010
12. Hulin C, Roznowski M, Hacia D. Alternative opportunities and withdrawl decisions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 233-250:1985
13. Organ DW. The subtle significance of job satisfaction. In B. M. Staw, *Psychological Dimensions of Organizational Behavior* (pp. 108-113). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1995
14. Kamiti RK. *The effect of performance appraisal system on civil servants motivation*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Nairobi: 2014

15. Nyatera VO. Headteachers and Teachers perceptions regarding staff Performance appraisal. *Unpublished Master of Education thesis, Kenyatta University*: 2011
16. Jonyo DO, Jonyo BO. Management in Kenyan Public Schools: Implications and Challenges. *European Journal of Educational Sciences*, EJES September 2017 edition Vol.4,No.3: 2017
17. Kanisa NO, Makokha EN. Effect of performance appraisal on organizational performances. *European Journal of Business and management*, 9 (26) 95-101:2017
18. Gichuki P. *Teachers Perceptions of Performance Appraisal System Effectiveness in Public Secondary Schools in Naivasha and Gilgil District, Nakuru County*. Unpublished Work: 2017.
19. Jawahar IM. A model of organizational justice and workplace aggression. *Journal of Management*, 28(6), 811-834: 2007.
- 20 Akpotu NE. Performance appraisal of the Nigerian secondary school teachers: The students' perspectives. *International studies in educational Administration*. 32(3), 44-54: 2014
- 21 Oluoch G. *The Effects of Talent Management Processes on Performance of Young Professionals: A Case of Trufoods* (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University-Africa): 2017.
22. Adofo SP. *An evaluation of the performance appraisal system and its effect on employee performance*. Unpublished MBA Dissertation, Kwame Nkrumah University: 2011
23. Lydia SD. Performance Appraisal in the Ghana Education Service, the Case of Basic School Teachers in Ho Municipality. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR) Volume 3, Issue 6, June 2015, PP 117-133 ISSN 2349-0330 (Print) & ISSN 2349-0349 (Online) [www.arcjournals.org](http://www.arcjournals.org) : 2015*
- 24 Monyatisi P, Steyne T, Kamper G. Teachers appraisal in Botswana Secondary schools: A Critical Analysis: *South Africa Journal of Education* Vo. 1. 26 (2) 215 228: 2006.
- 25 Tilahum GG, Shanbel YT. *Is the Role of Teacher Performance Appraisal in Ethiopia Rhetoric or Reality? Convergence between Knowledge and Implementation and Finding Solutions from the Process*: unpublished thesis, Department of Psychology, Bahir Dar University: 2014.
26. Swaartbooi ON. *Performance appraisal the nurses experiences working in primary health care*. Unpublished MBA, Stellenbosch University: 2016
27. Karyeija GK. The impact of culture on Performance Appraisal Reforms in Africa: The case of Uganda's Civil Service. *Asian Social Science*, 8(4) 159- 174: 2012.
28. Morgan DL. Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods. *Journal of mixed methods research*, 1(1), 48-76: 2007.

29. Creswell JW. *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating*. W. Ross MacDonald School Resource Services Library: 2013.
30. Warokka A, Gallato CG, Moorthy T. Organizational justice in performance appraisal system and work performance: Evidence from an emerging market. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*. 2012, 1-18: 2012.
31. Gichuki, K. *Teachers Perceptions of Performance Appraisal System Effectiveness in Public Secondary Schools in Naivasha and Gilgil District, Nakuru County*. Unpublished Work: 2010.
32. Obi E. *Educational Management and Practice*. Enugu: Jamoe Enterprises(Nig): 2003

UNDER PEER REVIEW